

# Map-based Modular Approach for Zero-shot Embodied Question Answering

Koya Sakamoto<sup>1,2</sup>, Daichi Azuma, Taiki Miyanishi<sup>2</sup>, Shuhei Kurita<sup>3</sup> and Motoaki Kawanabe<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract**—Building robots capable of interacting with humans through natural language in the visual world presents a significant challenge in the field of robotics. To overcome this challenge, Embodied Question Answering (EQA) has been proposed as a benchmark task to measure the ability to identify an object navigating through a previously unseen environment in response to human-posed questions. Although some methods have been proposed, their evaluations have been limited to simulations, without experiments in real-world scenarios. Furthermore, all of these methods are constrained by a limited vocabulary for question-and-answer interactions, making them unsuitable for practical applications. In this work, we propose a map-based modular EQA method that enables real robots to navigate unknown environments through frontier-based map creation and address unknown QA pairs using foundation models that support open vocabulary. Unlike the questions of the previous EQA dataset on Matterport 3D (MP3D), questions in our real-world experiments contain various question formats and vocabularies not included in the training data. We conduct comprehensive experiments on virtual environments (MP3D-EQA) and two real-world house environments and demonstrate that our method can perform EQA even in the real world.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Home robots are required to understand language, execute tasks as directed. For example, when we forget where we left our smartphones, it would be helpful if a robot could move around the room to find it and tell us where it is now. To complete this complex task, robots require navigation skills to locate a target object and the ability to generate textual responses based on visual observation. Such skills and ability can be measure in Embodied Question Answering (EQA) [10], [34]. EQA is the task that an agent is places in an unseen environment and explores to answer a given question. The existing approach for EQA uses the end-to-end learning approach [10], [34]. However, recent studies on semantic visual navigation [12] indicate that modular learning approaches are effective in real-world scenarios, whereas end-to-end learning approaches fail due to a significant domain gap in visual observations between simulations and reality. Existing EQA methods follow an end-to-end framework trained on simulation and their performance in the real world can be expected to be low. In addition, the VQA modules of the existing methods often struggle to deal with new types of questions because existing 3D-VQA models are trained with a limited vocabulary and a few question types. In terms of question variety, the questions in the MP3D-EQA dataset are composed of only limited types of questions




Fig. 1. Example of our method. We give an agent a question and the agent explores an unseen environment. When it finds target object, it checks if it is a true target object from image-text matching (ITM). If ITM score is lower than a threshold, it keeps exploring. If ITM score is higher than the threshold, it stops and performs VQA.

such as “what color” or “what room” even though we ask diverged questions such as “where” and “what is”. When we consider EQA in more realistic daily life settings, EQA models need to deal with open-set vocabulary and various types of questions.

In this paper, we present a map-based modular EQA method combining two specialized modules for object-goal navigation (ObjNav) [7], [8], [29] and Visual Question Answering (VQA) [3], [20], [19], [22] tasks. In our method, the agent extracts a target object category from a given question and then searches for objects belonging to the extracted category. The ObjNav module uses the frontier-based exploration method [36], which selects the closest unexplored region as the goal, enabling robust room exploration even when the agent is deployed in a different environment. Once a target object is found and assessed to be relevant to a question, the VQA module answers the question with an open-set vocabulary. In contrast to previous end-to-end EQA approaches using reinforcement learning, our modular-based approach is expected to work robustly even if the arrangement of furniture or the layout of the house changes.

Using the MP3D-EQA dataset, we evaluate our proposed method and find that it performs comparably or even superiorly to the existing end-to-end methods using reinforcement learning. On MP3D-EQA, the VQA top-1 accuracy scores around 0.43, which is higher than the scores stated on existing methods [34]. Our method works well for navigation on EQA as the VQA scores on the agent’s start positions are

<sup>1</sup> Graduate School of Informatics, Kyoto University, Japan

<sup>2</sup> Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International (ATR), Kyoto, Japan

<sup>3</sup> RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, Tokyo, Japan

lower than those after navigation.

