

# An LLM-enhanced Multi-objective Evolutionary Search for Autonomous Driving Test Scenario Generation

Haoxiang Tian  
Institute of Software Chinese  
Academy of Sciences, University of  
Chinese Academy of Sciences  
China  
tianhaoxiang20@otcaix.iscas.ac.cn

Xingshuo Han  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
xingshuo001@e.ntu.edu.sg

Guoquan Wu  
Institute of Software Chinese  
Academy of Sciences  
China  
gqw@otcaix.iscas.ac.cn

Yuan Zhou  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
y.zhou@ntu.edu.sg

Shuo Li  
Jun Wei  
Dan Ye  
Wei Wang  
Institute of Software Chinese  
Academy of Sciences  
China  
{lishuo19,wj,yedan,wangwei}@otcaix.iscas.ac.cn

Tianwei Zhang  
Nanyang Technological University  
Singapore  
tianwei.zhang@ntu.edu.sg

## ABSTRACT

The safety of Autonomous Driving Systems (ADSs) is significantly important for the implementation of autonomous vehicles (AVs). Therefore, ADSs must be evaluated thoroughly before their release and deployment to the public. How to generate diverse safety-critical test scenarios is a key task for ADS testing. This paper proposes LEADE, an LLM-enhanced scenario generation approach for ADS testing, which adopts the LLM-enhanced adaptive evolutionary search to generate safety-critical and diverse test scenarios. LEADE leverages LLM's ability in program understanding to better comprehend the scenario generation task, which generates high-quality scenarios of the first generation. LEADE adopts an adaptive multi-objective genetic algorithm to search for diverse safety-critical scenarios. To guide the search away from the local optima, LEADE formulates the evolutionary search into a question & answering task, which leverages LLM's ability in quantitative reasoning to generate differential seed scenarios to break out of the local optimal solutions. We implement and evaluate LEADE on industrial-grade full-stack ADS platform, Baidu Apollo. Experimental results show that LEADE can effectively and efficiently generate safety-critical scenarios and expose 10 diverse safety violations of Apollo. It outperforms two state-of-the-art search-based ADS testing techniques by identifying 4 new types of safety-critical scenarios on the same roads.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Software Testing, Validation and Verification, Reliability and Safety;**

## KEYWORDS

Autonomous Driving System, Simulation Test, Scenario Generation

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The safety and reliability of Autonomous Driving Systems (ADSs) are significantly important for the development and implementation of autonomous vehicles (AVs) [15]. It is essential to perform thorough testing on ADSs before deploying them in the real world [12]. This process requires large amounts of diverse and comprehensive traffic scenarios. However, testing AVs on public roads takes huge costs and can increase the risk of accidents. Alternatively, simulation testing can create large amounts of test scenarios with extremely low costs, which has been widely used in ADS testing. Currently, about 90% of ADS testing is completed through simulation platforms, 9% is completed at the test sites, while only 1% is completed through actual road testing [50].

Due to the complexity of real traffic, the "long-tail" problem stands as the primary restriction to the practical implementation of autonomous driving [41]: despite existing technologies have achieved autonomous driving capabilities for over 90% of scenarios, their realization in public roads remains unattainable without addressing the remaining 10% of long-tail scenarios [17]. Therefore, how to generate diverse safety-critical test scenarios to solve the long-tail problem is a key task for AV testing.

The conventional scenario generation strategy is to simulate naturalistic driving environments [8, 19]. However, due to the rareness of safety-critical events under naturalistic conditions, it is difficult to thoroughly find safety violations of ADSs from the test scenarios generated by simulating the public traffic driving environments. To address this issue, researchers have proposed new approaches to generate safety-critical test scenarios for ADSs, which can be broadly classified into two categories. The first kind of approach is traffic accident-based scenario generation, which reproduces traffic accidents from crash databases to test the ADSs [10, 13, 21, 48]. However, these test scenarios are simple and fixed. The tested ADSs may perform well in these tests, but their performance under broader conditions may not be adequately assessed.

