

A Synthetic Dataset for Manometry Recognition in Robotic Applications

Pedro Antonio Rabelo Saraiva¹, Enzo Ferreira de Souza¹, João Manoel Herrera Pinheiro¹,
Thiago H. Segreto¹, Ricardo V. Godoy¹, and Marcelo Becker¹

Abstract—This work addresses the challenges of data scarcity and high acquisition costs for training robust object detection models in complex industrial environments, such as offshore oil platforms. The practical and economic barriers to collecting real-world data in these hazardous settings often hamper the development of autonomous inspection systems. To overcome this, in this work we propose and validate a hybrid data synthesis pipeline that combines procedural rendering with AI-driven video generation. Our methodology leverages BlenderProc to create photorealistic images with precise annotations and controlled domain randomization, and integrates NVIDIA’s Cosmos-Predict2 world-foundation model to synthesize physically plausible video sequences with temporal diversity, capturing rare viewpoints and adverse conditions. We demonstrate that a YOLO-based detection network trained on a composite dataset, blending real images with our synthetic data, achieves superior performance compared to models trained exclusively on real-world data. Notably, a 1:1 mixture of real and synthetic data yielded the highest accuracy, surpassing the real-only baseline. These findings highlight the viability of a synthetic-first approach as an efficient, cost-effective, and safe alternative for developing reliable perception systems in safety-critical and resource-constrained industrial applications.

I. INTRODUCTION

The uninterrupted functioning and security of vital infrastructure, especially within the petroleum and natural gas sectors, are of utmost importance due to the inherent dangers associated with the handled materials and the severe repercussions of system malfunctions [1]–[3]. Conventional maintenance and inspection procedures in these intricate industrial settings are largely dependent on human personnel, who are frequently exposed to substantial hazards such as contact with toxic agents, extreme temperatures, and confined spaces [4], [5]. Accordingly, there is a strong demand for technologies that increase inspection effectiveness [6], [7] while simultaneously reducing human exposure in dangerous scenarios [8]–[10].

The introduction of autonomous legged robots, e.g., Unitree B2 [11] and ANYmal C [12], offers a promising alternative [13], [14]. Unlike wheeled or tracked systems that struggle with uneven terrain, legged platforms can operate in a reliable manner even in the presence of stairs and irregular surfaces [15], enabling routine, automated data capture that minimizes downtime and reduces human risk [16].

This work was carried out with the support of Petrobras, using resources from the R&D clause of the ANP, in partnership with the University of São Paulo (USP) and the intervening foundation Fundação de Apoio à Física e à Química (FAFQ), under Cooperation Agreement No. 2023/00013-7 and 2023/00016-6.

¹Pedro Saraiva, Enzo Ferreira de Souza, Thiago H. Segreto, Ricardo V. Godoy, and Marcelo Becker are with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of São Paulo, São Carlos, Brazil. becker@sc.usp.br

However, reliable perception remains a key bottleneck: robots must detect and localize facility-critical assets—valves, pipes, gauges, and safety equipment—to assess conditions and comply with procedures in visually cluttered plants [3], [17]. Acquiring and annotating large, diverse datasets for training modern detectors (e.g., YOLO) is time-consuming, costly, and often disruptive to operations; access constraints and safety risks further limit in-plant data collection [18]–[21].

To overcome these limitations, in this work, we leverage high-quality synthetic data at two complementary levels. First, we use BlenderProc—an open-source, procedural rendering pipeline—to generate photorealistic images with controlled domain randomization over geometry, illumination, materials, and sensors [22]–[24]. Second, we integrate NVIDIA Cosmos-Predict2, NVIDIA’s latest world-foundation model (WFM) family for “physical AI” [25]–[27], via ComfyUI [28] workflows to synthesize physically plausible imagery and video priors from rare viewpoints, adverse lighting, and hard-to-stage events, thus broadening coverage beyond what is practical to render or capture in the field. Cosmos provides model variants and deployment tooling intended for robotics and AV pipelines, enabling scalable generation and curation that complements procedural graphics and reduces the sim-to-real gap in downstream perception [29].