We also conducted comprehensive surveys in two real houses with different question formats from those in MP3D-EQA and additionally included target objects not present in MP3D-EQA for our experiments. The results showed that our map-based modular approach achieved high question-answer accuracy.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Visual Question Answering in 3D Space

In the domain of 3D spatial understanding and question answering (3D-QA) [4], [13], [37], models provide answers to textual questions regarding rich RGB-D indoor scans encapsulating entire 3D scenes. Distinguished from conventional 2D-QA [3] models commonly employed in visual question answering, the 3D-QA task poses distinct challenges, particularly concerning spatial comprehension, object alignment, directionality, and localization based on textual cues within a 3D setting. However, environments change dynamically, and it is necessary to gather information anew each time. Thus, EQA is a more realistic task as an agent explores an unseen environment and answers a question.

### B. Language-Guided Object Goal Navigation

Object goal navigation is a task for an embodied agent to follow a short textual phrase for a target object category, explore in the 3D scene, and finally reach the target object [7]. It is also similar to the vision and language navigation (VLN) task where agents follow detailed navigation instructions [2], [16], [1], often concatenated with the noisy-channel language modelings [17] or the history aware multimodal transformer [9]. In object goal navigation, SemExp [7] and PONI [29] take map-based approaches where they create semantic maps from semantic segmentation and top-down projection, and exploit them in determining long-term goals and actions. In both methods, they develop global policies to infer long-term goals with limited vocabularies. Thus, these methods cannot deal with many other object categories which is not included in train data. To overcome the limitation of vocabulary, zero-shot object goal navigation methods have been proposed [23], [11], [6] that can navigate to objects without vocabulary constraints. GOAT [6] can navigate to any object or location depicted through text, images, or merely by object category.

### C. Embodied Referring Expression Comprehension

Referring expression comprehension is a task of localizing objects following a textual short phrase of the referring expression and introduced in 2D images first [15], [25], [39], [24]. In navigation settings, referring expressions become more plausible when agents perform referring expressions comprehensions not only with 2D images but also video or 3D observations. Yuankai *et al.* [27] proposed referring expression for embodied agents. Sima *et al.* [31] proposes a task that requires referring expression and manipulation for embodied agents. Kurita *et al* [18] performed referring

expression comprehension on the first-person video setting, which is also close to the robotic navigation setting.

### D. Question Answering for Embodied Agents

VQA is useful for navigation as an agent can recognize a scene by performing VQA [14]. An agent does not collide with transparent doors by answering a question about an environment. VQA after navigation is also a crucial problem. An agent is asked a question, explores an unseen environment, and answers the question. There are several datasets [10], [34], [38], [33] on this task. The original EQA [10] and MP3D-EQA [34] propose a dataset in which questions consist of almost a single target in them on House3D [35] and Matterport3D [5]. Yu *et al.* [38] proposes a generalization of EQA. Each question in the generalized task contains multiple objects and an agent has to navigate to them to answer the question. K-EQA [33] presets a dataset of which questions (e.g. “Please tell me what objects are used to cut food in the room?”) require prior knowledge such as “knife is used for cutting food”. The baseline models [10], [34] are end-to-end imitation learning approaches on shortest paths. Thus, it causes collisions with the wall, which is not desirable when applying the models in the real world. The model [34] uses point clouds so that the agent does not collide with the objects. However, both models are based on supervised methods and lack of vocabularies.

## III. PROPOSED METHOD

We first describe the definition of the EQA task and subsequently present the overview of our map-based modular approach to solving this task. Our approach combines a map-based navigation module and a Visual Question Answering (VQA) module trained on Web-scale image-text data.

### A. Task Definition

The EQA task aims to answer a question by exploring and finding a target object in the unseen 3D world. During EQA, an agent can observe its location, orientation, RGB-D image, and a given question by a user. The agent can take actions such as moving forward, turning left or right, and stopping. After finding a target object, the agent conducts visual question answering (VQA) based on the observed images and the posed question. The episode is considered successful if the predicted answer matches the true answer.

