

Physically Ground Commonsense Knowledge for Articulated Object Manipulation with Analytic Concepts

Jianhua Sun,* Jiude Wei,* Yuxuan Li,* Cewu Lu[†]
Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Abstract

We human rely on a wide range of commonsense knowledge to interact with an extensive number and categories of objects in the physical world. Likewise, such commonsense knowledge is also crucial for robots to successfully develop generalized object manipulation skills. While recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLM) have showcased their impressive capabilities in acquiring commonsense knowledge and conducting commonsense reasoning, effectively grounding this semantic-level knowledge produced by LLMs to the physical world to thoroughly guide robots in generalized articulated object manipulation remains a challenge that has not been sufficiently addressed. To this end, we introduce analytic concepts, procedurally defined upon mathematical symbolism that can be directly computed and simulated by machines. By leveraging the analytic concepts as a bridge between the semantic-level knowledge inferred by LLMs and the physical world where real robots operate, we are able to figure out the knowledge of object structure and functionality with physics-informed representations, and then use the physically grounded knowledge to instruct robot control policies for generalized, interpretable and accurate articulated object manipulation. Extensive experiments in both simulation and real-world environments demonstrate the superiority of our approach.

1. Introduction

Studies in human cognition [3, 4, 14, 16, 31] figure out that humans possess a wide range of commonsense knowledge which guides us to properly interact with an extensive number and categories of objects in the physical world. Such knowledge spans multiple physical concepts, including the spatial structures, functional properties and physical dynamics of objects. We are able to ground the commonsense knowledge from human cognition to the physical

*These authors contributed equally.

[†]Corresponding Author.




Figure 1. An illustration of the same knowledge presented using both semantic and physical expressions. Compared with semantic expressions, physical ones carry precise mathematical definitions and detailed numerical values, which can be better understood and computed by robots to instruct object manipulation. More details are provided in Fig. 3-Top.

world and effectively manipulate real-world objects based on this knowledge to accomplish specific tasks.

Therefore, this commonsense knowledge is also essential for the successful development of general robot manipulation. As recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) have shown substantial potential in utilizing commonsense knowledge and performing commonsense reasoning [1, 19, 30], researchers have leveraged LLMs in articulated object manipulation tasks to pursue more generalized robot manipulation capabilities [10, 12, 17, 29]. LLM-instructed paradigm incorporates an understanding of the semantics underlying the manipulation tasks. This facilitates an intuitive comprehension of the task goal, and enabling the semantic-level reasoning between actions and outcomes, which guide the robot to reasonably complete manipulation tasks, especially for open-ended tasks in real-world environment [2, 13].

However, since LLMs function at the semantic level, significant challenges still remain in effectively integrating their commonsense reasoning capability into the control policy, which operates at the physical level to manage




Figure 2. Illustrations of conventional LLM-driven object manipulation pipeline (left) and our approach (right). With analytic concepts, we bridge the gap between semantic level representations, which LLM excels at, and the physical world, on which the control policy operates. Refer to Fig. 3 for descriptions of **L_Handle**, **grasp_above** and **push_clockwise**.

real-robot interactions. On one hand, encoding knowledge in natural language as feature inputs for the control policy may hinder the control policy from fully recognizing the physical concepts underlying the knowledge [5, 22]. On the other hand, LLMs struggle with high-precision numerical analysis [9, 11], making it difficult to fine-tune an LLM to convey commonsense knowledge in a sufficiently precise physical form for manipulation tasks that demand high accuracy. Fig. 1 illustrates the differences between knowledge in the semantic form learned by LLMs and the physical form understood by robots.

In order to construct a bridge between the semantic-level knowledge inferred by LLMs and the physical world where real robots operate, we introduce analytic concepts. In our vision, a piece of commonsense knowledge encapsulates the essential commonality shared by a group of similar entities. From this perspective, an analytic concept is procedurally defined with mathematical symbols to represent such generalized commonality in a physical form which can be directly computed and simulated by machines. By aligning the semantic knowledge provided by LLMs with analytic concepts and mapping the analytic concepts to the physical world, we can identify important priors regarding object structure and functionality according to these concepts, and finally use these pieces of physically grounded knowledge to instruct robot control policies.