This work introduces a practical pipeline that blends BlenderProc rendering with Cosmos-Predict2 generation to mitigate data scarcity for vision-based inspection in oil and gas facilities. We build a large-scale, richly annotated synthetic dataset and train a YOLO-based detector, showing that synthetic data can substantially reduce reliance on costly and hazardous in-plant collection while improving recognition of safety-critical assets in complex environments.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section II presents the related works. Section III details the unified pipeline—procedural dataset creation with BlenderProc and AI-extended synthesis with Cosmos-Predict2 (ComfyUI)—and training/validation of the object detector. Section IV presents quantitative and qualitative results, and Section V concludes with limitations and future work.

II. RELATED WORK

Synthetic data has become a practical solution for the scarcity and safety constraints of in-plant data collection, with domain randomization and photorealistic rendering shown to reduce the sim-to-real gap for perception and control [30]. Early sim-to-real studies demonstrated that heavy appearance randomization can transfer object localization and even collision-avoidance policies trained purely in simulation

to the real world [31], [32]. Recent analyses formalize when and how randomization narrows the gap and how to tune distributions over simulator parameters [33], [34].

On the procedural/graphics side, toolchains such as BlenderProc provide modular, scriptable generation of photorealistic images with rich annotations and sensor simulation—now a common backbone for dataset bootstrapping in robotics and industrial vision [22]. Parallel efforts in commercial-grade simulators (NVIDIA Omniverse/Isaac Sim Replicator) expose APIs for large-scale synthetic data generation with domain randomization, sensor models, and annotators, frequently used in AV/robotics pipelines [35], [36]. Unity’s Perception stack similarly targets turnkey dataset creation with labeled and randomized scenes for object detection and pose estimation [37].

Complementary to procedural rendering, world foundation models (WFMs) have emerged as AI-native generators that simulate and predict physically plausible scenes directly from text/visual conditions. NVIDIA’s Cosmos platform targets “physical AI” use cases (robotics, AV, industrial vision), exposing Cosmos-Predict2 models for Video-to-World generation (2B and 14B variants) and post-training/fine-tuning workflows aimed at scalable coverage of rare viewpoints, adverse illumination, and hard-to-stage events [38]–[40]. Public releases and reports emphasize open accessibility and training on large corpora of robotics/drive videos, positioning Cosmos as a data engine to complement graphics-based pipelines rather than replace them [41], [42]. Community workflows via ComfyUI further lower integration friction, enabling mixed procedural+generative curation where Cosmos assets are inserted into Blender/YOLO pipelines [43]. Taken together, recent work indicates that hybrid pipelines, procedural rendering for precise labels and controllable physics, plus WFM-based synthesis for broader coverage and temporal variation, can materially reduce reliance on hazardous, costly field acquisition in complex industrial environments.

III. METHODOLOGY

Our methodology combines real data acquisition, synthetic data generation through BlenderProc, and AI-extended video synthesis using NVIDIA Cosmos Predict2 integrated via ComfyUI. The unified pipeline is illustrated in Fig. 1.

A. Real Data Acquisition and Annotation

We collected approximately 2,500 real images and video frames of industrial manometers. These samples were annotated using a hybrid approach: manual bounding-box labeling with CVAT and semi-automatic segmentation with SAM2, as shown in Fig. 2. A small portion of these annotations was further reviewed by experts to ensure quality.