### B. Overview of EQA Framework

As illustrated in Fig 2, our EQA framework mainly consists of language-guided navigation and Visual Question Answering (VQA) modules. First, an agent spawns in an unknown environment and is simultaneously given a question asking about the indoor situation (e.g. “What color are the cabinets in the kitchen?”). Next, the agent explores the indoor environment, observing the images from its egocentric view. The navigation module extracts visual features at each step and encodes a given question into the linguistic features. These visual and linguistic features are used for deciding the following action from action space {“move\_forward”,




Fig. 2. **Map-based Modular Embodied Question Answering Model Overview.** The proposed model consists of the Navigation module surrounded by the blue line and the VQA module surrounded by the red line. The Navigation module consists of the Perception module and Policies. The perception module builds a 2D map over time memorizing images with image-text matching scores, the Global Policy selects a long-term goal based on the 2D map and their frontiers, the Deterministic Local Policy outputs actions, and the VQA module provides the answers based on memorized images and the given question.

“turn\_right”, “turn\_left”, “stop”}. When the agent finds a target object, it determines whether the object is a target object by image-text matching. If the object is considered a target object, the “stop” action is selected and the navigation is terminated. Finally, the VQA module predicts the answer based on the images collected up to the current state, taking into account the image-text matching scores.

### C. Language-guided Navigation Module

**Language Understanding.** Our navigation module detects a goal object category from a given question and explores to find the corresponding target object. We used the `gpt-35-turbo-0613` as the GPT 3.5 model through the Azure OpenAI API to extract an object category with a prompt in Fig 3. We also use the `gpt-35-turbo-0613` for converting questions into declarative sentences for image-text matching (ITM).

**Scene Understanding.** This module generates a semantic map for navigation using semantic segmentation on first-person images. We use Detic [40], which identifies 21,00 object classes, to segment observed images based on the object category extracted by LLMs. Then, this module overlays the semantic segmentation outcomes with depth information and projects them onto a top-down view.

**Planner.** To find a target object, we use frontier-based exploration [36], which selects the closest unexplored region as a goal. Using the created semantic map, the agent first detects frontiers, defined as the edges or boundaries




Fig. 3. Dataset pre-processing using `gpt-35-turbo-0613`. It extracts a target object category from a given question for ObjNav and converts a question into a declarative text for image-text matching

between known and unknown areas within an environment. The closest frontier to the agent is designated as a long-term goal if multiple frontiers exist. The agent uses the  $A^*$  algorithm to determine the path between its current position and the long-term goal and selects a sequence of actions for moving to that position. The long-term goal is updated every 25 steps to simulate in parallel. As for the experiments in the real world, the updating steps change dynamically according to the observation of target objects and reaching the long-term goal. After finding a target object, the agent sets the target object’s position to the long-term goal. While exploring the environment, the agent stores the images when it approaches the target object within one meter and faces the center position of the target object for the subsequent image-

text matching and VQA modules. Exploration stops after 100 steps or when a stop action is selected (the text-image matching score is greater than  $\beta$ , which will be introduced later.)

#### D. Image-text Matching Module

The agent has to distinguish target objects from others based on a declarative text converted from a question. To tackle this problem, we use vision-language foundation models BLIP2 [19] and CLIP [28] as an image-text matching module. Using these foundation models, we measure the similarity between observed images and declarative sentences. We assumed that the similarity between an image containing the target object and a declarative sentence would be greater than the similarity between an image without the target object and a declarative sentence. The agent stops and performs VQA on the image when the similarity score exceeds  $\beta$ ; otherwise, it continues to move.

#### E. Visual Question Answering Module

After exploring the target object, we obtain a set of images and select the one with the highest similarity score for VQA. We use the pre-trained vision-language models for this VQA module, such as BLIP [20], BLIP2 [19] and LLaVA [22].

## IV. EXPERIMENTS

### A. EQA Datasets

Our experiments leverage the Matterport3D (MP3D) EQA dataset within the Habitat simulator [30], [32], [26]. The dataset uses scenes derived from 3D reconstructions of real-world settings. MP3D-EQA [34] publishes only train and val splits. Thus, we split the training dataset into train' and val' based on scenes, and use the original val dataset as a test dataset.

