
REALITY BITES: ASSESSING THE REALISM OF DRIVING SCENARIOS WITH LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS

Jiahui Wu

Simula Research Laboratory and
University of Oslo
Oslo, Norway
jiahui@simula.no

Chengjie Lu

Simula Research Laboratory and
University of Oslo
Oslo, Norway
chengjielu@simula.no

Aitor Arrieta

Mondragon University
Mondragon, Spain
aarrieta@mondragon.edu

Tao Yue

Beihang University
Beijing, China
yuetao@buaa.edu.cn

Shaukat Ali

Simula Research Laboratory
Oslo, Norway
shaukat@simula.no

ABSTRACT

Large Language Models (LLMs) are demonstrating outstanding potential for tasks such as text generation, summarization, and classification. Given that such models are trained on a humongous amount of online knowledge, we hypothesize that LLMs can assess whether driving scenarios generated by autonomous driving testing techniques are realistic, i.e., being aligned with real-world driving conditions. To test this hypothesis, we conducted an empirical evaluation to assess whether LLMs are effective and robust in performing the task. This reality check is an important step towards devising LLM-based autonomous driving testing techniques. For our empirical evaluation, we selected 64 realistic scenarios from DeepScenario—an open driving scenario dataset. Next, by introducing minor changes to them, we created 512 additional realistic scenarios, to form an overall dataset of 576 scenarios. With this dataset, we evaluated three LLMs (*GPT-3.5*, *Llama2-13B*, and *Mistral-7B*) to assess their robustness in assessing the realism of driving scenarios. Our results show that: (1) Overall, *GPT-3.5* achieved the highest robustness compared to *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B*, consistently throughout almost all scenarios, roads, and weather conditions; (2) *Mistral-7B* performed the worst consistently; (3) *Llama2-13B* achieved good results under certain conditions; and (4) roads and weather conditions do influence the robustness of the LLMs.

Keywords Large Language Models · Realistic Driving Scenarios · Robustness

1 Introduction

The autonomy of vehicles has significantly increased in the last few years, up to a level where human intervention is not even required for some vehicles in certain restricted situations. To achieve such a level, it is paramount to ensure the high dependability of autonomous driving systems (ADSs) through automated testing. Because of this, significant effort has been devoted by the research community to devise effective and efficient techniques to test ADSs [1, 2, 3]. To this end, automated test case generation aims to generate test cases (e.g., driving scenarios in our case) to fail ADSs, for instance, by finding collisions. To this end, different techniques have been proposed in the last few years, including search-based techniques [4, 5, 6, 7], reinforcement learning techniques [8, 9, 10, 11] and causality-driven techniques [12].

Unfortunately, such techniques produce unrealistic driving scenarios, especially when simulated environments are involved [13]. For example, the simulation may not precisely represent the dynamic characteristics of vehicles during a collision realistically, such as how they respond to impact forces, or how they affect each other’s trajectories.

Different approaches have been proposed to overcome such problems, such as finding ADS configurations that avoid such situations and gain confidence in the validity and realism of the generated driving scenarios for testing [6]. Besides, some ADS testing techniques particularly aim to generate realistic driving scenarios with measures such as enforcing realistic constraints [14] and utilizing real-world driving data [15, 16, 17]. Those techniques require compute-intensive approaches combining search algorithms with simulation-based testing that usually involves a simulated environment, while, as Stocco et al. [13] indicate, there exists a reality gap between the simulation-based test and real-world test. In practice, it is extremely time-consuming to assess whether the generated test scenario is realistic for the real-world testing setup due to the complexity and infinite number of driving scenarios. Subsequently, developing effective and efficient techniques to assess whether a driving scenario for testing an ADS is realistic is essential.

Large Language Models (LLMs) have demonstrated great potential in various domains including context understanding, machine translation, and logic reasoning. With the capabilities of open-world cognition and common-sense reasoning, LLMs have gained significant attention in the domain of ADSs such as decision-making and environmental awareness [18, 19]. Given that LLMs have learned a large amount of information, we conjecture that they can provide adequate means to assess the realism of ADS driving scenarios. To validate our hypothesis, we carry out a comprehensive empirical evaluation to assess the robustness of three prominent LLMs, i.e., *GPT-3.5* [20], *Llama2-13B* [21], and *Mistral-7B* [22] in assessing the realism of driving scenarios. We validated the selected LLMs on 64 realistic scenarios (original) from open-source driving scenario set DeepScenario [23]. Moreover, we generated 512 additional scenarios by mutating the original scenarios. As a result, we have a dataset of 576 realistic scenarios. We defined *robustness score* to measure LLM’s robustness and evaluated LLMs by considering four independent variables, namely road, weather, scenario, and parameter (i.e., the parameter settings of the vehicle, such as position). Our results show that: (1) Overall, *GPT-3.5* achieves the highest *robustness score* (i.e., 12.59 out of 20) compared to *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B*, whose *robustness scores* are 9.48 and 5.60, respectively. (2) Regarding the robustness by roads, *GPT-3.5* has the most robust performance on 3 out of 4 roads (i.e., *robustness scores* with 12.64, 12.20, and 12.38), whereas *Mistral-7B* is the worst for all roads. (3) Concerning the robustness to weather conditions, a similar pattern to that for roads can be observed, i.e., *GPT-3.5* achieves the best *robustness scores* on 3 out of 4 weather conditions (i.e., 12.65, 11.34, and 13.56), whereas *Mistral-7B* is the worst for all weather conditions.

In summary, we conducted an empirical study to evaluate LLMs’ abilities in assessing the realism of driving scenarios with three LLMs and an open-source driving scenario dataset. We presented a novel metric, i.e., *robustness score*, to measure the robustness of LLMs for realistic scenario identification. We analyzed the impact of different independent variables (i.e., road, weather, parameter, and scenario) on the robustness of the LLMs and reported our findings. Such findings are a stepping stone for developing novel testing strategies to generate realistic driving scenarios with LLMs.

2 Related Work

Scenario-based ADS testing cost-effectively generates realistic (if possible) driving scenarios to test how well an ADS interacts with the environment under these scenarios. Various ADS testing approaches have been proposed, e.g., based on search-based testing (SBT) [4, 5, 6, 24, 25], reinforcement learning (RL) based testing [8, 9, 10, 14, 11] and causality-driven testing [12]. SBT-based approaches use fitness functions to guide optimized scenario generation. For instance, FITEST [5] uses a multi-objective search algorithm to generate critical driving scenarios, whereas AV-FUZZER [24] combines fuzzing and SBT to identify safety violations. RL-based approaches focus on adaptive scenario generation in dynamic driving environments. For example, DeepCollision [10] generates critical scenarios by dynamically configuring an ADS’s operating environment, whereas MORLOT [11] combines RL and multi-objective search, for violating multiple requirements simultaneously. Some ADS testing techniques particularly aim to generate realistic driving scenarios with measures, e.g., enforcing realistic constraints [14] and using real driving data [15, 16, 17, 8]. However, these techniques involve a virtual environment in the testing loop, and evidence showed a reality gap between virtual and physical ADS testing [13]. Thus, it is important to assess whether driving scenarios generated with these techniques are realistic to be used in real-world ADS testing. Given that LLMs are trained on an extensive amount of real-world knowledge, we aim to evaluate LLMs’ abilities in assessing the realism of scenarios generated by ADS testing techniques. This reality check is a critical step towards developing LLM-based realistic driving scenario generation for ADS testing.

Advances in LLMs provide possibilities to use them for solving diverse software engineering (SE) problems [26, 27, 28], e.g., code generation, completion, and repair [29, 30, 31, 32], requirement completion and classification [33, 34], and software testing [35, 36, 37]. For code generation and completion, various LLMs, e.g., *GPT-3.5* have been applied to interpret natural language descriptions and generate code snippets. Mastropaolo et al. [29] empirically investigated how the pre-trained and fine-tuned T5 model [38] perform to support code-related tasks such as automated bug-fixing and code summarization. OSS-INSTRUCT [30] prompts LLMs with open-source code snippets to generate high-quality coding instruction data to boost LLMs’ performance via instruction tuning. Evidence also shows that

LLMs exhibit strong contextual understanding, enabling them to capture nuances and intricacies of natural language requirement [39, 27]. PRCBERT [33] is a prompt learning approach for requirement classification using BERT-based pre-trained LLMs. Furthermore, LLMs are being explored to generate test cases based on natural language descriptions or existing code, thereby automating software testing [35]. CodeMosa [36] integrates SBT and LLMs for code (i.e., CodeX [40]) to generate high-coverage test cases for programs under test. Additionally, studies have investigated LLMs characteristics, e.g., as non-determinism [41] and uncertainty [42]. Notably, empirical evaluations predominantly concentrate on SE tasks related to code generation, question answering, and text summarization. Our work is the very first to explore LLMs’ potential in assessing the realism of driving scenarios of ADSs.