B. Synthetic Data with BlenderProc

3D models of manometers were rendered with BlenderProc. To improve generalization and reduce overfitting, domain randomization was applied: random backgrounds (industrial textures and photos), lighting variations, camera pose sampling, and post-processing (noise, blur, chromatic aberration),




Fig. 1: Proposed methodology pipeline for dataset creation and training. The framework integrates three sources: (i) real data acquisition and annotation (manual via CVAT and semi-automatic via SAM2), (ii) synthetic renders generated in BlenderProc with domain randomization (backgrounds, illumination, pose, post-processing), and (iii) AI-extended video frames generated through ComfyUI with NVIDIA Cosmos Predict2 (relighting, motion, occlusion). All data sources are reviewed, merged, and used for training the YOLO-based object detector.



(a) Manual bounding boxes in CVAT. (b) SAM2-assisted segmentation overlays.

Fig. 2: Examples of real data annotations: (a) manual boxes curated in CVAT; (b) semi-automatic pixel masks using SAM2, later spot-checked by experts.

with examples provided in Fig. 3. BlenderProc provides pixel-perfect labels, ensuring accurate segmentation and bounding-box masks.

C. AI-Extended Video Generation (ComfyUI + Cosmos Predict2)

To complement static synthetic renders, we integrated AI-driven video extension, illustrated in Fig. 4. Real short clips



(a) Manometer in a random background. (b) An example of multi .blend files.

Fig. 3: BlenderProc synthetic samples.



(a) Relighting and viewpoint changes with motion blur. (b) A frame from a shot clip made with Cosmos.

Fig. 4: AI-extended video frames produced via ComfyUI + NVIDIA Cosmos Predict2.

of manometers were expanded using ComfyUI workflows with NVIDIA Cosmos Predict2, enabling frame synthesis with temporal consistency, relighting, viewpoint changes, and motion blur. These pseudo-extended frames introduce temporal diversity (occlusion, reflections, jitter) that is difficult to model with static rendering. Pseudo-labels were propagated across frames using tracking and filtered with confidence thresholds, with human-in-the-loop auditing on a subset to mitigate noise.

D. Data Composition Strategy

All data sources were merged into a unified dataset. To investigate the impact of proportions, we defined scenarios with:

- **Real only** (2,500 images)
- **Mixed** (real + synthetic in ratios 1:1, 1:3)

Within the synthetic portion, we tested different splits between BlenderProc renders and AI-extended video frames, adopting 70% BlenderProc and 30% video-based synthesis as baseline.

E. Training and Evaluation

All scenarios were trained with the same YOLO-based architecture using identical hyperparameters. Evaluation was performed exclusively on a held-out set of real images. Metrics include mAP@[.5:.95], recall, average recall (AR),

per-class AP, and PR curves. We also report normalized metrics (mAP divided by average instances per image), shown in Fig. 7, and perform ablations on domain randomization factors.

IV. RESULTS

In this section we present the experimental protocol, justification for synthetic data generation, proportionality choices between real and synthetic samples, and the results obtained in different scenarios.

A. Experimental Protocol

Four training scenarios were defined: (i) only real images (2,500) and (ii) a mix of real and synthetic images.

For mixed datasets, we tested ratios of 0.5:0.5, 1:1, and 1:3 (real:synthetic). All scenarios were trained with the same YOLO-based detection architecture and evaluated on the same test split of real images.

B. Justification

The adoption of synthetic data is motivated by three factors: 1) the cost and time of annotating real images are significantly higher than generating synthetic ones; 2) domain randomization techniques such as random backgrounds, lighting and camera poses reduce overfitting and bridge the sim-to-real gap; 3) prior work shows that mixing 5–20% real data with synthetic data is often enough to reach competitive performance.

C. Proportionality of Synthetic Data

Considering the availability of 2,500 real photos, we defined proportionality as follows: - **1:1** \rightarrow 2,500 real + 2,500 synthetic - **1:3** \rightarrow 2,000 real + 7,500 synthetic

Additionally, a synthetic-only set was created with 20,000 images to serve as control set.

D. Results

Table I shows dataset composition and Table II reports object detection performance. Fig. 5.

TABLE I: Dataset composition (examples).