Fig. 2 demonstrates how we improve on the current LLM-instructed paradigm with analytic concepts. Specifically, given an open-ended text description of an object manipulation task in natural language and an RGB-D im-

age of the workspace, a robot should apply proper physical interactions to accomplish this task. In common practice (Fig. 2-Left), a multi-modal LLM is used to analyze the task description along with the image, then reason about where and how to interact with the target object and finally output a semantic-level task plan to instruct the control policy. In comparison (Fig. 2-Right), apart from the task description and the image of the workspace, we additionally provide the LLM with our proposed analytic concepts. With their crafted designs (delineated in Sec. 3), an LLM is capable of thoroughly comprehending and naturally linking these analytic concepts with other information together through its commonsense reasoning capability. Subsequently, we prompt the LLM to provide responses by employing analytic concepts, focusing on three critical aspects: the target part for manipulation, the target part’s structural knowledge, and the manipulation knowledge required to complete the manipulation task. In this manner, the semantic-level knowledge of these three aspects inferred by the LLM is aligned with the analytic concepts, and then we ground the concepts in the physical world. Finally, the control policy incorporates the knowledge within the grounded concepts as well as the RGB-D information of the target object, and generates reliable interaction strategies guided by the physical knowledge embedded in the concepts.

By bridging the semantic knowledge and the physical world through analytic concepts, our approach greatly benefits from the capability of LLMs in commonsense reasoning and instructing robot control policies for generalized, interpretable, and accurate articulated object manipulation. We have conducted exhaustive experiments in both simulation and real-world environments to demonstrate the superiority of our approach in articulated object manipulation.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We introduce analytic concepts to build a bridge between semantic-level knowledge inferred by LLMs and the physical world where real robots operate.
- We propose a pipeline to ground semantic-level knowledge in the physical world through analytic concepts, enabling concrete and precise guidance for the robot in completing various manipulation tasks.
- Benefiting from the strong reasoning capability of LLMs and analytic concepts as a physically grounded representation, our approach demonstrates great superiority in articulated object manipulation tasks across extensive object categories in both simulation and real-world environments.

2. Related Works

2.1. Articulated Object Manipulation

Articulated Object manipulation encompasses a wide range of tasks that center on how an embodied agent effectively




Figure 3. [Top] Example implementation of concept **L_Handle**, including **Concept Identity**, **Analytic Structural Knowledge** defined in 3D space (a-b), and **Analytic Manipulation Knowledge** (c-f). [Bottom] Visualizations of representative analytic concepts.

interacts with different kind of articulated objects, involving both visual perception and physical interactions [8, 12, 17, 24, 26]. Many researchers have investigated this topic from different aspects. For example, Xiang et al. [33] proposes a realistic and physics-rich simulator, and collects a large-scale set of articulated objects which include models of real-world manufacturers’ products and possess real-world diversity and complexity. Where2Act [24] introduces a framework to predict action likelihoods and generate manipulation proposals on a per-pixel basis, facilitating targeted interactions. Where2Explore [25] introduces a few-shot learning framework that measures affordance similarity across categories, enabling migration of affordance knowledge to novel objects. GPartNet [8] proposes the idea of generalized actionable parts and leverages the GPart pose as a kind of structured representation to define heuristic interaction policies for object manipulation. ManipLLM [17] takes a step further to use the robust reasoning capabilities of LLMs to infer action policies directly from an RGB image featuring a target object. These studies have contributed significantly to the development of the field.

2.2. Large Language Models

Recent advanced LLMs like LLaMa [30] and GPT-3 [7] have shown surprising abilities in solving a series of complex tasks, especially few-shot tasks which previous language models like GPT-2 [27] cannot do well, demonstrating significant potential in learning commonsense knowl-

edge and commonsense reasoning. To better harness LLMs’ power in vision research, Multi-modal Large Language Models [1, 18, 19] are developed and greatly broaden the scope of visual understanding and processing. For example, GPT-4o [1] effectively leverages commonsense knowledge and performs commonsense reasoning to interpret and respond to multi-modal tasks with a nuanced understanding, achieving competitive results in many vision tasks such as image captioning and visual question answering.

However, applying LLMs to object manipulation tasks [12, 17, 26], which involves precise interactions with the physical world, remains in its early stages. One of the most challenging problem is to align the representations in semantic and visual modalities with the action modality of a robot which concretely grounds in the physical world [21]. In this paper, we propose analytic concepts to better leverage the power of LLMs in the physical world and achieve more generalized robotic manipulation skills.

3. Analytic Concepts

We introduce how analytic concepts are developed to represent pieces of commonsense knowledge in a physical form in this section. As the example in Fig. 3-Top, each analytic concept consists of three components, concept identity, analytic structural knowledge, and analytic manipulation knowledge. Note that the manipulation knowledge is linked with a particular spatial structure, so we focus pri-

marily on structural knowledge when designing a concept and integrate the related manipulation knowledge into the same concept.

3.1. Concept Identity

First of all, we should give an identity to a concept as a unique symbol for a piece of commonsense knowledge, ensuring one-to-one correspondence. Besides, we further introduce a precise and concise synopsis of this concept along with the identity, so that the concept can be clearly understood not only by humans but also LLMs.