The agent is equipped with sensors including a RGB-D sensor and a pose sensor. The observation space encompasses RGB-D images with dimensions  $480 \times 640$ . The pose sensor reports the agent's position and rotation, which are subsequently converted to represent the delta in the variation of the agent's position and orientation from the last measurement. The agent spawns 10, 30, and 50 actions away from the end positions of the ground truth shortest paths or random start positions. The shortest path lengths from these start positions to end positions are 3.45, 4.53, 5.71, and 8.21 meters.

### B. Image-text matching.

When determining whether an image corresponds to the target object of a given question, there are multiple caption formats to consider. To improve EQA accuracy so as not to treat an object that is not the correct answer as the target object, we searched for suitable pairs of models and caption formats. As shown in Fig.4, the pair of BLIP2-MSCOCO and declarative text is the best on MP3D-EQA.




Fig. 4. ROC Curves of Image-text Matching of MP3D-EQA [34] at train'. We compare scores of BLIP2-pretrain, BLIP2-MSCOCO, and CLIP. BLIP2-MSCOCO is a BLIP2 model fine-tuned on MSCOCO [21]. The combination of declarative text and BLIP2-MSCOCO scores higher than the other on MP3D-EQA.




Fig. 5. VQA top-1 accuracy on MP3D-EQA train'. The scores of LLaVA-v1.5-7b and LLaVA-v1.5-13b are higher than those of others.

### C. Implementation details.

We mainly use the implementation of SemExp [7]. There are two hyperparameters: the thresholds  $\alpha, \beta$  of semantic segmentation and image-text matching. We set  $(\alpha, \beta) \in (0.3, 0.0), (0.2, 0.1), (0.1, 0.2)$  from Fig. 4. If the agent estimates that it is within 1.0 m of the target object in the semantic map, the agent stops.

### D. Baselines.

We compare our method with VQA results on agents' start positions without navigation because there is no existing method for zero-shot EQA. As shown in Fig. 5, LLaVA-v1.5-7b and 13b score higher than others. As we consider implementing our method in real-world environments, we adopted LLaVA-v1.5-7b.

### E. Evaluation Metrics

We use the following metrics for evaluation: VQA top-1 accuracy,  $d_T$  (distance to target). The VQA top-1 accuracy is defined as the rate at the output of VQA models with the




Fig. 6. The robot which we used in the real world experiments. We use i-CART mini for the mobile robot. The stereo camera is attached at 0.88 meters. 2D LiDAR is attached close to the floor so that SLAM can determine where the robot can navigate.

highest probability is the same as the ground truth answer. The  $d_T$  is defined as the distance to the target from the agent position along the shortest path. In our setting, the target position is defined as the agent end position of the shortest paths. As for our methods, the  $d_T$  is calculated between the target position and the position on which image-text matching scores higher than  $\beta$  or the highest. These metrics are calculated for  $T_{-N}$ .  $T_{-N}$  is defined as a start position. According to ground truth shortest paths, we set an agent on  $N$  back steps away from an end position.

#### F. Experimental Results

**EQA in Simulation.** The quantitative results of the comparison study are reported in TABLE I. Our method outperformed the VQA only baseline.  $d_T$  of our method with  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.1, 0.2)$  is lower than the distances between start positions and end positions along the shortest paths. However, the distance is much larger than the defined stop distance of 1m. The reason is that the agent goes in the wrong direction and cannot find target objects, or the semantic segmentation method segments a part of objects in front of target objects and the agent stops in front of the objects. The navigation scores with  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.1, 0.2)$  are higher than others and the VQA top-1 accuracy of  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.1, 0.2)$  is mainly higher than others.

**EQA in Real.** We evaluate our method in real-world environments. Fig. 6 shows a robot equipped with a stereo camera and 2D LiDAR. The robot performed 19 episodes of EQA tasks in two houses. We set  $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.2)$  from some demonstrations. The robot was placed 0.5 meters (the minimum range of SLAM) away from objects and walls. Success is defined as the robot searching for the true target object without collisions and predicting a true answer. We consider it successful that the robot can find the