Scenario	Real Images	Synthetic Images	Total
Real only	2500	0	2500
Mix 1:1	2500	2500	5000
Mix 1:3	2500	7500	10000
Mix 0.5:0.5	1250	1250	2500

TABLE II: Performance comparison (updated with 0.5:0.5).

Scenario	mAP@[.5:.95]	Recall	AR
Real only	0.936	0.969	0.969
Mix 1:1	0.962	0.972	0.972
Mix 1:3	0.928	0.948	0.948
Mix 0.5:0.5	0.868	0.933	0.933

These results indicate that mixed datasets outperform the real-only baseline. In our experiments, the 1:1 mix achieved the highest mAP50-95, while the 1:3 mix still surpassed the real-only model but trailed the 1:1 configuration, as depicted




Fig. 5: Object instances per dataset scenario across four settings (Real only, Mix 1:1, Mix 1:3, Mix 0.5:0.5). Synthetic augmentation increases instance density; notably, Mix 0.5:0.5 uses only half the real images yet preserves a high number of instances, supporting robust training despite reduced real data.




Fig. 6: mAP@[.5:.95] vs epochs for all scenarios. The Mix 1:1 configuration consistently achieves the best accuracy. The Real-only and Mix 1:3 curves converge to very similar performance, while Mix 0.5:0.5 underperforms. These results indicate that adding synthetic data is beneficial, but excessive synthetic proportion (e.g., 1:3) does not yield further gains over Real-only and incurs additional compute cost.

in the training evolution in Fig. 6. These findings corroborate the broader consensus that blending a modest amount of real data with a larger volume of synthetic data can guide the detector toward realistic features while benefiting from the diversity and volume of synthetic samples.

E. Additional Analyses




Fig. 7: Normalized mAP (0.5–0.95) per dataset scenario, corrected by the average number of instances per image.




Fig. 8: Precision over training epochs for four training regimes. The synthetic-augmented configuration reaches high precision within the first epochs and remains near saturation. Synthetic data can accelerate the reduction of false positives.




Fig. 9: Recall across training epochs for four training regimes. Mix 1:1 provides the most consistent recall gains. Real-only and Mix 1:3 display similar recall trajectories, whereas Mix 0.5:0.5 is lower yet notably better than a naive halving of the real dataset would suggest, evidencing the compensatory effect of synthetic data.




Fig. 10: F1-score over epochs for four training regimes. The curves mirror the recall advantage of Mix 1:1 while preserving high precision. Real-only and Mix 1:3 are nearly tied, and Mix 0.5:0.5 trails but benefits from synthetic augmentation given the reduced real data.




Fig. 11: Early-epoch mAP50(B) (first 20 epochs) comparing four training regimes.

Figures 8–10 showcase the training dynamics of *Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1-score* across the four regimes (Real only, Mix 1:1, Mix 1:3, and Mix 0.5:0.5), enabling a side-by-side inspection of convergence behavior. A consistent pattern is that the Mix 1:1 configuration accelerates early learning relative to the Real-only baseline, reflected in higher early-epoch averages (e.g., absolute gains of $\sim+0.024$ in Precision, $\sim+0.042$ in Recall, and $\sim+0.034$ in F1 within the first 20 epochs). In contrast, Mix 1:3 tends to underperform in the same interval and later converges to results that are practically tied with Real only. The Mix 0.5:0.5 setting exhibits the slowest convergence and lowest asymptotic accuracy; nevertheless, despite using only half the real images, synthetic augmentation prevents a sharp degradation, indicating that synthetic data can partially compensate for small or imperfect real datasets. Complementarily, Fig. 11 highlights the early-epoch window of mAP50(B) (up to epoch 20): Mix 1:1 surpasses the Real-only model (by $\sim+0.03$ absolute mAP50 at the end of the window), Mix 1:3 hovers

near or slightly below the baseline, and Mix 0.5:0.5 remains lower throughout. Taken together, these analyses suggest that synthetic data can materially improve early optimization and stability, especially in Recall and the resulting F1, provided that the synthesis pipeline is properly configured; otherwise, suboptimal choices in synthetic generation may negate the expected benefits.