3.2. Analytic Structural Knowledge

The analytic structural knowledge is a series of mathematical procedures revealing the essential commonality of the spatial structure, including spatial layout and structural relationships, shared by all instances of the concept. Further, there are variable parameters in the procedures to represent the variations among different physical instances. That is, a physical instance of this concept can be created with specific parameters, and in turn, a target in the physical world can be also resolved into parameters of a concept.

3.3. Analytic Manipulation Knowledge

To properly interact with a spatial structure, we should know about its functional properties like affordances and physical dynamics like the effect of a force on it. From this point of view, we provide manipulation knowledge of grasp poses that meet the functional properties of the concept and force directions that would cause effective movement. Similar to the analytic structural knowledge, analytic manipulation knowledge is also formulated by mathematical procedures with variable parameters. A concept may contain multiple pieces of manipulation knowledge, and we also provide a precise and concise synopsis for each piece of manipulation knowledge to help LLMs perform better reasoning on them.

3.4. Discussions

Implementation. Considering each analytic concept is a symbol with procedural definitions, it is a good idea to implement them as class templates. Specifically, we use Python scripts in our implementation.

Creation of Analytic Concepts. As analytic concepts represent commonsense knowledge which is widely used in our daily life, such knowledge is easily understood, simply and clearly defined, and highly generalizable. Particularly, we invite volunteers with high-school level math skills to create analytic concepts, as well as knowledge and corresponding synopses of their created analytic concepts, which are checked by experts for correctness. We figure out that a concept along with knowledge and synopses can be finished in less than two hours on average and the same concept

created by different volunteers show a high degree of consistency. This demonstrates that the analytic concepts can be easily created, possess great robustness and show strong consensus among different people. So far, we have created 153 analytic concepts and thanks to their strong generalization capability, we find that only a small portion of them are sufficient to handle a large number of daily object manipulation tasks. Fig. 3-Bottom provides the visualizations of representative analytic concepts. We will make our created analytic concepts publicly available to facilitate the research of the community.

4. Methodology

In this section, we discuss about our methodology of grounding semantic-level knowledge reasoned by LLMs in the physical world with analytic concepts, and how physically grounded representations can benefit articulated object manipulation.

Problem Formulation. We study articulated object manipulation under the following task setting. Given an RGB image and its corresponding depth map featuring an object, as well as a task description in natural language, a robot is asked to conduct proper physical interaction with the object by using a parallel gripper to complete the task. This requires an intelligent system to possess the capability of commonsense reasoning to understand the object and task description, and also the capability of managing the complex physics involved in generating affordances and strategies for contact-rich interactions.

Pipeline. Fig. 4 presents the pipeline of our methodology, containing three major steps: i) target the part for manipulation, ii) ground the structural knowledge, and iii) ground the manipulation knowledge. Then, the robot performs interaction with the object guided by the grounded knowledge. We clearly demonstrates how these steps operate in the following sections.

4.1. Target the Part for Manipulation

In the first step, we use a multi-modal LLM to figure out the target part for manipulation from the task definition and RGB image. Particularly, we first adopt GPT-4o [1] as the multi-modal LLM and prompt it with “*find the **part** to interact within the <RGB Image> in order to complete the task <Task>, and determine the <category> of the **part***” to acquire a semantic-level description of the target part as well as the category of the target part. Then, the part’s description is sent into Grounded-SAM [28] along with the RGB image to obtain the pixel-level part segmentation on the image. Finally, we apply the segmentation mask to the depth image to crop the point cloud of the target part \mathcal{P} . As for the category of the target part, it is used in the next step for identifying analytic concept.




Figure 4. Illustration of our proposed approach with three major steps. (a) Target the part for manipulation. (b) Ground the structural knowledge. (c-d) Ground the manipulation knowledge.

4.2. Ground the Structural Knowledge

After obtaining the point cloud \mathcal{P} of the target part being manipulated, we further leverage the LLM to reason about the structural knowledge of this part and ground it on corresponding analytic concept with a parameter estimator.

Concept Identification. Leveraging the commonsense reasoning capability of the LLM, we can identify an analytic concept that best represents the spatial structure of the target part. Specifically, analytic concepts are first categorized into different groups (e.g. handle, lid) according to the spatial structure they describe and their synopses. To identify the best-matching analytic concept for the target part, we provide the LLM with concepts from the same category as the target part, using those concepts’ identities along with the synopses in natural language. The LLM is then prompted to determine “*which concept best matches the spatial structure of the target part*”. In this manner, we are able to align the semantic-level knowledge embedded in the LLM with analytic concepts.