The second kind of approaches, which is more promising, is the search-based scenario generation [23, 24, 32, 42]. The key idea is to extensively search for safety-critical scenarios in the simulation space [14, 22, 28–30, 35, 43, 44]. Many of these approaches adopt the genetic algorithm to generate critical scenarios. Generally, the search process is divided into three steps: 1) randomly initialization to create scenarios of the first generation; 2) evaluating each generated scenario with a defined fitness function; 3) selecting high-quality scenarios to conduct variation operators to generate new scenarios. This strategy has demonstrated high capability in discovering new safety-critical scenarios for ADS testing.

However, search-based scenario generation also exposes two challenges, which are not well addressed in prior studies. **C1: The random initialization of first generation scenarios highly affects the efficiency of the evolutionary search for critical scenarios.** The quality of first generation scenarios has a greater impact on the following search process. However, in traditional genetic algorithms, the first generation individuals are crafted by randomly initialized scenarios, which are highly contingent and uncertain. **C2: The evolutionary search process is prone to fall into local optima.** In existing genetic algorithms, the scenarios of each generation are generated by the high-fitness individuals retained from previous generations, which tend to cause convergence prematurely and result in a large number of iterations that can only find a small number of safety-critical scenarios.

The goal of this paper is to introduce a new search-based scenario generation method, which can overcome the above challenges. Our key idea is to leverage the great capability of Large Language Models (LLMs) to generate high-quality first generation scenarios and guide the generation away from the local optima. LLMs, represented by ChatGPT-4 from OpenAI [38], have emerged as a powerful tool for language understanding and question answering [37, 47]. They can interact with humans as a knowledgeable expert. In addition to the chatbot services, LLMs have also been used in software testing for different domains, e.g., unit test generation [39], input generation for mobile GUI testing [31]. However, it is infeasible to directly apply LLMs to generate safety-critical scenarios for ADS testing. This is because traffic scenarios normally have high dimensionality and complexity, making it difficult for LLMs to fully and accurately understand the search space. Additionally, since LLMs have no specific domain knowledge about the traffic scenarios, they will make up unreasonable scenarios, or arbitrarily modify existing scenarios, rendering them less effective.

To address the above issues, we propose a novel methodology to adapt LLM’s capability to traffic scenario generation. The key insight of our solution is to leverage LLM’s program understanding and reasoning capabilities to generate high-quality first generation scenarios and differential seed scenarios, facilitating the evolutionary search for more diverse and safety-critical test scenarios. With this strategy, we can use LLM’s ability in program understanding to better comprehend the scenario generation task, which generates high-quality scenarios of first generation considering scenario generation requirements instead of random initialization, **thus addressing C1.** We can also leverage LLM’s ability in quantitative reasoning to generate differential seed scenarios to break out of local optimal solutions, **thus addressing C2.**

Built upon this insight, we introduce LEADE, a LLM-enhanced scenario generation approach for ADS testing, which adopts an LLM-enhanced evolutionary search technique for safety-critical and diverse scenarios. LEADE consists of two modules: **1 Scenario Program Generation.** The input to this module is a vehicle recording video, the most common scenario resource in real traffic. LEADE first designs and implements a lightweight method to generate easy-to-understand scenario programs from vehicle recording video for the LLM. Based on the scenario programs, LEADE enables LLM to understand the test requirements of scenario generation task. **2 LLM-enhanced Scenario Adaptive Evolutionary Search.** This module is to search for diverse safety-critical scenarios to test ADS. Firstly, LEADE makes LLM generate first generation scenario programs considering test requirements. Secondly, LEADE formulates scenario evolutionary search into a question & answering task, using an LLM-enhanced adaptive multi-objective genetic algorithm to guide scenarios towards diverse and safety-critical ones.