F. Synthetic Data Composition: BlenderProc vs. Video-based

Inside the synthetic portion, we explored the impact of splitting between BlenderProc-rendered images and AI-extended video frames. BlenderProc provides proper labels and strong control over background, illumination, and pose, while video-based synthesis injects temporal variation such as blur, occlusion, and camera jitter. The baseline adopted was 70% BlenderProc and 30% video-based frames, which balances labeling accuracy and temporal diversity.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This study demonstrates that mixing synthetic data with real images improves detection performance and training dynamics in industrial scenarios. Among the tested configurations, the 1:1 mixture delivers the best overall accuracy. Real-only and 1:3 converge to practically the same performance, indicating diminishing returns when the synthetic portion overwhelms the real data. The 0.5:0.5 setting underperforms the other mixes, but—despite using only half the real images—synthetic augmentation prevents a sharp degradation, suggesting that synthetic data can effectively compensate for small or imperfect real datasets.

Future work will extend the framework to more complex scenes, incorporate multimodal data (e.g., depth and infrared), and evaluate cross-domain transferability. This methodology has the potential to contribute to advancing robust perception systems with lower development costs and broader applicability.

Key takeaways: (i) The best-performing network is the 1:1 mix (real + synthetic); (ii) Real-only and 1:3 are practically tied at convergence, showing limited gains from excessive synthetic proportion; (iii) The 0.5:0.5 mix underperforms but remains viable—synthetic data mitigates the drop expected from halving real images; (iv) Beyond accuracy, heavier synthetic mixes increase compute cost without commensurate gains, so moderate synthetic ratios are preferable for cost-benefit; (v) Synthetic data is particularly valuable to “patch” small or faulty real datasets, stabilizing training and preserving generalization.