Parameter Estimation. With the identified concept, we then estimate the parameters of this concept to ground it on the target part. There are generally two types of parameters: i) ones in the formulations of the structural knowledge that controls the spatial structure of analytic concepts, and ii) 6-dof pose parameters that record the global translation and rotation in world coordinates. Therefore, the parameter estimation process is also divided into two steps accordingly.

For structural parameters, we use a point cloud encoder, Point-Transformer [35] in our implementation, with an average pooling operation to encode the point cloud of the target \mathcal{P} into deep features and then use different MLPs to

regress the parameters of each type of analytic concept.

For 6-dof pose parameters, we take \mathcal{P} as input and also use a Point-Transformer encoder and a subsequent MLP decoder as network, while in this case the decoder outputs a point cloud \mathcal{P}^* representing \mathcal{P} in canonical space. Then we apply Umeyama algorithm [32] and RANSAC [6] for outlier removal in order to acquire the translation and rotation from \mathcal{P}^* to \mathcal{P} . The translation and rotation can be adopted as the 6-dof pose of the analytic concept.

4.3. Ground the Manipulation Knowledge

So far, we have identified the analytic concept corresponding to the target part and grounded the concept on its real-world point cloud by estimating the parameters. To guide the robot to complete the manipulation task, we still need manipulation knowledge involving grasp pose about how the gripper should grasp the target part and force direction about how the gripper should move after grasping. Similar as grounding the structural knowledge, the first step is to prompt the LLM with manipulation knowledge of grasp pose / force direction along with corresponding synopsis and ask the LLM to determine “*which kind of grasp pose / force direction works best to accomplish the task*”. Then, we discuss how the two types of manipulation knowledge are physically grounded.

Grasp Pose. Each piece of analytic manipulation knowledge for grasp pose refers to a category of grasp poses belonging to the same pattern, and an exact grasp pose \mathbf{G} is physically grounded by estimating the parameters of such analytic knowledge. Therefore, we also develop a neural network for each kind of grasp pose knowledge to estimate its proper parameters given the target point cloud \mathcal{P} .

Different from the structural parameters which are unique for a specific part, there are many possible answers for the grasp pose knowledge parameters, as illustrated in the bottom-left image in Fig. 4-c. To this end, we adopt the idea of conditional GAN [23] to develop a generative framework. The generator G uses MLPs to generate multiple possible candidates of parameters from a Gaussian noise z conditioned on deep features of \mathcal{P} embedded with a Point-Transformer. Then, we incorporate a discriminator D to score each candidate and select the best one. The discriminator has a Point-Transformer encoder for \mathcal{P} and an MLP encoder for the parameters, concatenates the encoded features together and decodes them with MLPs as a score in $[0, 1]$.

With the parameters, a physically grounded grasp pose \mathbf{G} can be calculated according to the analytic manipulation knowledge.

Force Direction. After obtaining the grasp pose \mathbf{G} , the function for force direction knowledge can be invoked to calculate a vector \mathcal{F} indicating the direction in which the force should be applied to the target part when manipulating the object.

4.4. Interact with the Object

Guided by the physically grounded knowledge embedded in analytic concepts, a robot can interact with the object heuristically. The robot first moves its gripper to the grasp pose \mathbf{G} and completes the grasping. After that, the gripper moves along the force direction \mathcal{F} to complete the task.

4.5. Training and Implementation Details

Training Data Preparation. To prepare data for training the models in our approach, we first provide analytic concept annotations for real objects. Particularly, we annotate the concept parameters for training objects from PartNet-Mobility [33]. Then, we place each object in the SAPIEN [33] simulator and use a camera to capture the RGB image and depth map of this object. According to the URDF and analytic concept annotation of an object, we can easily obtain the ground-truth bounding box, point cloud, 6-dof pose and structural parameters of each actionable part. To collect positive and negative samples for grasp pose parameters, we perform extensive random sampling for the parameters within its domain, then calculate the grasp pose based on the sampled parameters and test it in the simulator. If the grasp is successful, the parameter is considered a positive sample; otherwise, it is a negative sample.

Grounded-SAM. Grounded-SAM [28] consists of two major components, Grounding-Dino [20] and SAM [15]. We keep SAM [15] frozen and fine-tune Grounding-Dino [20] with RGB images of size 336×336 with ground-truth bounding boxes of the actionable parts, along with natural language prompt that describes the actionable parts pro-

vided by GPT-4o [1].

Structural Parameter Estimation. The encoder is a Point-Transformer [35] that extracts 128 groups of points with size 32 from the input with 2048 points and has 12 6-headed attention layers. The subsequent MLP has three layers with ReLU activation and outputs the structural parameters. The network is trained with L2 loss between the estimated and ground-truth structural parameters.