We implement and evaluate LEADE on Baidu Apollo [6], an industrial-grade full-stack ADS platform that is widely used to control AVs on public roads. Experimental results show that LEADE can effectively and efficiently generate safety-critical scenarios and find diverse safety violations of Apollo. LEADE exposes 10 distinct types of safety violations of Apollo in 14 hours, and outperforms two state-of-the-art search-based ADS testing techniques by identifying 4 new types of safety-critical scenarios.

The contributions of this paper are as follows:

- **Insight:** For the first time, we propose to formulate the ADS test scenario generation and evolution as a question & answering task. We leverage LLM’s powerful capabilities in program understanding and reasoning to generate high-quality first population and differential seed scenarios to search for more diverse and safety-critical scenarios.
- **Technique:** We design a lightweight method to generate ADS test scenarios from vehicle camera videos using the LLM, and a federate fuzz engine that combines LLM’s reasoning-based differential seed scenario generation with adaptive evolutionary search considering failure-inducing, diversity and coverage.
- **Evaluation:** We perform effectiveness and efficiency evaluation on an industrial level-4 grade ADS, and present a comprehensive analysis of LEADE and the discovered safety violations of ADSs.

## 2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Autonomous Driving System Selection

We target the industry-grade ADS to ensure the high practicality of LEADE. In particular, we select the open-source full-stack ADS, Baidu Apollo [6], due to their representativeness, practicality and advancedness. (1) Representativeness. Apollo ranks among the top 4 leading industrial ADS developers [5] (the other three ADSs, Waymo, Ford, and Cruise, are not released publicly). (2) Practicality. Apollo can be readily installed on vehicles for driving on public roads [4] (it has provided self-driving services for real vehicles [1, 3]). (3) Advancedness. Apollo is actively and rapidly updated (the releases of Apollo update on a weekly basis).




Figure 1: Overall framework of LEADE

```

map_name = "san_francisco";

car_model = "Lincoln MKZ 2017";
ego_init_position = "lane_39"->20;
ego_target_position = "lane_40"->50;
vehicle_type = (car_model);
ego_vehicle = AV(ego_init_position, ego_target_position, vehicle_type);

npc1_type = "Truck";
npc1_heading = 0 deg related to ego_vehicle;
npc1_init_position = "lane_39"->30;
npc1_init_state = (npc1_init_position, npc1_heading, 6.0);
npc1_waypoints = Waypoint(("lane_759"->1, 2), ("lane_77"->1, 6));
npc1_destination = ("lane_77"->100);
npc1 = Vehicle(npc1_init_state, npc1_waypoints, npc1_destination, npc1_type);

ped_position = "lane_38"->30;
ped_init_state = (ped_position, 1.0);
ped_waypoints = Waypoint(("lane_38"->40, 1.0));
ped_destination_state = ("lane_39"->40);
ped = Pedestrian(ped_init_state, ped_waypoints, ped_destination_state);

time = 12:00;
weather = {rain:0.5, fog: 0.1, wetness: heavy};
env = Environment(time, weather);

scenario0 = createScenario{ load(map_name); ego_vehicle; {npc1, npc2}; {ped}; env };

```

Figure 2: An example of scenario program

## 2.2 ADS Test Scenario Program

In ADS simulation testing, the scenarios are described by scenario programs that can be executed in the simulator. Scenario programs specified using simulator APIs have loads of codes and cumbersome syntax, which is not conducive to LLM’s comprehensive and accurate understanding and reasoning of scenario programs. To tackle this issue, we investigate existing ADS test DSLs (domain-specific language) that can describe scenarios in Apollo [20, 27, 49], and select AVUnit [2] as the base platform considering the following aspects: 1) AVUnit features rich DSLs for specifying environment conditions and dynamic participants (NPC vehicles and pedestrians) with concise and intuitive syntax (an example of the scenario program described by AVUnit is shown as Figure 2); 2) AVUnit ensures deterministic scenario execution, which means that participants move following the defined trajectories. In the AVUnit scenario program, the position can be defined by "lane\_id -> dist" (here the dist is: the distance from the position to the starting point of the lane where it’s located. We call it *lane distance*).