VI. DATA AVAILABILITY

The curated dataset supporting this study (images, annotations, and train/validation/test splits) is publicly available on Figshare at Synthetic Data Manometry Interpretation [Dataset]. [44]. Version 1.0, released Aug. 2025, licensed under CC BY 4.0.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. I. Khan and M. Haddara, "Risk-based maintenance (rbm): A new approach for process plant inspection and maintenance," *Process Safety Progress*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 252–265, 2004.
- [2] J. Bhandari, E. Arzaghi, R. Abbassi, V. Garaniya, and F. Khan, "Dynamic risk-based maintenance for offshore processing facility," *Process Safety Progress*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 399–406, 2016.
- [3] M. Hutter, R. Diethelm, S. Bachmann, P. Fankhauser, C. Gehring, V. Tsounis, A. Lauber, F. Guenther, M. Bjelonic, L. Isler, H. Kolvenbach, K. Meyer, and M. Hoepflinger, "Towards a generic solution for inspection of industrial sites," in *Field and Service Robotics*, M. Hutter and R. Siegwart, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018.
- [4] F. I. Khan and S. Abbasi, "Major accidents in process industries and an analysis of causes and consequences," *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, vol. 12, no. 5, pp. 361–378, 1999.
- [5] J.-F. Yang, P.-C. Wang, X.-Y. Liu, M.-C. Bian, L.-C. Chen, S.-Y. Lv, J.-F. Tao, G.-Y. Suo, S.-Q. Xuan, R. Li, J.-W. Zhang, C.-M. Shu, and Z. Dou, "Analysis on causes of chemical industry accident from 2015 to 2020 in chinese mainland: A complex network theory approach," *Journal of Loss Prevention in the Process Industries*, vol. 83, p. 105061, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950423023000918>
- [6] A. Khan, S. Gupta, and S. K. Gupta, "Emerging uav technology for disaster detection, mitigation, response, and preparedness," *Journal of Field Robotics*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 905–955, 2022.
- [7] Q. Ma, W. Liang, and P. Zhou, "A review on pipeline in-line inspection technologies," *Sensors*, vol. 25, no. 15, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/1424-8220/25/15/4873>
- [8] M. Fisher, R. C. Cardoso, E. C. Collins, C. Dadswell, L. A. Dennis, C. Dixon, M. Farrell, A. Ferrando, X. Huang, M. Jump, G. Kourtis, A. Lisitsa, M. Luckcuck, S. Luo, V. Page, F. Papacchini, and M. Webster, "An overview of verification and validation challenges for inspection robots," *Robotics*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2021.
- [9] M. Karkoub, O. Bouhali, and A. Sheharyar, "Gas pipeline inspection using autonomous robots with omni-directional cameras," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 21, no. 14, pp. 15 544–15 553, 2021.
- [10] W. E. Heap, S. Man, V. Bassari, S. Nguyen, E. B. Yao, N. A. Tripathi, N. D. Naclerio, and E. W. Hawkes, "Large-scale vine robots for industrial inspection: Developing a new framework to overcome limitations with existing inspection methods," *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, pp. 2–13, 2024.
- [11] Q. Li, F. Cicirelli, A. Vinci, A. Guerrieri, W. Qi, and G. Fortino, "Quadruped robots: Bridging mechanical design, control, and applications," *Robotics*, vol. 14, no. 5, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2218-6581/14/5/57>
- [12] M. Hutter, C. Gehring, A. Lauber, F. Gunther, C. D. Bellicoso, V. Tsounis, P. Fankhauser, R. Diethelm, S. Bachmann, M. Bloesch, H. Kolvenbach, M. Bjelonic, L. Isler, and K. M. and, "Anymal - toward legged robots for harsh environments," *Advanced Robotics*, 2017.
- [13] J. Trevelyan, W. R. Hamel, and S.-C. Kang, *Robotics in Hazardous Applications*. Springer International Publishing, 2016.
- [14] J. Yang, C. Wang, B. Jiang, H. Song, and Q. Meng, "Visual perception enabled industry intelligence: State of the art, challenges and prospects," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, 2021.
- [15] M. Ramezani, M. Brandao, B. Casseau, I. Havoutis, and M. Fallon, "Legged robots for autonomous inspection and monitoring of offshore assets," in *Offshore Technology Conference*. OTC, 2020, p. D011S006R005.
- [16] C. Gehring, P. Fankhauser, L. Isler, R. Diethelm, S. Bachmann, M. Potz, L. Gerstenberg, and M. Hutter, "Anymal in the field: Solving industrial inspection of an offshore hvdc platform with a quadrupedal robot," in *Field and Service Robotics*, G. Ishigami and K. Yoshida, Eds. Singapore: Springer Singapore, 2021, pp. 247–260.
- [17] A. Bonci, P. D. Cen Cheng, M. Indri, G. Nabissi, and F. Sibona, "Human-robot perception in industrial environments: A survey," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 5, 2021.
- [18] N. Manakitsa, G. S. Maraslidis, L. Moysis, and G. F. Fragulis, "A review of machine learning and deep learning for object detection, semantic segmentation, and human action recognition in machine and robotic vision," *Technologies*, vol. 12, no. 2, 2024.