LLMs in the ADS context primarily focus on ADS control design policies and environment understanding [43, 44, 45] and decision-making [46, 47, 48, 49]. LLM’s few-shot learning enables faster and more accurate learning and reasoning [50, 51]. In the perception phase of autonomous driving, such capabilities can greatly improve ADS’s performance in understanding the dynamic environment. PromptTrack [43] predicts and tracks multiple 3D objects in driving environments with a given language prompt. HiLM-D [44] incorporates high-resolution information (e.g., images sampled from videos) into multi-modal LLMs for risk object localization and intention and suggestion prediction tasks. LLM’s open-world cognitive and commonsense reasoning can enhance ADS’s decision-making capability [18, 19]. Liu et al. [46] formulated the multi-task decision-making problem as a sequence modeling problem and then proposed MTD-GPT to manage multiple driving tasks simultaneously. DriveGPT4 [52] is an end-to-end ADS based on multi-modal LLMs that can interpret, reason, and answer diverse questions from human drivers to enhance ADS’s driving ability. Regarding applying LLMs for ADS testing, TARGET [53] uses an LLM to parse traffic rules and generate executable scenario scripts. TARGET was evaluated on four ADSs, resulting in 217 driving scenarios, in which approximately 700 traffic rule violations, collisions, and other significant issues, including navigation failures, were identified. To compare with our work, TARGET aims to extract knowledge from traffic rules and generate scenario representations, but not to check scenario realism. In conclusion, some works use LLMs to develop control policies and generate driving scenarios, but there is no work studying the LLMs robustness in assessing the realism of driving scenarios, which is an important step towards building ADS testing techniques for generating realistic driving scenarios. To this end, it is necessary to conduct a comprehensive evaluation to see whether LLMs are effective and robust in assessing the realism of driving scenarios, which is our focus.

3 Experiment Design

We present the design of our empirical evaluation in this section. In detail, we describe the benchmark dataset used for our experiment in Section 3.1. Section 3.2 presents the detailed experimental settings including the subject LLMs, temperature settings for LLMs, and the prompt design. We show our research questions in Section 3.3 and define the evaluation metrics in Section 3.4.

3.1 Benchmark Dataset

To study LLMs’ robustness in assessing the realism of driving scenarios, we created a benchmark dataset containing realistic scenarios from DeepScenario [23]. DeepScenario is an open dataset containing realistic driving scenarios generated with DeepQTest [14], a reinforcement learning-based strategy. DeepQTest ensures that all scenarios in DeepScenario are realistic by benefiting from the realistic constraints in its scenario generation process and by introducing real-world weather data. For instance, when introducing a new object (e.g., a pedestrian or a vehicle) into the simulated environment, the object should keep a safe distance from other objects, restricting where the object can be generated with its initial position. Besides, DeepQTest enables the introduction of real-world weather conditions (from OpenWeather [54], an open-source online weather database) into simulations to generate realistic scenarios.

A driving scenario S describes the temporal development of scenes, each of which describes a snapshot of the environment [55]. In DeepScenario, S is defined as a tuple with scenes: $S = \langle scene_1, scene_2, \dots, scene_n, T \rangle$, where T and n are the period that S spans and the total number of scenes in S , respectively. A scene is defined as a 3-tuple: $scene = \langle ego\ story, obstacle\ story, environment\ state \rangle$, which, respectively, describe operations and kinetic parameters of the ADS, static and dynamic obstacles, weather conditions, and the time of the day. Listing 1 shows a snippet example of a driving scenario in DeepScenario, which shows that the ego and non-player character (NPC) vehicles are characterized by four parameters, i.e., position, rotation, velocity, and angular velocity. The information in $\langle wayPoint\ timeStamp = "i" \rangle$ indicates the state of the ego vehicle or NPC vehicle in the i -th scene, where the time interval between each scene is 0.5 seconds.

We create the benchmark dataset by selecting realistic scenarios from DeepScenario by considering four different roads (i.e., R1 to R4) with various road structures, e.g., their lane structures, traffic signs and signals, crosswalks, and intersections, four weather conditions (rainy day (RD), rainy night (RN), sunny day (SD), clear night (CN)), and four




Figure 1: Process for generating a prompt from a DeepScenario scenario to evaluating the realism of the scenario with an LLM

driving scenarios containing an ego vehicle and one NPC vehicle. We select scenarios with only one NPC vehicle since more NPC vehicles will increase the prompt length to more than the maximum number of tokens (i.e., 4K) for *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B*, hence making outputs incomplete or not meaningful. As a result, we collected 64 realistic scenarios (4 roads \times 4 weather conditions \times 4 driving scenarios) from DeepScenario.

To create realistic variations to the realistic scenarios, we employ a mutation operator [56], which mutates values of the four parameters of the NPC vehicle in a scenario, i.e., position, rotation, velocity, and angular velocity, by 1% increment (e.g., mutated position = original position \times 1.01) or decrement (e.g., mutated position = original position \times 0.99), in each timestamp of a selected realistic scenario. We mutate one parameter at a time in each timestamp, e.g., only increasing the value of the position of an NPC vehicle by 1%, to produce one variation of the realistic scenario. As a result, we obtain $64 \times 4 \times 2 = 512$ variations to the 64 realistic scenarios. We then manually checked all 512 scenarios by replaying them in the simulation and ensured their realism was still preserved.

```

1 <DeepScenario timestep="0.5">
2   <Story name="Default">
3     <ObjectAction name="Act_Ego0">
4       <objectRef objectRef="Ego0"/>
5       <WayPoint timeStamp="1">
6         <DynamicParameters>
7           .....
8           <Velocity velocityX="-0.0" velocityY="-0.25" velocityZ="-0.0"/>
9           <AngularVelocity angularVelocityX="-0.001" angularVelocityY="-0.0" angularVelocityZ="0.001"/>
10          </DynamicParameters>
11          <GeographicParameters>
12            <ObjectPosition positionX="-201.879" positionY="10.27" positionZ="217.72"/>
13            <ObjectRotation rotationX="0.01" rotationY="180" rotationZ="-0.004"/>
14          </GeographicParameters>
15        </WayPoint>
16        <WayPoint timeStamp="2">
17          .....
18        </WayPoint>
19        .....
20      </ObjectAction>
21      <ObjectAction name="Act_NPC0">
22        <objectRef objectRef="NPC0"/>
23        <WayPoint timeStamp="1">
24          .....
25        </WayPoint>
26        .....
27      </ObjectAction>
28    </Story>
29  </StoryBoard>
30 </DeepScenario>
    
```

Listing 1: Exemplifying driving scenarios in DeepScenario

3.2 Experimental Settings

We discuss various experimental settings for our empirical evaluation in this subsection.

Table 1: Prompt template with example

Paragraph	Template	Example
System Message	... You are a helpful scenario realism evaluation assistant. You will evaluate the following autonomous driving scenario, and check whether the scenario is realistic ...	
Scenario Description	Road	In the following scenario, Ego0’s driving intention is to [Ego’s driving intention on the current road].
	Weather	The weather in this scenario is [weather conditions in the current scenario].
	Parameter	The [the parameter name] of [the specific object in the current scenario] is [the parameter triple values].
	Timestamp	At [the simulation time corresponding to the current timestamp] seconds: [parameter descriptions of the Ego and NPC corresponding to the current timestamp].
Query	Your task is to perform the following actions ... Evaluate the realism of the scenario ... Output whether the scenario is realistic ... Use the following format ... Evaluation of the Realism of the scenario: <evaluation results> ... Realistic: <True or False> ...	In the following scenario, Ego0’s driving intention is to first drive on a dual-way road, then turn right to a one-way road of four lanes. The weather in this scenario is sunny and day. The ‘position’ of Ego0 is (-293.259, 10.204, 1.007). At 0.0 seconds: The ‘position’ of Ego0 is (-293.259, 10.204, 1.007). ... The ‘position’ of NPC0 is (-273.203, 10.208, -6.955). ...

Subject LLMs. We selected three representative LLMs: *GPT-3.5* [20], *Llama2-13B* [21], and *Mistral-7B* [22], for our evaluation by considering their availability, diversity, and performance under various general-purpose tasks. *GPT-3.5* is a generative pre-trained transformer (GPT) developed by OpenAI. *Llama2-13B* is the pre-trained and fine-tuned LLM with 13 billion parameters created by Meta. *Mistral-7B* is a 7-billion-parameter LLM built by Mistral AI. We selected *Mistral-7B* since it showed better performance than *Llama2-13B* on various benchmarks including reasoning, mathematics, and code generation [22].

Temperature and Repetitions. Different temperature settings influence the quality of the task performed by an LLM [57]. Generally, a higher value enables an LLM to produce more diverse results but increases the non-determinism, whereas a lower value produces more deterministic results. In our context, we are interested in identifying realism more deterministically; therefore, we set a temperature setting of 0.0 for the three LLMs. Finally, LLMs are stochastic (even when the temperature setting is 0 [41]); therefore, to account for randomness, we asked each LLM to identify the realism of each scenario ten times.