6-dof Pose Estimation. The network shares the same architecture as that used in structural parameter estimation. The network is trained with chamfer distance loss between the estimated point cloud and the point cloud of the input in canonical space which is obtained by transforming the input point cloud according to its ground-truth 6-dof pose.

Grasp Pose Estimation. The Point-Transformer and MLPs in both generator and discriminator shares the same architecture as that used in structural parameter estimation. As we already have positive and negative grasp pose parameter samples, we first train the discriminator with

$$\mathcal{L}_D = -\mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}^+}} [\log D(x|y)] - \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p_{\text{data}^-}} [\log (1 - D(x|y))] \quad (1)$$

where $D(x|y)$ is the output score of the discriminator representing the likelihood of sample x in the data distribution given condition y , and p_{data^+} and p_{data^-} denotes the positive and negative data distribution. Then we train the generator with

$$\mathcal{L}_G = -\mathbb{E}_{z \sim p_z} [\log D(G(z|y))] \quad (2)$$

where $G(z|y)$ refers to the generated sample according to noise z given condition y , and p_z is a Gaussian distribution.

Discussion. As our main purpose is to provide a baseline to demonstrate the feasibility and effectiveness of using analytic concepts to physically ground semantic-level commonsense knowledge, we do not delve into complex network designs.

5. Experiments

We thoroughly evaluate our approach on articulated object manipulation tasks against four representative approaches [8, 17, 24, 25], including state-of-the-art ManipLLM [17] to showcase the effectiveness of our approach. In the following sections, we present the simulation setting, experiment results and comprehensive analysis. We also carry out the object manipulation experiments with physical robots in real-world environments to provide a more comprehensive and stronger evaluation.

5.1. Simulation Setting

We design our evaluation in order to reflect the capability of an algorithm to accurately guide a robot to interact with articulated objects with a single gripper. Hence, we generally follow the experiment setting of Where2Act [24] which is widely used in the research community.

Task	Method	Train Categories										Test Categories						
		Box	Dor	Fct	Fdr	Ket	Mcw	Stf	Swt	Ten	Win	AVG	Bkt	Pot	Saf	Tab	Wsm	AVG
push	Where2Act	6.06	34.46	18.37	34.13	10.63	34.10	40.04	20.42	18.42	13.20	28.15	8.19	6.51	22.00	18.62	9.44	15.08
	Where2Explore	8.16	41.54	17.84	37.91	12.14	36.72	36.57	24.97	20.41	17.05	28.53	14.47	11.30	34.30	23.02	16.13	21.68
	GAPartNet	6.64	49.06	18.32	43.35	10.92	38.09	38.13	19.03	20.80	14.85	29.21	24.53	10.46	29.23	24.86	8.75	22.48
	ManipLLM	8.12	53.89	17.60	36.91	10.41	44.44	48.86	21.20	15.53	16.31	33.37	20.28	12.20	39.23	40.99	20.20	31.98
	Ours	8.95	58.41	22.50	49.55	14.12	46.30	60.38	26.87	24.17	16.86	41.08	26.71	15.13	42.82	53.75	23.01	40.33
pull	Where2Act	3.35	5.00	5.38	5.32	2.98	6.29	10.55	9.05	5.46	3.56	7.43	6.07	3.67	5.61	10.68	5.83	7.90
	Where2Explore	6.94	8.70	7.22	12.59	5.59	7.61	16.56	11.49	11.30	4.58	11.81	9.53	6.59	9.41	11.06	8.72	9.84
	GAPartNet	4.99	12.71	6.36	14.87	13.03	14.78	22.27	11.17	7.50	4.30	14.31	12.35	12.63	9.37	18.80	8.73	14.73
	ManipLLM	6.58	17.46	6.76	11.91	12.28	15.38	30.26	12.98	10.60	9.76	19.01	16.04	14.28	17.00	21.73	9.52	18.19
	Ours	8.04	28.50	7.92	20.76	16.01	25.43	42.96	15.27	11.86	11.10	25.97	19.10	18.34	20.20	32.26	19.60	25.50

Table 1. Evaluation results on manipulation tasks across different object categories with four previous baselines. All values represent the average success rate as a percentage. The average success rates are calculated based on the objects. The abbreviations of the object categories are listed as follows: Box, Door, Faucet, Fridge, Microwave, StorageFurniture, Switch, TrashCan, Window, Bucket, KitchenPot, Safe, Table, WashingMachine.