true target without collisions and predict the true answer. Across 19 episodes, we obtain success rates around 32% shown in TABLE II. It also shows that it is not a big effect if we use BLIP2-pretrain or BLIP2-MS-COCO as an image-text matching module. The agent collides with objects sometimes because of our defined rules and 2D SLAM limitation. If the deterministic local policy cannot create a path to the predicted long-term goal, the agent moves randomly and is likely to collide with objects. 2D SLAM only maps the areas that return a laser from 2D LiDAR. However, there are space under some objects such as tables and the agent considered that the area under a table can be navigatable even though the agent cannot go under the table. Figures 7 and 8 show success and failure cases of EQA. The agent navigated to target objects successfully in some episodes. Failure cases can be classified into 4 groups: navigation, image-text matching, semantic segmentation, and VQA. The agent failed to observe the target object and did not reach it within the maximum allowed steps. Even though it observed true positive images, if the image-text matching score was lower than a threshold and other scores, true positive image were ignored and VQA was performed on a different image. Some target objects cannot be detected by Detic. For example, we set the semantic segmentation threshold as 0.5, and objects such as mannequins and clothes cannot be segmented. In such cases, the agent continued to explore even after observing a target object. As for VQA, it sometimes predicted false answers on true positive images. These failure cases limit the upper bound of our method’s success rate. There is another problem with our method. It does not handle questions to count objects. When a question is “How many chairs are there in the house?”, the agent has to observe all chairs in just one image for my method and it is not possible if chairs are in the living room, bedroom, and other rooms. We need a more sophisticated memory architecture to accommodate such a question format.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Existing EQA methods follow a similar end-to-end framework trained on simulation. However, such existing methods following the end-to-end framework in EQA struggle with sim2real gap [12]. It is also notable that limited question answering vocabularies are utilized in these previous EQA studies. It is more challenging to deal with complicated questions and real-world environments. To address these problems, we propose a map-based modular EQA method. Our method has an open-set vocabulary and is a map-based approach. Thus, it is more suitable for real-world applications than existing methods.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Peter Anderson, Ayush Shrivastava, Joanne Truong, Arjun Majumdar, Devi Parikh, Dhruv Batra, and Stefan Lee. Sim-to-real transfer for vision-and-language navigation. In *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2020.

TABLE I

NAVIGATION AND VQA SCORES ON MP3D [34]. WE USED BLIP2-MSCOCO AS AN IMAGE-TEXT MATCHING MODEL AND LLaVA-v1.5-7B AS A VQA MODEL. OUR PROPOSED METHOD ACHIEVES SCORES COMPARABLE TO EXISTING SUPERVISED LEARNING METHODS EVEN THOUGH OURS ARE ZERO-SHOT METHODS.

| Method                               | Navigation<br>$d_r \downarrow$ |              |              |              | QA<br>Top-1 $\uparrow$ |               |               |              |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
|                                      | $T_{-10}$                      | $T_{-30}$    | $T_{-50}$    | random       | $T_{-10}$              | $T_{-30}$     | $T_{-50}$     | random       |
| VQA only                             | -                              | -            | -            | -            | 0.3829                 | 0.3887        | 0.3271        | 0.3054       |
| Ours ( $\alpha = 0.3, \beta = 0.0$ ) | 3.615                          | 4.131        | 4.737        | 7.885        | 0.4342                 | 0.4173        | 0.4025        | 0.3473       |
| Ours ( $\alpha = 0.2, \beta = 0.1$ ) | 3.599                          | 4.132        | 4.701        | 7.802        | <b>0.449</b>           | 0.4285        | <b>0.4178</b> | 0.3582       |
| Ours ( $\alpha = 0.1, \beta = 0.2$ ) | <b>3.393</b>                   | <b>3.938</b> | <b>4.664</b> | <b>7.734</b> | 0.4446                 | <b>0.4341</b> | 0.4093        | <b>0.368</b> |

TABLE II

NAVIGATION AND VQA SCORES IN THE REAL HOUSES. WE USED BLIP2-PRETRAIN AND BLIP2-MSCOCO AS AN IMAGE-TEXT MATCHING MODEL AND BLIP-PRETRAIN, LLaVA-v1.5-7B AS A VQA MODEL.

| ITM model      | VQA model     | QA accuracy | Collisions |
|----------------|---------------|-------------|------------|
| BLIP2-pretrain | BLIP-pretrain | 7/19        | 3/19       |
| BLIP2-pretrain | LLaVA-v1.5-7b | 6/19        | 3/19       |
| BLIP2-MSCOCO   | BLIP-pretrain | 6/19        | 4/19       |
| BLIP2-MSCOCO   | LLaVA-v1.5-7b | 6/19        | 4/19       |




Fig. 7. Qualitative examples of the success results in the real world.