Prompt Design. Figure 1 shows how various parameters are parsed from one driving scenario in our benchmark dataset to generate a prompt. It also shows the output generated by an LLM in response to such a prompt. In ①, at each timestamp, we extract specific variables and their values for each object in one driving scenario from DeepScenario, i.e., position, rotation, velocity, and angular velocity of the ego vehicle and NPC vehicle. We also obtain the corresponding roads and weather conditions for the driving scenario. Combining these variables, we organize the scenario information with a fixed format as shown in ②. Next, in ③, we use the scenario information to instantiate our fixed prompt template to generate the specific prompt used for LLM evaluation. Finally, we get the evaluation output from the LLM, as shown by ④.

For our empirical evaluation, we design one fixed prompt template including the system message, the scenario description, and the query for LLMs (see Table 1). In the scenario description paragraph, we also provide examples. Note that we provide a prompt with all four parameters (i.e., position, rotation, velocity, and angular velocity) of all objects (i.e., one ego and one NPC) in a scenario. Moreover, each LLM has a different default prompt format (e.g., *Llama2-13B* has the special «SYS» token); thus, for each LLM we keep the main contents of the prompt same to ensure a fair comparison with other LLMs, but adapt it for its specific default prompt format. We generated 576 prompts to assess 64 realistic scenarios and 512 mutated scenarios. Each prompt is repeated 10 times, resulting in 5760 prompt requests per LLM.

3.3 Research Questions (RQs)

Before evaluating the LLMs’ robustness, we first check their success rates. From the violin plots in Figure 2, we see the success rates 79.5% for *GPT-3.5*, 65.7% for *Llama2-13B* and 47.0% for *Mistral-7B*. In addition, *GPT-3.5* has the smallest variance. With a near 80% success rate achieved by *GPT-3.5*, we are confident that it is worth investigating the use of LLMs for determining the realism of driving scenarios. Based on this finding, we defined the following RQs. Table 2 shows our RQs, various independent variables and their combinations, goals, and evaluation metrics, with which we study the robustness of LLMs from the following three perspectives.




Figure 2: Distributions of each LLM’s success rate on evaluating all driving scenarios. The means represent the central tendency.

First, we study the robustness of LLMs when ignoring the differences between various roads and weather conditions in RQ1. This allows us to study the robustness with respect to scenarios (individual and merged) and parameters (individual and merged). Consequently, our RQ1 is: How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios with respect to scenarios and parameters? RQ1 is divided into four sub-RQs: 1) **RQ1.a**. What is the overall robustness of LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios? This RQ studies LLMs’ robustness without considering the differences in scenarios and parameters, providing a high-level view of each LLM’s robustness; 2) **RQ1.b**. How robust are LLMs in identifying each realistic scenario? This RQ identifies scenarios for which LLMs’ are the most and least robust in determining their realism; 3) **RQ1.c**. How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios with respect to each parameter? This RQ identifies parameters (e.g., position and velocity of an NPC vehicle) for which LLMs are the most and least robust; 4) **RQ1.d**. How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios with respect to each pair of scenarios and parameters? This RQ aims to identify the pairs of scenarios and parameters against which LLMs are the most and least robust.

Second, we study LLMs’ robustness with respect to each road in RQ2 to study road characteristics that impact LLMs’ robustness in identifying realistic scenarios. Thus, our RQ2 is: How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios on different roads? This RQ is further divided into four sub-RQs: 1) **RQ2.a**. What is the overall robustness of each LLM in identifying realistic scenarios on each road? This RQ identifies roads on which each LLM is the most and least robust in identifying the realism of scenarios; 2) **RQ2.b**. How robust are LLMs in identifying each realistic scenario on each road? This RQ identifies pairs of roads and scenarios against which LLM is the most and least robust; 3) **RQ2.c**. How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios for each parameter on each road? This RQ helps us identify pairs of parameters and roads against which LLM is the least and the most robust in identifying the realism of scenarios; 4) **RQ2.d**. How robust are LLMs in identifying each realistic scenario on each road for each parameter? This RQ identifies the triplets of scenarios, parameters, and roads against which LLMs are the most and least robust.

Third, we study LLMs’ robustness with respect to each weather condition to study the weather conditions influencing LLMs’ robustness in identifying realistic scenarios in RQ3. Our overall RQ3 is: How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios under various weather conditions? This RQ is answered with four sub-RQs: 1) **RQ3.a**. What is the overall robustness of LLMs for each weather condition? This RQ identifies weather conditions against which LLM is the least and the most robust in determining the realism of scenarios; 2) **RQ3.b**. How robust are LLMs in identifying each realistic scenario under each weather condition? This RQ identifies pairs of scenarios and weather conditions for which each LLM is the least and the most robust against; 3) **RQ3.c**. How robust are LLMs in identifying realistic scenarios for each pair of parameters and weather conditions? This RQ identifies pairs of parameters and weather conditions against which LLMs are the most and least robust in identifying realistic scenarios; 4) **RQ3.d**. How robust are LLMs in identifying each realistic scenario for each parameter under each weather condition? This RQ identifies the triplets of scenarios, parameters, and weather conditions against which LLMs are the most and least robust.

3.4 Evaluation Metrics

Robustness Score (RS) is defined to measure each LLM’s robustness in assessing the realism of driving scenarios. Since each LLM assesses each scenario S 10 times, we use $\#Succ_S$ to denote the number of times an LLM successfully identifies S as realistic, which ranges from 0-10. Next, for each original scenario S_{Org} and one of its mutation scenario S_{Mut} (e.g., position mutation S_{MutPos}) pair, we define RS as:

$$RS_{\langle S_{Org}, S_{Mut} \rangle} = \#AvgSuccess + \#Matched - \#Different, \quad (1)$$

Table 2: Research questions, independent variables and metrics. *Mer* denotes that data corresponding to an independent variable are merged during analyses, while *Inv* means the otherwise. *Sce*, *Par* and *WC* are abbreviations of scenario, parameter, and weather condition. Column *Goal* describes based on which the robustness is studied. For instance, *Robustness | pair < sce, par >* is about studying LLMs’ robustness based on scenario and parameter pairs. In the formulas of the evaluation metrics, *M1* and *M2* denote any pair of *GPT-3.5*, *Llama2-13B*, and *Mistral-7B*.

RQ	Independent Variable Sce, Par, Road, WC	Goal	Evaluation Metrics (Section 3.4)
1.a	Mer, Mer, Mer, Mer	Overall robustness	$RS_{Overall} = (\sum_{sce} \sum_{par} \sum_{road} \sum_{wc} RS_{<Org, Mut>}) / count(overall)$
1.b	Inv, Mer, Mer, Mer	Robustness sce	$T-5C_{all}, T-5C_{M1, M2}, B-5C_{all}, B-5C_{M1, M2}, IC_{M1, M2}$
1.c	Mer, Inv, Mer, Mer	Robustness par	$RS_{par} = (\sum_{sce} \sum_{road} \sum_{wc} RS_{<Org, Mut>}) / count(par)$
1.d	Inv, Inv, Mer, Mer	Robustness pair < sce, par >	$T-5C_{all}, T-5C_{M1, M2}, B-5C_{all}, B-5C_{M1, M2}, IC_{M1, M2}$
2.a	Mer, Mer, Inv, Mer	Overall robustness road	$RS_{<overall, road>} = (\sum_{sce} \sum_{par} \sum_{wc} RS_{<Org, Mut>}) / count(< overall, road >)$
2.b	Inv, Mer, Inv, Mer	Robustness pair < sce, road >	$T-5C_{all}, T-5C_{M1, M2}, B-5C_{all}, B-5C_{M1, M2}, IC_{M1, M2}$
2.c	Mer, Inv, Inv, Mer	Robustness pair < par, road >	$RS_{<par, road>} = (\sum_{sce} \sum_{wc} RS_{<Org, Mut>}) / count(< par, road >)$
2.d	Inv, Inv, Inv, Mer	Robustness triplet < sce, par, road >	$T-5C_{all}, T-5C_{M1, M2}, B-5C_{all}, B-5C_{M1, M2}, IC_{M1, M2}$
3.a	Mer, Mer, Mer, Inv	Overall robustness wc	$RS_{<overall, wc>} = (\sum_{sce} \sum_{par} \sum_{road} RS_{<Org, Mut>}) / count(< overall, wc >)$
3.b	Inv, Mer, Mer, Inv	Robustness pair < sce, wc >	$T-5C_{all}, T-5C_{M1, M2}, B-5C_{all}, B-5C_{M1, M2}, IC_{M1, M2}$
3.c	Mer, Inv, Mer, Inv	Robustness pair < par, wc >	$RS_{<par, wc>} = (\sum_{sce} \sum_{road} RS_{<Org, Mut>}) / count(< par, wc >)$
3.d	Inv, Inv, Mer, Inv	Robustness triplet < sce, par, wc >	$T-5C_{all}, T-5C_{M1, M2}, B-5C_{all}, B-5C_{M1, M2}, IC_{M1, M2}$