Data Setting. We have collected a total of 15 representative categories of objects from PartNet-mobility [33] for our experiments, after removing objects that are either too small (*e.g.* Pen, USB), requiring multi-gripper collaboration (*e.g.* Plier, Scissors), or not making sense for robot gripper to manipulate (*e.g.* Fan, Clock). In order to evaluate the capability of generalizing through novel categories, the 15 categories are divided into two groups, 10 categories for training and the rest 5 categories for testing.

Experiment Setting. We adopt the SAPIEN [33] simulator as the simulation environment for our evaluation. In each manipulation simulation, the target object is initially placed at the center of the scene within the simulator. The object’s joint pose is randomized, with a 50% chance of being at the closed state and a 50% chance at open state with random motion. An RGB-D camera with known intrinsic parameters stares at the center of the scene and is positioned at the upper hemisphere with a random azimuth $[0^\circ, 360^\circ)$ and a random elevation $[30^\circ, 60^\circ]$. To interact with the target object, we employ a Franka Panda Flying gripper with two fingers. We consider two types of primitive actions: pushing and pulling.

Evaluation Setting. We use the success rate as our evaluation metric to assess the capability of articulated object manipulation among different approaches. A manipulation is considered successful if the target joint’s movement exceeds 0.01 unit-length or 0.5 relative to its maximum motion range. The success rate is defined as the ratio of successful manipulations to the total number of test trials. Each testing object undergoes 10 trials.

5.2. Simulation Evaluation

We compare our approach with four baselines that represent seminal works in three different types of frameworks for articulated object manipulation tasks. For vanilla frameworks like Where2Act [24] and Where2Explore [25], they directly learn from 2D images or point clouds and output an affordance map at pixel-level. Standing for another type

of framework which leverages structured representations, GAPartNet [8] also takes point clouds as input, but proposes the idea of GAPart, treats the 6-dof pose of the GAPart as a kind of structured representation, and adopts the interaction policies predefined on each GAPart. The third type of framework including ManipLLM [17] leverages the robust reasoning capabilities of LLMs to infer affordance knowledge from RGB-D image and natural language inputs featuring a target object. In comparison with these previous frameworks, our approach integrates both the LLM’s reasoning capability and analytic concepts as a physically grounded structured representation for object manipulation tasks.

Main Results. The performance of different baselines in Tab. 1 highlights the critical role of commonsense reasoning and physically grounded representations in object manipulation tasks. Compared to vanilla frameworks Where2Act and Where2Explore, both ManipLLM and GAPartNet enhance one of these two aspects and achieve certain improvements. After fully integrating these two aspects through our approach by grounding commonsense knowledge inferred by LLMs on analytic concepts, the success rate of manipulation has been significantly boosted, about 23.1%/36.6% for train categories and 26.1%/40.18% for test categories (*push/pull*) on average compared with ManipLLM, demonstrating the superiority of our proposed analytic concepts and framework. The close results on train and test categories also suggest that our approach can effectively handle unseen objects. We attribute this property to the effect of the following two factors. First, our defined analytic concepts can cover ubiquitous common structure and generalize effectively to describe unseen objects. Second, utilizing its strong commonsense reasoning capability, an LLM can still find the best-match concepts to the target parts of unseen objects according to the concepts’ synopses.

LLM with Physically Grounded Analytic Concept. ManipLLM uses LLaMa-Adapter [34], a multi-modal LLM, to directly infer the pose of an end-effector of a robot to inter-

act with the target object. Note that the suction end-effector is originally employed by ManipLLM while the parallel gripper is used in our experiment setting, we show the performances of our approach and ManipLLM with both suction and parallel gripper as end-effector on our data setting in Tab. 2. After changing the end-effector from suction to parallel gripper, a very significant drop in the success rate of ManipLLM occurs, especially for *pull* which relies on more delicate interactions. This highlights the challenge of relying solely on LLMs to directly perform accurate numerical reasoning to produce precise affordances and interaction policies for manipulation tasks involving gripper-based grasping and interactions. In comparison, our approach is able to ground the semantic-level knowledge inferred by LLMs through analytic concepts. In this manner, a robot can precisely calculate the affordances and interaction strategies with these physically grounded concepts, and achieves much higher success rates, especially for more challenging settings, *i.e.* gripper as end-effector and pulling tasks.

Methods	Gripper		Suction	
	push	pull	push	pull
ManipLLM	33.37/31.98	19.01/18.19	58.64/58.03	52.55/57.13
Ours	41.08/40.33	25.97/25.50	62.89/61.24	61.54/60.52

Table 2. Comparison between ManipLLM and our approach on pushing and pulling tasks using gripper and suction as the end effector. All values represent the average success rate as a percentage, with that for the training objects shown before the slash and that for the testing objects after the slash.