## 2.3 ADS Test Scenario Generation

Generating diverse safety-critical scenarios is crucial for testing ADS, as they undergo frequent updates and extensive testing before being deployed on public roads. Due to the huge input space and functional complexity of ADSs [11, 34, 40], it brings great challenges to traditional software testing approaches when capturing various rare events from complex driving situations. [22]. How to generate diverse safety-critical scenarios to fully test ADSs has received significant attention in recent years [16, 26, 46]. ADS test scenario generation approaches are divided into two primary strategies: traffic accident-based approaches and search-based approaches.

**Traffic accident-based approaches.** These approaches generally reproduce traffic accidents from crash databases to test the ADS [10, 13, 21, 48]. Gambi et al. [21] propose an approach to generate test scenarios from police reports. Zhang X et al. [48] train a panoptic segmentation model to extract effective information from the accident record and recover traffic participants in the simulator. However, these approaches require lots of time to train and optimize the information extraction model, and the generated test scenarios are simple and fixed, which can not fully test industrial ADSs. Different from these methods, LEADE designs and implements a lightweight method to generate scenarios from traffic records, and searches for real-world various safety-critical scenarios based on them, which can reduce the time cost and test the ADS comprehensively.

**Search-based approaches.** Search-based techniques [23, 24, 32, 42] are widely used in ADS testing [14, 18, 22, 28–30, 35, 43–45] to guide the generated test scenarios towards more critical cases. Abdesslem et al. [9, 14] generate critical scenarios for ADSs by combining multi-objective search with surrogate models. AV-Fuzzer [30] and MOSAT [43] perturb the driving maneuvers of participants in an evolving traffic environment, which generates test scenarios towards safety-violation scenarios through high-level variation operations. In these approaches, there are two challenges: 1) the scenarios of the first generation are generated by random initialization, which is prone to create low-quality seed scenarios, affecting the efficiency of searching for safety-critical cases; 2) during the iterative search process, it is easy to fall into local optimality and tend to find the safety-violations similar to discovered ones. Compared with these approaches, LEADE can generate high-quality scenarios of first generation by leveraging the LLM’s capability in

quantitative reasoning and formulating the evolutionary search into Q&A task to generate differential seed scenarios for addressing the local optimal.

### 3 APPROACH

Figure 1 shows the framework of LEADE. It consists of two modules: scenario program generation, LLM-enhanced adaptive evolutionary search. **(1) Scenario program generation.** The generation process comprises three phases: scenario element extraction, abstract scenario construction and concrete scenario program generation. For the input vehicle recording videos, this module first extracts key elements from them, and then parses them into structured contexts to construct abstract scenarios. Based on constructed abstract scenarios, this module generates concrete scenario programs. **(2) LLM-enhanced adaptive evolutionary search.** This module enables the LLM to understand the generated scenario programs and the requirements of scenario generation task. Then it makes LLM generate first generation scenarios considering the test requirements. This module uses an adaptive multi-objective evolutionary method to search for diverse and safety-critical scenarios. When the evolution process gets stuck, LEADE generates feedback prompts to feed the individual characteristics of previous generations into the LLM, letting the LLM generate differential seed scenarios for the next generation. For the scenarios where the ego vehicle causes the safety violation, LEADE records them and can replay them to reproduce the safety violation of ADS.

#### 3.1 Scenario Program Generation

**3.1.1 Scenario element extraction.** To ensure the safety of ADSs, simulation testing requires a large number of scenarios in real traffic. One of the most common scenario records in real traffic is vehicle camera videos. Therefore, LEADE first extracts key elements (e.g., road, vehicle and pedestrian motions, weather) of scenarios from vehicle camera videos. Considering that LLMs have demonstrated strong capabilities in accurate recognition and comprehension of these elements, LEADE utilizes LLM to extract scenario key elements from the vehicle camera videos. Specifically, we use Honda Scenes dataset [33], which contains 80 hours of diverse high-quality driving video clips collected in San Francisco. The dataset includes roads, weather, vehicles, and pedestrians.