where $\#AvgSuccess$ is the average number of successes: $(\#Succ_{S_{Org}} + \#Succ_{S_{Mut}}) / 2$; $\#Matched$ is the number of successful results of S_{Mut} that match successful results of S_{Org} : $\#Matched = \min\{\#Succ_{S_{Org}}, \#Succ_{S_{Mut}}\}$; and $\#Different$ is the difference in the successful results of the LLM’s evaluation on S_{Org} and S_{Mut} : $abs(\#Succ_{S_{Org}} - \#Succ_{S_{Mut}})$. Therefore, the range of RS is between -5 to 20. Here, $RS = 20$ indicates that the LLM successfully identifies both the original and mutated scenarios in all runs, hence maximum robustness, while $RS = -5$ tells that the LLM is the least robust as the LLM identified the original (or mutated) scenario with a full extent of success, but failed for all runs on the mutated (original) scenario. $RS = 0$, instead, tells that the LLM failed to identify both the original and mutated scenarios as realistic.

We then follow the goals defined in Table 2 to calculate RS for each RQ by merging or dividing scenarios into different categories and then averaging metric values in each category.

Top-5 Count (T-5C), Bottom-5 Count (B-5C), and Inconsistent Count (IC) are defined to compare the robustness of different LLMs in terms of assessing the scenario realism for each scenario. We first rank all the scenarios for each LLM according to the RS achieved on each scenario. Next, we extract the top 5 and bottom 5 scenarios as two subsets, respectively: S_{top-5}^M and $S_{bottom-5}^M$, where $M \in \{GPT-3.5, Llama2-13B, Mistral-7B\}$.

$T-5C$ counts the number of identical scenarios in the top 5 scenarios of different LLMs. Concretely, we define $T-5C_{all}$ for all three LLMs as:

$$T-5C_{all} = |S_{top-5}^{GPT-3.5} \cap S_{top-5}^{Llama2-13B} \cap S_{top-5}^{Mistral-7B}|. \quad (2)$$

Also, for each LLM pair $M1$ and $M2$, we define $(T-5C_{M1, M2})$ as:

$$T-5C_{M1, M2} = |S_{top-5}^{M1} \cap S_{top-5}^{M2}|, \quad (3)$$

where $M1 \in \{GPT-3.5, Llama2-13B, Mistral-7B\}$ and $M2 \in \{GPT-3.5, Llama2-13B, Mistral-7B\} \setminus \{M1\}$.

Similarly, $B-5C$ counts the number of identical scenarios appearing in the bottom 5 scenarios of different LLMs. We calculate the $B-5C_{all}$ and $B-5C_{M1, M2}$ for all the three LLMs and LLM pairs.

IC measures the number of scenarios that fall into the top (bottom) 5 of $M1$ but the bottom (top) 5 of $M2$, i.e., appear inconsistently in the top 5 and bottom 5 of a scenario for the pair $M1$ and $M2$:

$$IC_{M1, M2} = |S_{top-5}^{M1} \cap S_{bottom-5}^{M2}| + |S_{bottom-5}^{M1} \cap S_{top-5}^{M2}|, \quad (4)$$

where $M1 \in \{GPT-3.5, Llama2-13B, Mistral-7B\}$ and $M2 \in \{GPT-3.5, Llama2-13B, Mistral-7B\} \setminus \{M1\}$.

Table 3: Robustness scores achieved by LLMs (overall and by parameter) for answering RQ1.a, RQ1.c, RQ2.a, RQ2.c, RQ3.a, and RQ3.c. The best robustness scores are highlighted in bold. *all*, *pos*, *roa*, *vel* and *ang* denote parameters *Overall*, *Position*, *Rotation*, *Velocity*, and *Angular Velocity*, respectively; *R1-R4* represent Road1-Road4, and *RD*, *RN*, *SD*, and *CN* denote Rainy Day, Rainy Night, Sunny Day, and Clear Night, respectively.

RQ		GPT-3.5					Llama2-13B					Mistral-7B				
		RS_{all}	RS_{pos}	RS_{roa}	RS_{vel}	RS_{ang}	RS_{all}	RS_{pos}	RS_{roa}	RS_{vel}	RS_{ang}	RS_{all}	RS_{pos}	RS_{roa}	RS_{vel}	RS_{ang}
RQ1	All	12.59	12.88	12.23	12.38	12.87	9.48	8.85	9.22	9.89	9.97	5.60	5.05	6.11	4.79	6.44
RQ2	R1	12.64	12.70	12.23	13.08	12.55	11.89	13.36	12.00	10.47	11.72	5.89	4.72	9.69	4.22	4.92
	R2	12.20	12.34	12.39	11.55	12.50	6.12	4.06	6.28	6.08	8.06	3.74	3.88	0.78	3.81	6.48
	R3	12.38	12.78	11.67	12.55	12.50	6.46	4.50	6.41	8.59	6.33	5.89	5.38	6.33	4.61	7.23
	R4	13.15	13.70	12.61	12.36	13.92	13.47	13.48	12.20	14.44	13.77	6.88	6.23	7.66	6.53	7.11
RQ3	RD	12.65	12.52	12.95	12.36	12.77	10.12	10.66	8.81	10.22	10.78	5.18	5.77	5.77	4.19	5.02
	RN	12.81	13.34	11.12	13.41	13.38	13.55	11.89	13.94	14.06	14.33	3.63	2.81	4.38	2.89	4.45
	SD	11.34	10.91	12.70	10.00	11.73	6.79	6.22	6.78	6.92	7.25	5.87	4.50	6.45	5.09	7.42
	CN	13.56	14.77	12.12	13.77	13.59	7.47	6.64	7.36	8.38	7.52	7.71	7.12	7.86	7.00	8.86




Figure 3: Distributions of robustness scores achieved by the LLMs (overall) for answering RQ1.a and RQ1.c. The mean represents the central tendency.

4 Results and Analyses

4.1 RQ1: Overall Robustness of LLMs

RQ1.a studies the overall LLMs’ robustness without differentiating scenarios, parameters, roads, and weather conditions. Results are shown in the third row of Table 3 in the RS_{all} columns calculated with $RS_{Overall}$. Overall, we can see that *GPT-3.5* has the highest robustness score (i.e., $RS_{Overall} = 12.59$), followed by *Llama2-13B* (i.e., $RS_{Overall} = 9.48$), whereas *Mistral-7B* has the lowest robustness score (i.e., $RS_{Overall} = 5.60$). Figure 3 shows violin plots for the three models for *Overall*. We observe that variances in robustness scores for *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* are much higher compared to *GPT-3.5*. Hence, we can conclude that *GPT-3.5* demonstrates better robustness in accurately identifying realistic scenarios, exhibiting lower variance and thereby showing a higher level of trustworthiness in identifying realistic scenarios.

In RQ1.b, we study the overall LLMs’ robustness while differentiating scenarios. We use $T-5C_{all}$, $T-5C_{M1,M2}$, $B-5C_{all}$, $B-5C_{M1,M2}$, and $IC_{M1,M2}$ metrics as described in Section 3.4. The results are summarized in Table 4 in the *Overall* row. Generally, we have the following observations: 1) There is only one scenario that is identified as realistic by the three selected models in $T-5C_{all}$, whereas there is no scenario identified as realistic with worst robustness by all three models in $B-5C_{all}$. This suggests that specific characteristics of scenarios affect LLM’s performance in correctly and robustly identifying scenarios as realistic; 2) We find scenarios commonly identified as realistic by two models in the same rank category. For instance, 6 scenarios (the highest number among all three pairs of models) ranked in $T-5C_{M1,M2}$ by *Llama2-13B* are also identified as realistic by *Mistral-7B* with high robustness scores. This may suggest that *Llama2-13B* shares some abilities with *Mistral-7B* to identify scenarios as realistic correctly with high robustness. Similarly, 5 scenarios are commonly identified by *GPT-3.5* and *Llama2-13B* in $T-5C_{M1,M2}$ suggesting some similarity between the two models. 3) We find that, generally, common scenarios (i.e., identical scenarios in the top 5 scenarios across two or more LLMs) are not identified in $B-5C$ as we can see that there is only one scenario that is identified as realistic with low robustness by *GPT-3.5* and *Mistral-7B*. Lastly, 4) the instances for IC are also generally low with the highest $IC_{M1,M2}$ observed for the *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* pair (i.e., 4).