5.3. Real-world Evaluation

Settings. We conduct experiments that involve interacting with 8 real-world household objects from different categories. The manipulation tasks involve *open the box*, *switch the handle of the bucket*, *open the door*, *lift the lid of the kettle*, *open/close the laptop*, *lift the lid of pot*, *open the closet of the storage* and *move the lid of the trashcan*. We employ a robot arm with a parallel gripper as its end-effector and utilize a RealSense D415 camera to capture the RGB-D image. We adopt success rate as metric, where we define a successful interaction as one in which the gripper securely grasps the target object and then moves correctly to complete the task. Each task is tested for 10 times.

Quantitative Analysis. Tab. 3 shows the performance of our approach in real-world experiments, demonstrating high success rates. The comparison with baseline ManipLLM further highlights the importance of a physically grounded knowledge representation in accurate and reliable robot manipulation tasks.

Qualitative Analysis. We visualize the outputs of each step in our approach for four real-world manipulation tasks in Fig. 5, showing the promising capabilities of our approach

Objects								
ManipLLM	0.60	0.20	0.40	0.50	0.70	0.40	0.50	0.40
Ours	0.90	0.60	0.70	0.80	0.90	0.80	0.80	0.70

Table 3. Results of real-world experiments. All values represent success rate as a percentage.

to accurately locate the target part, physically ground both structural and manipulation knowledge and successfully complete the manipulation tasks. We attribute this success to the effective integration of both the strong reasoning capability of LLMs and the physically grounded knowledge represented by analytic concepts.




Figure 5. Visualizations of the output in each step in real-world experiments. The leftmost column lists the task description. In the **Analytic Concept** column, light blue meshes represent analytic concepts grounded on the target parts. The **Grasp Pose** and **Manipulation** columns illustrate how the gripper grasps the target parts and completes the manipulation tasks.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we focus on articulated object manipulation and introduce analytic concepts to represent commonsense knowledge involved in this task in a physical form. Each concept encompasses an identity, as well as analytic structural and manipulation knowledge procedurally defined with mathematical symbols. These concepts construct a bridge between the semantic-level knowledge and the physical world, helping to overcome the limitations of LLMs in precise numerical reasoning and the shortcomings of natural language in describing physical concepts. Taking advantages of analytic concepts, we further propose an object manipulation pipeline to successfully translate semantic-level commonsense knowledge inferred by LLMs into concrete physical-level knowledge, instructing robots to complete various manipulation tasks accurately. Our approach demonstrates its superiority across a wide range of object categories in both simulation and real-world scenarios.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 1, 3, 4, 6
- [2] Emily M Bender and Alexander Koller. Climbing towards nlu: On meaning, form, and understanding in the age of data. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 5185–5198, 2020. 1
- [3] Irving Biederman. Recognition-by-components: a theory of human image understanding. *Psychological review*, 94(2): 115, 1987. 1
- [4] Susan Carey and Fei Xu. Infants’ knowledge of objects: Beyond object files and object tracking. *Cognition*, 80(1-2): 179–213, 2001. 1
- [5] Vanya Cohen, Jason Xinyu Liu, Raymond Mooney, Stefanie Tellex, and David Watkins. A survey of robotic language grounding: Tradeoffs between symbols and embeddings. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.13245*, 2024. 2
- [6] Martin A Fischler and Robert C Bolles. Random sample consensus: a paradigm for model fitting with applications to image analysis and automated cartography. *Communications of the ACM*, 24(6):381–395, 1981. 5
- [7] Luciano Floridi and Massimo Chiriatti. Gpt-3: Its nature, scope, limits, and consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30: 681–694, 2020. 3
- [8] Haoran Geng, Helin Xu, Chengyang Zhao, Chao Xu, Li Yi, Siyuan Huang, and He Wang. Gapartnet: Cross-category domain-generalizable object perception and manipulation via generalizable and actionable parts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7081–7091, 2023. 3, 6, 7
- [9] Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Saurav Kadavath, Akul Arora, Steven Basart, Eric Tang, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*, 2021. 2
- [10] Yining Hong, Haoyu Zhen, Peihao Chen, Shuhong Zheng, Yilun Du, Zhenfang Chen, and Chuang Gan. 3d-llm: Injecting the 3d world into large language models. *NeurIPS*, 2023. 1
- [11] Yi Hu, Xiaojuan Tang, Haotong Yang, and Muhan Zhang. Case-based or rule-based: How do transformers do the math? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17709*, 2024. 2
- [12] Siyuan Huang, Iaroslav Ponomarenko, Zhengkai Jiang, Xiaoyi Li, Xiaobin Hu, Peng Gao, Hongsheng Li, and Hao Dong. Manipvqa: Injecting robotic affordance and physically grounded information into multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.11289*, 2024. 1, 3
- [13] Wenlong Huang, Chen Wang, Ruohan Zhang, Yunzhu Li, Jiajun Wu, and Li Fei-Fei. Voxposer: Composable 3d value maps for robotic manipulation with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05973*, 2023. 1
- [14] John E Hummel and Irving Biederman. Dynamic binding in a neural network for shape recognition. *Psychological review*, 99(3):480, 1992. 1
- [15] Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 6
- [16] Alan M Leslie, Fei Xu, Patrice D Tremoulet, and Brian J Scholl. Indexing and the object concept: developing-what’andwhere’systems. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 2(1): 10–18, 1998. 1
- [17] Xiaoqi Li, Mingxu Zhang, Yiran Geng, Haoran Geng, Yuxing Long, Yan Shen, Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Liu, and Hao Dong. Manipllm: Embodied multimodal large language model for object-centric robotic manipulation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18061–18070, 2024. 1, 3, 6, 7
- [18] Ziyi Lin, Chris Liu, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Longtian Qiu, Han Xiao, Han Qiu, Chen Lin, Wenqi Shao, Keqin Chen, et al. Sphinx: The joint mixing of weights, tasks, and visual embeddings for multi-modal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07575*, 2023. 3
- [19] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024. 1, 3
- [20] Shilong Liu, Zhaoyang Zeng, Tianhe Ren, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Jie Yang, Qing Jiang, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, Hang Su, et al. Grounding dino: Marrying dino with grounded pre-training for open-set object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05499*, 2023. 6
- [21] Yuen Ma, Zixing Song, Yuzheng Zhuang, Jianye Hao, and Irwin King. A survey on vision-language-action models for embodied ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14093*, 2024. 3
- [22] Arjun Majumdar, Karmesh Yadav, Sergio Arnaud, Jason Ma, Claire Chen, Sneha Silwal, Aryan Jain, Vincent-Pierre Berges, Tingfan Wu, Jay Vakil, et al. Where are we in the search for an artificial visual cortex for embodied intelligence? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:655–677, 2023. 2
- [23] Mehdi Mirza. Conditional generative adversarial nets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.1784*, 2014. 6
- [24] Kaichun Mo, Leonidas J Guibas, Mustafa Mukadam, Abhinav Gupta, and Shubham Tulsiani. Where2act: From pixels to actions for articulated 3d objects. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 6813–6823, 2021. 3, 6, 7
- [25] Chuanruo Ning, Ruihai Wu, Haoran Lu, Kaichun Mo, and Hao Dong. Where2explore: Few-shot affordance learning for unseen novel categories of articulated objects. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024. 3, 6, 7
- [26] Shengyi Qian, Weifeng Chen, Min Bai, Xiong Zhou, Zhuowen Tu, and Li Erran Li. Affordancellm: Grounding affordance from vision language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 7587–7597, 2024. 3
- [27] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 3
- [28] Tianhe Ren, Shilong Liu, Ailing Zeng, Jing Lin, Kunchang Li, He Cao, Jiayu Chen, Xinyu Huang, Yukang Chen,