Although LLMs perform well on image understanding and analysis, their performance can be significantly influenced by the quality of the input prompts. First, LEADE splits each scenario video clip into a sequence of images. For the sequence of scenario images, we design linguistic patterns to generate input prompts for the LLM, to guide it to understand the given scenario and extract key elements, including weather, road type and surface conditions, traffic lights and signs, types and motions of traffic participants (vehicles and pedestrians) within the camera sight.

To design the prompt patterns, we select 20 different scenario video clips that include various types of roads, weather, and traffic participants. Five authors with experience in ADS testing independently write the prompt sentences, and submit them to the LLM to extract the key elements from each of the selected scenarios. Each author performs the self-check and cross-check on the extraction results of the ten scenarios. For the extraction results that have

**Prompt**

You are an autonomous driving expert who specializes in identifying traffic scenarios. I will show you a series of traffic pictures taken by the camera of the vehicle you are driving. These pictures are from the same one scenario. Please use concise and structured language to describe the following objects in the scenario: road conditions, traffic participants (all vehicles and pedestrians, and other obstacles within the visible range), and surrounding environment.

Figure 3: The prompt for scenario element extraction



Figure 4: An example of recorded scenario

inaccuracy or missing key information, the corresponding prompt is modified until the prompt can guide LLM to accurately and comprehensively extract the key elements of all the selected scenarios. Finally, the five authors vote for the five prompts based on their versatility, ease of understanding, and simplicity. The prompt is shown as Figure 3.

**3.1.2 Abstract Scenario Construction.** The abstract scenarios are constructed by parsing the extracted elements into structured description contents. First, for each scenario, LEADE uses StanfordNLP to perform part-of-speech tagging and dependency analysis on the corresponding extracted element contents. Then each object in the scenario is parsed into a tuple. Taking the scenario elements in Figure 4 as an example, its abstract scenario is shown as Table 1, which is composed of elements in five categories: environment, road condition, ego vehicle driving task, NPC vehicles, and pedestrians.

Table 1: An example of abstract scenario

Element	Description
Environment	time="daytime", weather="sunny"
Road	type="crossroad", signal="traffic light"
EV task	turn right
NPC Vehicle	[type="truck",motion=["drive forward"], position="left front",direction="opposite"] [type="SUV",motion=["cross"], position="left vertical",direction="right vertical"] [type="car",motion=["stop","cross"], position="opposite front",direction="opposite"]
Pedestrian	[motion="cross",position="right front", direction="left front",number=1]

(1) Environment: this category contains scenario time (e.g., night) and weather (e.g., rainy) to describe the driving environment of the test scenarios.

(2) Road condition: this category contains road type (e.g., crossroad) and traffic signal (e.g., traffic light) to describe the road condition in the scenario.

(3) Ego vehicle (EV) task: ego vehicle is the video recording vehicle of the scenario. The driving task of ego vehicle contains its

**Table 2: Road districts**

Road districts	Definition
$A(S, f)$	In front of $S$ and before the junction
$A(S, lf)$	Left front of $S$ and before the junction
$A(S, rf)$	Right front of $S$ and before the junction
$A(S, lv)$	Left lanes vertical to the lane of ego vehicle) of $S$
$A(S, rv)$	Right lanes vertical to the lane of ego vehicle) of $S$
$A(S, o)$	The other side lanes of the junction