These observations indicate that, in the context of identifying driving scenarios in terms of their realism, it is, in general, hard to achieve consensus among models, especially when more than two models are considered. This is because, firstly, driving scenarios contain rich information, which is more challenging to classify than many other tasks such as requirement classification [33]. Secondly, the LLMs we experimented with are all general models, i.e., not made for ADS.

Table 4: Top-5 Count ($T\text{-}5C$), Bottom-5 Count ($B\text{-}5C$), and Inconsistent Count (IC) (overall) for answering RQ1.b and RQ1.d. all denote $T\text{-}5C_{all}/B\text{-}5C_{all}$. G,L , G,M , and L,M represent $T\text{-}5C_{M1,M2}/B\text{-}5C_{M1,M2}/IC_{M1,M2}$ with the model pairs (i.e., $M1, M2$) of $GPT\text{-}3.5$ and $Llama2\text{-}13B$, $GPT\text{-}3.5$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$, and $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$, respectively.

Parameter	$T\text{-}5C$				$B\text{-}5C$				IC		
	all	G,L	G,M	L,M	all	G,L	G,M	L,M	G,L	G,M	L,M
Overall	1	5	2	6	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
Position	10	13	17	26	0	3	1	5	7	9	17
Rotation	3	9	5	12	0	1	1	4	5	8	11
Velocity	7	12	7	21	1	2	3	4	7	4	14
Angular Velocity	7	15	10	14	1	1	3	1	4	7	10

RQ1.c analyzes LLMs’ overall robustness by each parameter. Table 3, the second row (RS_{pos} , RS_{roa} , RS_{vel} , and RS_{ang} columns), shows the robustness scores (i.e., RS_{par}) of the four parameters for the three models. Generally, we have the same findings as RQ1.a, i.e., $GPT\text{-}3.5$ has the highest RS_{par} for all four parameters, followed by slightly lower RS_{par} for $Llama2\text{-}13B$. Finally, $Mistral\text{-}7B$ has the lowest RS_{par} . Figure 3 shows violin plots for the three models for each parameter. We see that $GPT\text{-}3.5$ has the lowest variance in robustness scores across all parameters.

In RQ1.d, we study the overall robustness of LLMs while considering each pair of scenarios and parameters. Table 4, rows 3-6 summarize the results for the four parameters. Generally, the $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ pair, for all the four parameters have the highest number of $T\text{-}5C$, $B\text{-}5C$, and IC with one exception (i.e., for *Angular Velocity*, it is second best after the $GPT\text{-}3.5$ and $Llama2\text{-}13B$ pair tied with the rest of the model pairs). These results suggest that $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ share some abilities that make them consistently identify the same scenarios as realistic. On the other hand, the $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ pair also share the highest number of inconsistencies.

RQ1: $GPT\text{-}3.5$ demonstrate the best robustness in identifying realistic scenarios with lower variance followed by $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$. However, $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ have large variances in their robustness scores. Moreover, robustness is also specific to each scenario indicating that the specific characteristics of scenarios, indeed, impact the robustness of LLMs. Finally, $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ appear to have similar abilities to identify realistic scenarios with high robustness on all the parameters.

4.2 RQ2: LLMs Robustness by Roads

RQ2.a studies the overall LLMs’ robustness for each road (i.e., $RS_{<overall,road>}$). Results are shown in Table 3. For R1-R3 with *Overall*, $GPT\text{-}3.5$ has the highest robustness scores (i.e., 12.64, 12.20, and 12.38), whereas for R4, $Llama2\text{-}13B$ has the highest robustness score, i.e., 13.47. $Mistral\text{-}7B$ is the worst for all roads. Our results indicate that road characteristics, indeed, impact the LLMs’ robustness in identifying realistic driving scenarios. In addition, from Figure 4, we can further observe that $GPT\text{-}3.5$ has the lowest variance for all roads. Moreover, for R4, all models (especially $GPT\text{-}3.5$) achieved slightly less variance than for the other roads. After investigating the road structure of R4 and the scenarios generated on R4, we find that it is more difficult for the scenario generation strategy (i.e., DeepQTest) to generate realistic scenarios on R4 than on the other roads because the road structure of R4 is more complex than the others [14]. Thus, we conjecture that the generated realistic scenarios for R4 are complex realistic scenarios, and LLMs are good at comprehending complex scenarios.

RQ2.b studies the LLMs’ robustness for each road and scenario pair with the $T\text{-}5C_{all}$, $T\text{-}5C_{M1,M2}$, $B\text{-}5C_{all}$, $B\text{-}5C_{M1,M2}$, and $IC_{M1,M2}$ metrics as described in Section 3.4. The results are shown in Table 5 (see rows *Overall* for each road). Generally, we find that for $T\text{-}5C$, the pair $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ has the highest count for R1-R3, whereas for R4, the pair $GPT\text{-}3.5$ and $Llama2\text{-}13B$ has the highest count, but only one more than the $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ pair (i.e., a minor difference). These results indicate that for R1-R3, $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ share the abilities to identify realistic scenarios robustly, whereas the same holds for R4, $GPT\text{-}3.5$ and $Llama2\text{-}13B$. For $B\text{-}5C$, for $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ pair, we observed the highest number of counts for R1 and R2, whereas for R3 and R4, the pair has the second highest number of counts. In general, for both, $T\text{-}5C$ and $B\text{-}5C$, the highest count is quite small (i.e., the highest one is 4). This indicates that there are some common patterns (e.g., similarity between the $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ pair), but those appear to be weak. For IC , the $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ pair has the highest count for R1, R3, and R4, whereas the second highest for R2 (which is one less than the highest). This finding indicates that the pair $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ also tends to give inconsistent results in terms of identifying realistic scenarios. A possible reason for this could be that both $Llama2\text{-}13B$ and $Mistral\text{-}7B$ show low confidence when predicting scenarios’ realism, producing higher inconsistencies among them.




Figure 4: Distributions of robustness scores achieved by the LLMs (by road) for answering RQ2.a and RQ2.c. The mean represents the central tendency.

RQ2.c studies the robustness ($RS_{\langle par, road \rangle}$) of the LLMs for each road and parameter pair. The results are shown in Table 3, under the RQ2 row under the $RS_{\langle pos, road \rangle}$, $RS_{\langle roa, road \rangle}$, $RS_{\langle vel, road \rangle}$, and $RS_{\langle ang, road \rangle}$ columns. For R1-R4, in general, *GPT-3.5* has the highest robustness for all the parameters except *Position* on R1 and *Velocity* on R4, where *Llama2-13B* has a better robustness. In addition, from the violin plots in Figure 4, we observe that for all roads and all parameters, *GPT-3.5* still has low variance in robustness scores, indicating *GPT-3.5* producing reliable results. Based on these results, we can conclude that *GPT-3.5*, for most parameters on all roads, robustly identifies realistic scenarios. Although in two specific cases *Llama2-13B*'s robustness was slightly higher than *GPT-3.5*'s, in R2 and R3 roads, *Llama2-13B*'s values plummeted. This suggests that *Llama2-13B* is robust only under certain circumstances, e.g., the R1 and *Position* pair.

RQ2.d studies the LLMs' robustness concerning each triplet of scenario, parameter, and road using the $T-5C_{all}$, $T-5C_{M1, M2}$, $B-5C_{all}$, $B-5C_{M1, M2}$, and $IC_{M1, M2}$ metrics from Section 3.4. Table 5 summarizes the results (see *Position*, *Rotation*, *Velocity*, and *Angular Velocity* rows for all roads). In general, we find that for $T-5C$, for all parameters, *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* identify the highest numbers of common scenarios. A similar pattern is observed for $B-5C$, i.e., *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* have the highest common number of scenarios (except for *Rotation* with R4, where it is second best). These results, once again, indicate similar abilities of *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* to common scenarios

Table 5: Top-5 Count ($T-5C$), Bottom-5 Count ($B-5C$), and Inconsistent Count (IC) (by road) for answering RQ2.b and RQ2.d. Columns *all* denote $T-5C_{all}/B-5C_{all}$. Columns G,L , G,M , and L,M represent $T-5C_{M1,M2}/B-5C_{M1,M2}/IC_{M1,M2}$ with the model pairs (i.e., $M1, M2$) of $GPT-3.5$ and $Llama2-13B$, $GPT-3.5$ and $Mistral-7B$, and $Llama2-13B$ and $Mistral-7B$, respectively. $R1-R4$ represent Road1-Road4.