- [19] C. Shorten and T. Khoshgoftaar, "A survey on image data augmentation for deep learning," *Journal of Big Data*, vol. 6, 07 2019.
- [20] J. Redmon, S. Divvala, R. Girshick, and A. Farhadi, "You only look once: Unified, real-time object detection," 2016.
- [21] A. Bochkovskiy, C.-Y. Wang, and H.-Y. M. Liao, "Yolov4: Optimal speed and accuracy of object detection," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.10934>
- [22] M. Denninger, M. Sundermeyer, D. Winkelbauer, Y. Zidan, D. Olefir, M. Elbadrawy, A. Lodhi, and H. Katam, "Blenderproc," 2019.
- [23] L. Eversberg and J. Lambrecht, "Generating images with physics-based rendering for an industrial object detection task: Realism versus domain randomization," *Sensors*, vol. 21, no. 23, 2021.
- [24] J. Dirr, D. Gebauer, J. Yao, and R. Daub, "Automatic image generation pipeline for instance segmentation of deformable linear objects," *Sensors*, vol. 23, no. 6, 2023.
- [25] NVIDIA Corporation. (2025) Nvidia cosmos: World foundation models for physical ai. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/ai/cosmos/>
- [26] NVIDIA Research. (2025) Cosmos-predict2. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://research.nvidia.com/labs/dir/cosmos-predict2/>
- [27] NVIDIA Cosmos Team, "Cosmos-predict2," <https://github.com/nvidia-cosmos/cosmos-predict2>, 2025, apache-2.0 license, Accessed: 2025-08-18.
- [28] ComfyUI Authors. (2025) Comfyui examples: Nvidia cosmos predict2. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: https://comfyanonymous.github.io/ComfyUI_examples/cosmos_predict2/
- [29] NVIDIA Corporation. (2025) Nvidia cosmos documentation. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.nvidia.com/cosmos/index.html>
- [30] G. Paulin and M. Ivacic-Kos, "Review and analysis of synthetic dataset generation methods and techniques for application in computer vision," *Artificial Intelligence Review*, vol. 56, no. 9, pp. 9221–9265, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-022-10358-3>
- [31] J. Tobin, R. Fong, A. Ray, J. Schneider, W. Zaremba, and P. Abbeel, "Domain randomization for transferring deep neural networks from simulation to the real world," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.06907*, 2017.
- [32] F. Sadeghi and S. Levine, "Cad2rl: Real single-image flight without a single real image," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.04201*, 2016.
- [33] Q. Vuong, S. Vikram, H. Su, S. Gao, and H. I. Christensen, "How to pick the domain randomization parameters for sim-to-real transfer of reinforcement learning policies?" *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.11774*, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11774>
- [34] X. Chen *et al.*, "Understanding domain randomization for sim-to-real transfer," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://openreview.net/forum?id=T8vZHIRTyY>
- [35] NVIDIA Corporation. (2025) Omniverse replicator. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: https://docs.omniverse.nvidia.com/extensions/latest/ext_replicator.html
- [36] —. (2025) Perception data generation (replicator) — isaac sim. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: https://docs.isaacsim.omniverse.nvidia.com/latest/replicator_tutorials/index.html
- [37] S. Borkman *et al.*, "Unity perception: Generate synthetic data for computer vision," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.04259*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.04259>
- [38] NVIDIA Corporation. (2025) Nvidia cosmos: Physical ai with world foundation models. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/ai/cosmos/>
- [39] —. (2025) Predict2 model reference — cosmos. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.nvidia.com/cosmos/latest/predict2/reference.html>
- [40] —. (2025) Predict2 quickstart guide — cosmos. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: https://docs.nvidia.com/cosmos/latest/predict2/quickstart_guide.html
- [41] M. Liu. (2025) Nvidia makes cosmos world foundation models openly available to physical ai developer community. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/cosmos-world-foundation-models/>
- [42] NVIDIA Corporation. (2025) Why world foundation models will be key to advancing physical ai. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: <https://blogs.nvidia.com/blog/world-foundation-models-advance-physical-ai/>
- [43] ComfyUI Authors. (2025) Nvidia cosmos predict2 — comfyui examples. Accessed: 2025-08-18. [Online]. Available: https://comfyanonymous.github.io/ComfyUI_examples/cosmos_predict2/
- [44] P. Saraiva, "Synthetic data manometry interpretation," Figshare, 2025, version 1.0, CC BY 4.0. [Online]. Available: https://figshare.com/articles/figure/SynthetcData_ManometryInterpretation/29936768