**Table 3: Rules for defining ego vehicle**

Ego task	Rules
Drive along the lane	$S \in L_i, LT_S < LE_i$ ; $D \in L_i, LT_S < LT_D \leq LE_i$
Change to left lane	$S \in L_i, LT_S < LE_i$ ; $D \in A(S, lf), LT_D > LT_S$
Change to right lane	$S \in L_i, LT_S < LE_i$ ; $D \in A(S, rf), LT_D > LT_S$
Cross	$S \in L_i, LT_S < LE_i$ ; $D \in L_j, L_j \in A(S, o), LD_j = LD_i$
Turn right	$S \in L_i, LT_S < LE_i$ ; $D \in L_j, L_j \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_j) = 1$
Turn left	$S \in L_i, LT_S < LE_i$ ; $D \in L_j, L_j \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_j) = -1$

driving motion in the scenario (e.g., turn at intersection) and the driving direction (e.g., to the right). In the generated test scenario, the ego vehicle will connect to ADS and be tested by other extracted elements of the scenario.

(4) NPC vehicles: this category describes the NPC vehicles in the scenario, including vehicle type (e.g., SUV, truck), vehicle motion (e.g., change lane), vehicle position and direction relative to the ego vehicle (e.g., left front).

(5) Pedestrians: this category describes the pedestrians in the scenario, including number of pedestrians, pedestrian motion (e.g., cross the intersection), pedestrian position and direction relative to the ego vehicle (e.g., from the left to the right).

**3.1.3 Concrete Scenario Program Generation.** According to each abstract scenario, LEADE generates the concrete scenario program. To do this, three tasks are required to solve: 1) defining the starting position and target position of the ego vehicle (the vehicle connects into the ADS); 2) defining the trajectories for NPC vehicles and pedestrians; 3) defining the parameters of time and weather.

**(1) Determining ego vehicle's starting position and destination.** LEADE first selects one road  $R$  in the map according to the extracted road type. Then it parses the selected road to obtain all its lane information, including lane ID, lane direction, lane length. The starting position and destination of ego vehicle are marked as  $S$  and  $D$  respectively, which are determined by the ego vehicle's driving task. To do this, LEADE decomposes the road into a group of districts based on the lane structure, ego vehicle's starting position and the relative positions to ego vehicle, as shown in Table 2.

LEADE defines a series of rules for determination of starting position and destination of ego vehicle, shown as Table 3.  $L_i$  represents the lane with ID  $i$ ,  $LD_i$  represents the direction of  $L_i$ ,  $LE_i$  represents the length of  $L_i$ ,  $LT_S$  represents the lane distance of position  $S$ .

**(2) Modeling motions of participants (including NPC vehicles and pedestrians) to generate trajectories for them.** Based on the road districts above, LEADE models the motions of NPC vehicles and pedestrians. We conclude the types of vehicle motions from [7] and the types of pedestrian motions from

**Table 4: The modeling for "turn around"**

POS	DIR	Trajectory rules
far left	right	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_m) = -1$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, lf), \cos(LD_i, LD_n) = -1$
	left	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_m) = -1$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, o), LD_n = LD_i$
far right	right	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_m) = -1$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, o), LD_n = LD_i$
	left	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_m) = -1$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, lf), \cos(LD_i, LD_n) = -1$
opposite side	right	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, o), \cos(LD_i, LD_m) = -1$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = 1$
	left	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, o), \cos(LD_i, LD_m) = -1$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = -1$
front	right	$W_0 \in L_i, LT_{W_0} > LT_S$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = 1$
	left	$W_0 \in L_i, LT_{W_0} > LT_S$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = -1$
left front	right	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, lf), LD_m = LD_i, LT_{W_0} > LT_S$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = 1$
	left	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, lf), LD_m = LD_i, LT_{W_0} > LT_S$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = -1$
right front	right	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, rf), LT_{W_0} > LT_S$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, rv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = 1$
	left	$W_0 \in L_m, L_m \in A(S, rf), LT_{W_0} > LT_S$ $W_f \in L_n, L_n \in A(S, lv), \sin(LD_i, LD_n) = -1$

[36]. As page limitation, we take a NPC vehicle motion, "turn around" as an example to illustrate the motion modeling, shown as Table 4 and others are available at motion modeling folder in <https://github.com/ADStesting-test/Leade>.  $W_0$  represents the initial waypoint and  $W_f$  represents the ending waypoint of the NPC vehicle or pedestrian.  $i$  is the ID of the lane of ego vehicle's starting position.  $POS$  is the position and  $DIR$  is the direction.