Road	Parameter	$T-5C$				$B-5C$				IC		
		<i>all</i>	G,L	G,M	L,M	<i>all</i>	G,L	G,M	L,M	G,L	G,M	L,M
R1	Overall	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	4	5	6	8
	Position	6	7	6	14	5	6	5	12	13	10	26
	Rotation	6	6	7	14	2	2	6	7	8	13	21
	Velocity	7	7	8	14	3	3	5	9	10	13	23
	Angular Velocity	5	7	5	13	2	5	2	11	12	10	24
R2	Overall	1	3	2	3	1	2	3	3	3	5	4
	Position	6	6	7	8	5	6	5	9	5	9	11
	Rotation	3	4	5	8	3	3	4	9	6	10	16
	Velocity	2	2	5	10	4	4	5	11	8	7	18
	Angular Velocity	5	5	6	13	3	3	7	7	9	13	20
R3	Overall	3	4	3	4	1	2	3	2	4	3	6
	Position	6	6	7	10	3	4	6	6	6	12	14
	Rotation	3	4	5	10	1	3	2	5	7	9	15
	Velocity	3	4	4	8	1	3	4	4	7	7	13
	Angular Velocity	4	5	7	10	2	4	2	6	7	11	17
R4	Overall	2	5	3	4	1	2	2	1	6	3	8
	Position	5	7	5	13	5	6	5	9	13	9	22
	Rotation	3	4	4	12	1	2	4	3	7	8	14
	Velocity	4	5	4	13	4	5	4	9	10	7	22
	Angular Velocity	8	8	8	15	4	5	4	11	13	10	26

with high robustness or low robustness. With respect to *Inconsistent*, the *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* pair has the highest number of counts.

RQ2: Road characteristics, indeed, affect LLMs robustness in identifying realistic scenarios. For most roads, *GPT-3.5* still has the highest robustness with low variances, whereas for one road *Llama2-13B* has the highest robustness (although the difference with *GPT-3.5* is low). Moreover, in roads R2 and R3, the *RS* of *Llama2-13B* are very low when compared to *GPT-3.5*. *Mistral-7B* has the worst robustness on all the roads. The pair *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* tends to show similarities in identifying realistic scenarios with high robustness on all the roads.

4.3 RQ3: LLMs Robustness by Weather Conditions

We study the effect of weather conditions on the LLMs’ robustness. Particularly, RQ3.a studies the overall LLMs’ robustness for each weather condition. Results are shown in the RQ3 row, *Overall* of Table 3. For RD, SD, and CN, *GPT-3.5* performs the most robust (12.65 for RD, 11.34 for SD and 13.56 for CN). For RN, *Llama2-13B* outperforms both *GPT-3.5* and *Mistral-7B*, though the difference between *Llama2-13B* and *GPT-3.5* is very close (13.55 vs. 12.81). Under all four weather conditions, *GPT-3.5* and *Llama2-13B* largely outperform *Mistral-7B*; in other words, *Mistral-7B* is consistently the worst model. Furthermore, we can observe that, under RD and RN, the performance of *GPT-3.5* and *Llama2-13B* is close, but *Llama2-13B* performs very poorly for SD and CN as compared to *GPT-3.5*. These results indicate that the weather conditions do impact LLMs’ ability to identify realistic scenarios robustly and the level of the impact differs; *GPT-3.5* is consistently robust and *Mistral-7B* is consistently not robust under all four weather conditions. Interestingly, *Llama2-13B* is much more robust on the rainy day and night, but less robust on the sunny day and clear night.

From Figure 5, one can clearly observe that *GPT-3.5* achieves the lowest variances in the robustness scores under all weather conditions. Both *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* show large variances under all weather conditions. Though for RD, *Llama2-13B* achieves higher robustness scores, the variance of the distribution is much larger than *GPT-3.5*’s, hence *GPT-3.5* is recommended.

RQ3.b studies the robustness with respect to each weather condition and scenario pair (see results in the *Overall* rows of Table 6). Under RD, for $T-5C$, the *GPT-3.5* and *Llama2-13B* pair (G,L) achieve the highest number of common scenarios (i.e., 5); for $B-5C$, three pairs are equal in sharing 3 common scenarios. Under RN and CN, the pair of




Figure 5: Distributions of robustness scores achieved by the LLMs (by weather condition) for answering RQ3.a and RQ3.c. The mean represents the central tendency.

Llama2-13B and *Mistral-7B* shares the highest numbers of common scenarios in both *T-5C* and *B-5C*, implying that these two models agree with each other the most under rainy and clear nights. For SD, we do not see a clear champion. When looking at *IC*, under all four weather conditions, the pair of *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* has the highest numbers, implying that they disagree the most. One plausible reason could be that both *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* demonstrate low confidence in identifying realistic scenarios, introducing more non-determinism in the evaluation results.

RQ3.c studies robustness across weather conditions and parameters. Results are shown in the RQ3 row of Table 3. Under RD, SD and CN, consistently across all parameters, *GPT-3.5* has the best robustness. Under RN, *GPT-3.5* performs the best for *Position*, but *Llama2-13B* performs the best for the other three parameters. *Mistral-7B* performs consistently poorly under all weather conditions for all parameters. In general, *Llama2-13B* and *GPT-3.5* achieve comparable results under RD and RN, but *Llama2-13B* performs much worse under SD and CN. These results are quite consistent with the observations from RQ3.a. From Figure 5, we can observe the low variance in robustness scores for *GPT-3.5*. However, it is hard to observe any interaction effects between the weather conditions and parameters.

RQ3.d studies the robustness of the LLMs by each triplet of scenarios, parameters, and weather conditions. Results are shown in Table 6 (see *Position*, *Rotation*, *Velocity*, and *Angular Velocity* under each weather condition). For *T-5C*, we observe that *Llama2-13B* and *Mistral-7B* share the highest numbers of common scenarios for all the four weather

Table 6: Top-5 Count ($T-5C$), Bottom-5 Count ($B-5C$), and Inconsistent Count (IC) (by weather condition) for answering RQ3.b and RQ3.d. Columns *all* denote $T-5C_{all}/B-5C_{all}$. Columns G,L , G,M and L,M represent $T-5C_{M1,M2}/B-5C_{M1,M2}/IC_{M1,M2}$ with the model pairs (i.e., $M1, M2$) of $GPT-3.5$ and $Llama2-13B$, $GPT-3.5$ and $Mistral-7B$, and $Llama2-13B$ and $Mistral-7B$, respectively. RD , RN , SD , and CN denote Rainy Day, Rainy Night, Sunny Day, and Clear Night.

Weather	Parameter	$T-5C$				$B-5C$				IC		
		<i>all</i>	G,L	G,M	L,M	<i>all</i>	G,L	G,M	L,M	G,L	G,M	L,M
RD	Overall	2	5	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	4	9
	Position	3	7	3	10	4	5	4	9	12	8	19
	Rotation	4	6	5	8	0	2	1	2	7	8	9
	Velocity	6	8	6	10	2	3	4	5	6	9	17
	Angular Velocity	4	6	5	11	0	2	3	3	7	10	17
RN	Overall	4	4	5	11	3	3	6	7	8	8	16
	Position	6	6	7	14	3	3	6	8	10	13	22
	Rotation	6	6	6	16	6	6	6	16	12	12	32
	Velocity	6	6	6	16	8	8	8	16	14	14	32
	Angular Velocity	10	10	10	16	5	5	5	16	15	15	32
SD	Overall	1	3	1	3	1	2	2	1	2	5	5
	Position	2	3	4	5	4	5	7	6	6	11	14
	Rotation	5	6	7	9	3	5	3	5	4	9	12
	Velocity	4	4	5	10	2	2	4	6	8	7	16
	Angular Velocity	7	8	8	10	2	3	3	5	6	9	15
CN	Overall	2	3	2	6	1	2	2	3	4	3	4
	Position	9	10	11	11	2	2	4	5	7	12	11
	Rotation	4	4	6	13	3	3	6	9	8	12	22
	Velocity	5	7	5	10	2	3	3	5	11	8	9
	Angular Velocity	6	7	8	11	2	3	3	4	9	12	13

conditions with the exception of CN with Position, where the $GPT-3.5$ and $Mistral-7B$ pair has the same number of common scenarios (i.e., 11) as the $Llama2-13B$ and $Mistral-7B$ pair. Similarly, for $B-5C$, under RN and CN, the $Llama2-13B$ and $Mistral-7B$ pair has the highest numbers of common scenarios across all parameters; under the other two weather conditions, the $Llama2-13B$ and $Mistral-7B$ pair also share more common scenarios in most cases, but the differences with the other pairs are not so prominent. For IC , the $Llama2-13B$ and $Mistral-7B$ pair disagrees the most.

RQ3: $GPT-3.5$ is the best under three weather conditions and slightly under-performed $Llama2-13B$ under the rainy night, but with much smaller variances. $Llama2-13B$ performed much better under the rainy day and rainy night conditions than under the sunny day and clear night conditions. $Mistral-7B$ performed poorly consistently under all weather conditions. These observations are also obtained when looking at each parameter.

5 Threats to Validity

Conclusion Validity. LLMs are stochastic, which means that they produce different results when running the same prompt (even when the temperature parameter value is 0 [41]). We mitigated this threat by running each prompt 10 times and by considering this stochasticity in the evaluation metrics (Section 3.4).