- [2] Peter Anderson, Qi Wu, Damien Teney, Jake Bruce, Mark Johnson, Niko Sünderhauf, Ian Reid, Stephen Gould, and Anton van den Hengel. Vision-and-language navigation: Interpreting visually-grounded navigation instructions in real environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2018.
- [3] Stanislaw Antol, Aishwarya Agrawal, Jiasen Lu, Margaret Mitchell, Dhruv Batra, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. VQA: Visual Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015.
- [4] Daichi Azuma, Taiki Miyanishi, Shuhei Kurita, and Motoaki Kawanabe. Scanqa: 3d question answering for spatial scene understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022.
- [5] Angel Chang, Angela Dai, Thomas Funkhouser, Maciej Halber, Matthias Niessner, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Andy Zeng, and Yinda Zhang. Matterport3d: Learning from rgb-d data in indoor environments. *International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, 2017.
- [6] Matthew Chang, Theophile Gervet, Mukul Khanna, Sriram Yendamandra, Dhruv Shah, So Yeon Min, Kavita Shah, Chris Paxton, Saurabh Gupta, Dhruv Batra, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Jitendra Malik, and Devendra Singh Chaplot. Goat: Go to any thing, 2023.
- [7] Devendra Singh Chaplot, Dhiraj Gandhi, Abhinav Gupta, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Object goal navigation using goal-oriented semantic exploration. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2020.
- [8] Shizhe Chen, Thomas Chabal, Ivan Laptev, and Cordelia Schmid. Object goal navigation with recursive implicit maps. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, 2023.
- [9] Shizhe Chen, Pierre-Louis Guhur, Cordelia Schmid, and Ivan Laptev. History aware multimodal transformer for vision-and-language navigation. In *NeurIPS*, 2021.
- [10] Abhishek Das, Samyak Datta, Georgia Gkioxari, Stefan Lee, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Embodied Question Answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2018.
- [11] Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Ludwig Schmidt, and Shuran Song. Cows on pasture: Baselines and benchmarks for language-driven zero-shot object navigation. In *Proceedings*

### A - True positives ignored when comparing images on image-text scores and its threshold 0.2



### B - Segmentation model does not detect target object with its threshold



### C - Incorrect answers on true positives



Fig. 8. Qualitative examples of the failure results in the real world. (A) Matching with a threshold during exploration or comparing images post exploration can result in false negatives. (B) The semantic segmentation model cannot detect some objects with the agent’s positions and the threshold. (C) VQA model outputs incorrect answers on true positive images.

of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2023.