There are some general constraints when generating the trajectory ( $W_0, W_1, \dots, W_f$ ). 1) the constraint prohibiting NPC vehicles from driving opposite to the lane direction: for the NPC vehicle's two waypoints  $W_p, W_{p+1}$ ,  $W_p \in L_m, W_{p+1} \in L_n$ , if  $L_m = L_n$ ,  $LT_{W_{p+1}} \geq LT_{W_p}$ ; 2) the constraint for vehicle heading: the heading should be the same as the lane direction; 3) the constraint for vehicle speed: the speeds of vehicles should not be more than maximum speed limitation of the road; 4) the constraint for pedestrian speed: the speeds of pedestrian should not be more than 3m/s.

**(3) Defining the parameters of time and weather.** The category of time of day is discrete, and the category of weather is a dictionary variable whose keys and values are the types of weather and quantification of the weather type (which will be transferred to a real value in  $[0,1]$ ). Therefore LEADE encodes the time of day as a discrete vector, and encodes the weather as a vector  $[0, 1]^{|\text{wk}|}$ , where  $|\text{wk}|$  is the number of weather kinds defined in a simulator.

## 3.2 LLM-enhanced Adaptive Evolutionary Search

Based on the generated scenario program, LEADE uses LLM-enhanced adaptive genetic algorithm to search for more safety-critical and diverse test scenarios. The algorithm is shown as Algorithm 1. When starting an evolutionary search (line 1), instead of randomly initializing scenario programs as the first generation, LEADE makes the LLM create the first-generation scenario programs considering the ADS test requirements.

Then LEADE searches for diverse and safety-critical scenarios by a multi-objective evolutionary search technique (line 19-38),

**Algorithm 1** LLM-enhanced adaptive evolutionary search

---

**Ensure:** Safety-critical scenario set SCR  
**Require:** A scenario program example AE, crossover probability interval PC, crossover threshold  $threshold_c$ , mutation probability interval PM, mutation threshold  $threshold_m$ , starting and scenario program understanding prompt  $pt$

```

1: first-generation P = LLM_generate(AE, pt)
2: while
3:   do C ← 0, M ← 0, TS ← 0
4:   if NOT ((TS)>3 and TS[-1]=TS[-2]=TS[-3]) then
5:     for  $p_i \in P$  do
6:       execute  $p_i$ 
7:       if  $\exists$  ego safety violation in  $p_i$  then
8:         SCR ← SCR  $\cup$   $p_i$ 
9:       end if
10:    end for
11:    calculate fitness S
12:    TS ← TS  $\cup$  S
13:    P = Adaptive_variation(P, S, PC, PM,  $threshold_c$ ,  $threshold_m$ )
14:  end if
15:  prompt =  $pt$  + generate_feedback(P, S)
16:  P = LLM_generate(prompt)
17: end while
18: break
19: return SCR
20: procedure ADAPTIVE_VARIATION(P, S, PC, PM,  $threshold_c$ ,  $threshold_m$ )
21:   for  $p_i \in P$  do
22:     select fitness  $s_i \in S$ 
23:     generate crossover probability  $c_i \sim U(PC)$ 
24:     if  $c_i > threshold_c$  then
25:       C ← C  $\cup$   $p_i$ 
26:     end if
27:     generate mutation probability  $m_i \sim U(PM)$ 
28:     if  $m_i > threshold_m$  then
29:       M ← M  $\cup$   $p_i$ 
30:     end if
31:   end for
32:   for each two individuals  $p_i, p_j \in C$  do
33:      $p'_i, p'_j \leftarrow uniformCrossover(p_i, p_j)$ 
34:     PN ← PN  $\cup$   $p'_i, p'_j$ 
35:   end for
36:   for  $p_i \in M$  do
37:      $p'_i \leftarrow geneMutation(p_i)$ 
38:     PN ← PN  $\cup$   $p'_i$ 
39:   end for
40:   return PN
41: end procedure