Construct Validity. LLMs have a temperature parameter that must be set up, which we set to 0 because our application does not require diversity and we were interested in checking realism deterministically. Each LLM has its own specific default prompt format, e.g., the «SYS» system prompt «/SYS» for $Llama2-13B$. Not following such a format affect the LLM’s evaluation capabilities. To mitigate this threat, we carefully followed the documentation of each LLM to correctly use the default format with each prompt, while keeping the main contents of the prompt same for all LLMs to enable fair comparison among the selected LLMs.

External Validity. First, we only selected 576 realistic scenarios with one ego vehicle and one NPC vehicle, which does not guarantee that the results will be generalized to other cases, e.g., realistic scenarios with more NPC vehicles or unrealistic scenarios. Given the input limitations of the LLMs, the length of the prompts would have increased too much (i.e., exceeding the maximum token size) if more NPC vehicles had been provided, which could have resulted in the LLMs failing to output valid answers. In the future, we will consider more LLMs supporting larger numbers of tokens and different prompt templates to mitigate this threat. In addition, we will systematically involve unrealistic

scenarios to further study the LLM’s performance in assessing unrealistic scenarios, to make our findings more generalizable. Another external validity threat is that we only used scenarios that were generated by DeepScenario. Our implementation followed a decoding strategy to easily integrate other scenarios with other formats, which will be addressed in future evaluations to further generalize our findings.

6 Conclusion and Future Work

Testing autonomous driving systems (ADSs) focuses on generating driving scenarios. The realism of these scenarios plays a crucial role in assessing the dependability of ADSs. To this end, we empirically evaluated the robustness of three state-of-the-art large-language models (LLMs) in determining the realism of driving scenarios. For the empirical evaluation, we selected a total of 64 realistic scenarios from DeepScenario and generated additional 512 realistic scenarios by mutating the original scenarios’ parameters (e.g., velocity) with minor changes. We evaluated LLMs’ robustness from the perspectives of roads, weather conditions, scenarios, and scenario parameters individually and their combinations.

The results of our evaluation provide some interesting insights that are useful for practitioners designing ADS test generators. For instance, ADS testers can optimize the test generation process to generate realistic driving scenarios by selecting the LLM that is the most robust in recognizing realistic scenarios and then integrating it into the test generator to assess the realism of the generated driving scenarios. The most interesting, although not surprising, finding was that *GPT-3.5* is the most robust LLM for identifying realistic scenarios, showing the highest robustness scores with the lowest variances. Although, for some roads and weather conditions, *Llama2-13B* showed higher robustness scores, the performance of this model significantly degraded under other conditions. In contrast, *GPT-3.5*’s average robustness scores remained high for any kind of weather and road. Lastly, overall, *Mistral-7B* showed the worst robustness among the three LLMs, and therefore, its use is not recommended for this specific task. Another interesting finding was that both road characteristics and weather conditions affected the LLMs’ robustness when identifying realistic scenarios. For instance, *Llama2-13B* seems good at identifying realistic scenarios for roads R1 and R4, but bad on roads R2 and R3, and performs well under rainy night weather conditions. These results indicate that it might be worth selecting different LLMs according to the characteristics of road structures, weather conditions, and other environmental parameters. However, we need a dedicated and extensive experiment studying various environmental conditions in many scenarios to devise such an LLM selection strategy systematically.

There are different avenues we would like to explore in the near future. Firstly, we would like to experiment with other models, such as *GPT-4*; since *GPT-3.5* showed the highest robustness, our intuition is that *GPT-4* can even outperform *GPT-3.5*. Secondly, our evaluation was limited to 1 NPC vehicle due to the problems with the token limitation. To solve this issue, we would like to explore alternative strategies to use more than 1 NPC (e.g., reducing the timestamps, or invoking several times the LLMs and merging all the different outcomes). Besides, we intend to include unrealistic driving scenarios in our future empirical study. To do so, we plan to design an unrealistic scenario generation method and evaluate the generated unrealistic scenarios to further enhance the generalizability of our findings. Lastly, the LLMs we experimented with are all general models with no particular expertise in the field of ADSs. Thus, in future studies, we would like to study whether strategies like fine-tuning could help increase the robustness of LLMs when identifying the realism of ADSs’ scenarios.

Replication Package

The replication package is provided in an online repository [58].

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the Co-tester project (No. 314544) and the Co-evolver project (No. 286898/F20), funded by the Research Council of Norway. Aitor Arrieta is part of the Software and Systems Engineering research group of Mondragon Unibertsitatea (IT1519-22), supported by the Department of Education, Universities and Research of the Basque Country.

References

- [1] Demin Nalic, Tomislav Mihalj, Maximilian Bäuml, Matthias Lehmann, Arno Eichberger, and Stefan Bernsteiner. Scenario based testing of automated driving systems: A literature survey. In *FISITA web Congress*, volume 10, 2020.

- [2] Shuncheng Tang, Zhenya Zhang, Yi Zhang, Jixiang Zhou, Yan Guo, Shuang Liu, Shengjian Guo, Yan-Fu Li, Lei Ma, Yinxing Xue, and Yang Liu. A survey on automated driving system testing: Landscapes and trends. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, 32(5), jul 2023.
- [3] Xinhai Zhang, Jianbo Tao, Kaige Tan, Martin Törngren, José Manuel Gaspar Sánchez, Muhammad Rusyadi Ramli, Xin Tao, Magnus Gyllenhammar, Franz Wotawa, Naveen Mohan, Mihai Nica, and Hermann Felbinger. Finding critical scenarios for automated driving systems: A systematic mapping study. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 49(3):991–1026, mar 2023.
- [4] Raja Ben Abdesslem, Shiva Nejati, Lionel C Briand, and Thomas Stifter. Testing vision-based control systems using learnable evolutionary algorithms. In *2018 IEEE/ACM 40th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1016–1026. IEEE, 2018.
- [5] Raja Ben Abdesslem, Annibale Panichella, Shiva Nejati, Lionel C Briand, and Thomas Stifter. Testing autonomous cars for feature interaction failures using many-objective search. In *2018 33rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE)*, pages 143–154. IEEE, 2018.
- [6] Alessandro Calò, Paolo Arcaini, Shaukat Ali, Florian Hauer, and Fuyuki Ishikawa. Generating avoidable collision scenarios for testing autonomous driving systems. In *2020 IEEE 13th International Conference on Software Testing, Validation and Verification (ICST)*, pages 375–386. IEEE, 2020.
- [7] Guanpeng Li, Yiran Li, Saurabh Jha, Timothy Tsai, Michael Sullivan, Siva Kumar Sastry Hari, Zbigniew Kalbarczyk, and Ravishankar Iyer. Av-fuzzer: Finding safety violations in autonomous driving systems. In *2020 IEEE 31st International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*, pages 25–36. IEEE, 2020.
- [8] Shuo Feng, Haowei Sun, Xintao Yan, Haojie Zhu, Zhengxia Zou, Shengyin Shen, and Henry X Liu. Dense reinforcement learning for safety validation of autonomous vehicles. *Nature*, 615(7953):620–627, 2023.
- [9] Baiming Chen, Xiang Chen, Qiong Wu, and Liang Li. Adversarial evaluation of autonomous vehicles in lane-change scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(8):10333–10342, 2022.
- [10] Chengjie Lu, Yize Shi, Huihui Zhang, Man Zhang, Tiexin Wang, Tao Yue, and Shaukat Ali. Learning configurations of operating environment of autonomous vehicles to maximize their collisions. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 49(1):384–402, 2022.
- [11] Fitash Ul Haq, Donghwan Shin, and Lionel C. Briand. Many-objective reinforcement learning for online testing of dnn-enabled systems. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering, ICSE ’23*, page 1814–1826. IEEE Press, 2023.
- [12] Luca Giamattei, Antonio Guerriero, Roberto Pietrantuono, and Stefano Russo. Causality-driven testing of autonomous driving systems. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 2023.
- [13] Andrea Stocco, Brian Pulfer, and Paolo Tonella. Mind the gap! a study on the transferability of virtual versus physical-world testing of autonomous driving systems. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 49(4):1928–1940, apr 2023.
- [14] Chengjie Lu, Tao Yue, Man Zhang, and Shaukat Ali. Deepqtest: Testing autonomous driving systems with reinforcement learning and real-world weather data, 2023.
- [15] He Zhang, Huajun Zhou, Jian Sun, and Ye Tian. Risk Assessment of Highly Automated Vehicles with Naturalistic Driving Data: A Surrogate-based optimization Method. In *2022 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 580–585, June 2022.
- [16] Xintao Yan, Zhengxia Zou, Shuo Feng, Haojie Zhu, Haowei Sun, and Henry X Liu. Learning naturalistic driving environment with statistical realism. *Nature Communications*, 14(1):2037, 2023.
- [17] Alessio Gambi, Tri Huynh, and Gordon Fraser. Generating effective test cases for self-driving cars from police reports. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 257–267, 2019.
- [18] Zhenjie Yang, Xiaosong Jia, Hongyang Li, and Junchi Yan. Llm4drive: A survey of large language models for autonomous driving, 2023.
- [19] Can Cui, Yunsheng Ma, Xu Cao, Wenqian Ye, Yang Zhou, Kaizhao Liang, Jintai Chen, Juanwu Lu, Zichong Yang, Kuei-Da Liao, Tianren Gao, Erlong Li, Kun Tang, Zhipeng Cao, Tong Zhou, Ao Liu, Xinrui Yan, Shuqi Mei, Jianguo Cao, Ziran Wang, and Chao Zheng. A survey on multimodal large language models for autonomous driving, 2023.
- [20] OpenAI. Gpt 3.5, 2023.
- [21] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.