- [12] Theophile Gervet, Soumith Chintala, Dhruv Batra, Jitendra Malik, and Devendra Singh Chaplot. Navigating to objects in the real world. *Science Robotics*, VOL.8, NO.79, 2023.
- [13] 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. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [14] Kento Kawaharazuka, Yoshiki Obinata, Naoaki Kanazawa, Kei Okada, and Masayuki Inaba. Vqa-based robotic state recognition optimized with genetic algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, May 2023.
- [15] Sahar Kazemzadeh, Vicente Ordonez, Mark Matten, and Tamara Berg. ReferItGame: Referring to objects in photographs of natural scenes. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2014.
- [16] Jacob Krantz, Erik Wijmans, Arjun Majumdar, Dhruv Batra, and Stefan Lee. Beyond the nav-graph: Vision and language navigation in continuous environments. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2020.
- [17] Shuhei Kurita and Kyunghyun Cho. Generative language-grounded policy in vision-and-language navigation with bayes’ rule. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2021.
- [18] Shuhei Kurita, Naoki Katsura, and Eri Onami. Refego: Referring expression comprehension dataset from first-person perception of ego4d. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 15214–15224, October 2023.
- [19] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. BLIP-2: bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- [20] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2022.
- [21] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, Lubomir Bourdev, Ross Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Piotr Dollár. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context, 2015.
- [22] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- [23] Arjun Majumdar, Gunjan Aggarwal, Bhavika Devnani, Judy Hoffman, and Dhruv Batra. Zson: Zero-shot object-goal navigation using multimodal goal embeddings. In *Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- [24] Junhua Mao, Jonathan Huang, Alexander Toshev, Oana Camburu, Alan Yuille, and Kevin Murphy. Generation and Comprehension of Unambiguous Object Descriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2016.
- [25] Bryan A. Plummer, Liwei Wang, Chris M. Cervantes, Juan C. Caicedo, Julia Hockenmaier, and Svetlana Lazebnik. Flickr30k Entities: Collecting Region-to-Phrase Correspondences for Richer Image-to-Sentence Models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2015.
- [26] Xavi Puig, Eric Undersander, Andrew Szot, Mikael Dallaire Cote, Ruslan Partsey, Jimmy Yang, Ruta Desai, Alexander William Clegg, Michal Hlavac, Tiffany Min, Theo Gervet, Vladimír Vondruš, Vincent-Pierre Berges, John Turner, Oleksandr Maksymets, Zsolt Kira, Mrinal Kalakrishnan, Jitendra Malik, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Unnat Jain, Dhruv Batra, Akshara Rai, and Roozbeh Mottaghi. Habitat 3.0: A co-habitat for humans, avatars and robots, 2023.
- [27] Yuankai Qi, Qi Wu, Peter Anderson, Xin Wang, William Yang Wang, Chunhua Shen, and Anton van den Hengel. Reverie: Remote embodied visual referring expression in real indoor environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2020.

- [28] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision, 2021.
- [29] Santhosh K. Ramakrishnan, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Ziad Al-Halah, Jitendra Malik, and Kristen Grauman. Poni: Potential functions for objectgoal navigation with interaction-free learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR), 2022 IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2022.
- [30] Manolis Savva, Abhishek Kadian, Oleksandr Maksymets, Yili Zhao, Erik Wijmans, Bhavana Jain, Julian Straub, Jia Liu, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat: A Platform for Embodied AI Research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2019.
- [31] Qie Sima, Sinan Tan, and Huaping Liu. Embodied referring expression for manipulation question answering in interactive environment, 2022.
- [32] Andrew Szot, Alex Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, Yili Zhao, John Turner, Noah Maestre, Mustafa Mukadam, Devendra Chaplot, Oleksandr Maksymets, Aaron Gokaslan, Vladimir Vondrus, Sameer Dharur, Franziska Meier, Wojciech Galuba, Angel Chang, Zsolt Kira, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, Manolis Savva, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- [33] Sinan Tan, Mengmeng Ge, Di Guo, Huaping Liu, and Fuchun Sun. Knowledge-based embodied question answering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.07872*, 2021.
- [34] Erik Wijmans, Samyak Datta, Oleksandr Maksymets, Abhishek Das, Georgia Gkioxari, Stefan Lee, Irfan Essa, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. Embodied Question Answering in Photorealistic Environments with Point Cloud Perception. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019.
- [35] Yi Wu, Yuxin Wu, Georgia Gkioxari, and Yuandong Tian. Building generalizable agents with a realistic and rich 3d environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.02209*, 2018.
- [36] Brian Yamauchi. Frontier-based exploration using multiple robots. In *Proceedings of the second international conference on Autonomous agents*, pages 47–53, 1998.
- [37] Shuquan Ye, Dongdong Chen, Songfang Han, and Jing Liao. 3d question answering, 2022.
- [38] Licheng Yu, Xinlei Chen, Georgia Gkioxari, Mohit Bansal, Tamara L Berg, and Dhruv Batra. Multi-target embodied question answering. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019.
- [39] Licheng Yu, Patrick Poirson, Shan Yang, Alexander C. Berg, and Tamara L. Berg. Modeling Context in Referring Expressions. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2016.
- [40] Xingyi Zhou, Rohit Girdhar, Armand Joulin, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Ishan Misra. Detecting twenty-thousand classes using image-level supervision. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2022.