- Feng Yan, Zhaoyang Zeng, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Jie Yang, Hongyang Li, Qing Jiang, and Lei Zhang. Grounded sam: Assembling open-world models for diverse visual tasks, 2024. [4](#), [6](#)
- [29] Chao Tang, Dehao Huang, Wenqi Ge, Weiyu Liu, and Hong Zhang. Graspgpt: Leveraging semantic knowledge from a large language model for task-oriented grasping. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023. [1](#)
- [30] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. [1](#), [3](#)
- [31] Shimon Ullman. *High-level vision: Object recognition and visual cognition*. MIT press, 2000. [1](#)
- [32] Shinji Umeyama. Least-squares estimation of transformation parameters between two point patterns. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis & Machine Intelligence*, 13(04): 376–380, 1991. [5](#)
- [33] Fanbo Xiang, Yuzhe Qin, Kaichun Mo, Yikuan Xia, Hao Zhu, Fangchen Liu, Minghua Liu, Hanxiao Jiang, Yifu Yuan, He Wang, et al. Sapien: A simulated part-based interactive environment. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11097–11107, 2020. [3](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [34] Renrui Zhang, Jiaming Han, Chris Liu, Peng Gao, Aojun Zhou, Xiangfei Hu, Shilin Yan, Pan Lu, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Qiao. Llama-adapter: Efficient fine-tuning of language models with zero-init attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16199*, 2023. [7](#)
- [35] Hengshuang Zhao, Li Jiang, Jiaya Jia, Philip HS Torr, and Vladlen Koltun. Point transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 16259–16268, 2021. [5](#), [6](#)