- [22] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [23] Chengjie Lu, Tao Yue, and Shaukat Ali. Deepscenario: An open driving scenario dataset for autonomous driving system testing. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 20th International Conference on Mining Software Repositories (MSR)*, pages 52–56, 2023.
- [24] Guanpeng Li, Yiran Li, Saurabh Jha, Timothy Tsai, Michael Sullivan, Siva Kumar Sastry Hari, Zbigniew Kalbarczyk, and Ravishankar Iyer. Av-fuzzer: Finding safety violations in autonomous driving systems. In *2020 IEEE 31st International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*, pages 25–36, 2020.
- [25] Yang Sun, Christopher M. Poskitt, Jun Sun, Yuqi Chen, and Zijiang Yang. Lawbreaker: An approach for specifying traffic laws and fuzzing autonomous vehicles. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE '22*, New York, NY, USA, 2023. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [26] Quanjun Zhang, Chunrong Fang, Yang Xie, Yaxin Zhang, Yun Yang, Weisong Sun, Shengcheng Yu, and Zhenyu Chen. A survey on large language models for software engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15223*, 2023.
- [27] Angela Fan, Beliz Gokkaya, Mark Harman, Mitya Lyubarskiy, Shubho Sengupta, Shin Yoo, and Jie M Zhang. Large language models for software engineering: Survey and open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03533*, 2023.
- [28] Xinyi Hou, Yanjie Zhao, Yue Liu, Zhou Yang, Kailong Wang, Li Li, Xiapu Luo, David Lo, John Grundy, and Haoyu Wang. Large language models for software engineering: A systematic literature review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10620*, 2023.
- [29] Antonio Mastropaolo, Simone Scalabrino, Nathan Cooper, David Nader Palacio, Denys Poshyvanyk, Rocco Oliveto, and Gabriele Bavota. Studying the usage of text-to-text transfer transformer to support code-related tasks. In *2021 IEEE/ACM 43rd International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 336–347. IEEE, 2021.
- [30] Yuxiang Wei, Zhe Wang, Jiawei Liu, Yifeng Ding, and Lingming Zhang. Magicoder: Source code is all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.02120*, 2023.
- [31] Zhiyu Fan, Xiang Gao, Martin Mirchev, Abhik Roychoudhury, and Shin Hwei Tan. Automated repair of programs from large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1469–1481, 2023.
- [32] Hammond Pearce, Benjamin Tan, Baleegh Ahmad, Ramesh Karri, and Brendan Dolan-Gavitt. Examining zero-shot vulnerability repair with large language models. In *2023 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 2339–2356, 2023.
- [33] Xianchang Luo, Yinxing Xue, Zhenchang Xing, and Jiamou Sun. Prcbert: Prompt learning for requirement classification using bert-based pretrained language models. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 1–13, 2022.
- [34] Dipeeka Luitel, Shabnam Hassani, and Mehrdad Sabetzadeh. Improving requirements completeness: Automated assistance through large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03784*, 2023.
- [35] Junjie Wang, Yuchao Huang, Chunyang Chen, Zhe Liu, Song Wang, and Qing Wang. Software testing with large language model: Survey, landscape, and vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.07221*, 2023.
- [36] Caroline Lemieux, Jeevana Priya Inala, Shuvendu K. Lahiri, and Siddhartha Sen. Codamosa: Escaping coverage plateaus in test generation with pre-trained large language models. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 919–931, 2023.
- [37] Zhe Liu, Chunyang Chen, Junjie Wang, Mengzhuo Chen, Boyu Wu, Xing Che, Dandan Wang, and Qing Wang. Testing the limits: Unusual text inputs generation for mobile app crash detection with large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.15657*, 2023.
- [38] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):5485–5551, 2020.
- [39] Jianzhang Zhang, Yiyang Chen, Nan Niu, and Chuang Liu. A preliminary evaluation of chatgpt in requirements information retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12562*, 2023.
- [40] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.

- [41] Shuyin Ouyang, Jie M Zhang, Mark Harman, and Meng Wang. Llm is like a box of chocolates: the non-determinism of chatgpt in code generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.02828*, 2023.
- [42] Yuheng Huang, Jiayang Song, Zhijie Wang, Huaming Chen, and Lei Ma. Look before you leap: An exploratory study of uncertainty measurement for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.10236*, 2023.
- [43] Dongming Wu, Wencheng Han, Tiancai Wang, Yingfei Liu, Xiangyu Zhang, and Jianbing Shen. Language prompt for autonomous driving, 2023.
- [44] Xinpeng Ding, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Wei Zhang, and Xiaomeng Li. Hilm-d: Towards high-resolution understanding in multimodal large language models for autonomous driving, 2023.
- [45] Ali Keysan, Andreas Look, Eitan Kosman, Gonca Gürsun, Jörg Wagner, Yu Yao, and Barbara Rakitsch. Can you text what is happening? integrating pre-trained language encoders into trajectory prediction models for autonomous driving, 2023.
- [46] Jiaqi Liu, Peng Hang, Xiao qi, Jianqiang Wang, and Jian Sun. Mtd-gpt: A multi-task decision-making gpt model for autonomous driving at unsignalized intersections, 2023.
- [47] Hao Sha, Yao Mu, Yuxuan Jiang, Li Chen, Chenfeng Xu, Ping Luo, Shengbo Eben Li, Masayoshi Tomizuka, Wei Zhan, and Mingyu Ding. Languagempc: Large language models as decision makers for autonomous driving, 2023.
- [48] Licheng Wen, Daocheng Fu, Xin Li, Xinyu Cai, Tao Ma, Pinlong Cai, Min Dou, Botian Shi, Liang He, and Yu Qiao. Dilu: A knowledge-driven approach to autonomous driving with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16292*, 2023.
- [49] Daocheng Fu, Xin Li, Licheng Wen, Min Dou, Pinlong Cai, Botian Shi, and Yu Qiao. Drive like a human: Rethinking autonomous driving with large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, pages 910–919, 2024.
- [50] Jishnu Jaykumar P, Kamalesh Palanisamy, Yu-Wei Chao, Xinya Du, and Yu Xiang. Proto-clip: Vision-language prototypical network for few-shot learning, 2023.
- [51] Zhiqiu Lin, Samuel Yu, Zhiyi Kuang, Deepak Pathak, and Deva Ramanan. Multimodality helps unimodality: Cross-modal few-shot learning with multimodal models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 19325–19337, 2023.
- [52] Zhenhua Xu, Yujia Zhang, Enze Xie, Zhen Zhao, Yong Guo, Kwan-Yee. K. Wong, Zhenguo Li, and Hengshuang Zhao. Drivegpt4: Interpretable end-to-end autonomous driving via large language model, 2023.
- [53] Yao Deng, Jiaohong Yao, Zhi Tu, Xi Zheng, Mengshi Zhang, and Tianyi Zhang. Target: Automated scenario generation from traffic rules for testing autonomous vehicles, 2023.
- [54] OpenWeather. Openweather: Weather forecasts, nowcasts and history in a fast and elegant way, 2012.
- [55] Simon Ulbrich, Till Menzel, Andreas Reschka, Fabian Schuldt, and Markus Maurer. Defining and substantiating the terms scene, situation, and scenario for automated driving. In *2015 IEEE 18th international conference on intelligent transportation systems*, pages 982–988. IEEE, 2015.
- [56] Thomas Laurent, Stefan Klikovits, Paolo Arcaini, Fuyuki Ishikawa, and Anthony Ventresque. Parameter coverage for testing of autonomous driving systems under uncertainty. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 32(3):1–31, 2023.
- [57] Frank F Xu, Uri Alon, Graham Neubig, and Vincent Josua Hellendoorn. A systematic evaluation of large language models of code. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGPLAN International Symposium on Machine Programming*, pages 1–10, 2022.
- [58] Jiahui Wu, Chengjie Lu, Aitor Arrieta, Tao Yue, and Shaikat Ali. Repository for the paper “Reality Bites: Assessing the Realism of Driving Scenarios with Large Language Models”. <https://github.com/Simula-COMPLEX/RealityBites>, 2024.