```

---

which can improve the heritability of high-quality scenarios and increase the mutation of low-quality scenarios. To guide the search away from local optima, LEADE formulates the evolution process into a question & answering task. When the evolutionary search gets stuck, LEADE lets the LLM generate differential seed scenarios for the next generation (line 11-16). LEADE executes generated scenarios to test the ADS, and records the safety-violation scenarios of ego vehicle (line 4-8), which can be automatically reproduced to re-test the ADS.

**Table 5: Prompt patterns for first generation scenarios**

Prompt type	Sample of prompt patterns
Scenario understanding prompt	A scenario to test ADS is shown as follows. <A scenario program example>. <The introduction of keywords of parameters of ego vehicle>. <The introduction of keywords and parameters of NPC vehicle>. <The introduction of keywords and parameters of pedestrians>. <The introduction of keywords and parameters of environment>.
Starting prompt	You are an expert of ADS testing. We want you to generate <count> new different scenarios to challenge ADS. The lane_id should be in <set of lane_id>. The lane distance should be in [0,<lane length>]. The speed of npc vehicles should be in [0,speed_limit], and the speed of pedestrian should be in [0,3].

**3.2.1 LLM-guided creation of first-generation scenarios.** For the scenario program generated from traffic videos, we design the prompt patterns to facilitate LLM to correctly understand the scenario program and create the first-generation scenario programs for the evolutionary search of scenarios. Five authors are asked to write the prompts respectively and perform small-scale experiments to question the LLM for creating the first-generation scenario programs. Then considering how well the scenario programs generated by the LLM match user intent, they were selected the prompts with the best results. Based on them, they performed card sorting [56] and concluded prompt patterns. This process comes out two kinds of prompts, scenario understanding prompt and starting prompt, shown in Table 5.

**Scenario understanding prompt** is the prompt to tell LLM about the contextual semantics of scenario programs. Figure 2 is an example of *A scenario program example*. As page limitation, we take *the introduction of keywords and parameters of NPC vehicle* as an example, which is: "npc represents the vehicles not controlled by the AV, specified using the keyword *Vehicle*, followed by four parameters: the initial state (*npc\_init\_state*), the waypoints that it should follow (*npc\_waypoint*), the target state (*npc\_destination\_state*), the type of the vehicle (*npc\_type*). The state contains: its position, its heading, and its current speed. When specifying the state, the position must always be specified, but the heading and speed are optional. The waypoint is a list of states and specified using the keyword *Waypoint*. The position is described by a lane point. An example of lane point is "lane\_39"->20, which specifies a point on the lane with ID 39 and the point is 20 meters from the start of the lane."

**Starting prompt** is the prompt to inform the LLM of the current task that generates first population scenario programs. The set of *lane\_id*, *lane\_length*, *speed\_limit* are from the lane information obtained in Section 2.2.2 (1). LEADE sends the scenario program to LLM along with the input prompts, to obtain the first generation scenario programs. Note that, for the scenario programs generated from the LLM, LEADE checks the feasibility of participants' trajectories by the general constraints mentioned in 2.2.2 (2). For the scenario program with infeasible trajectories, LEADE feeds them back to the LLM to generate a feasible scenario program.

**3.2.2 Adaptive Evolutionary Search.** Based on the first-generation scenario programs, LEADE adopts an adaptive genetic algorithm to build successfully-improved Pareto-optimal solutions considering the following three objectives: failure-inducing to ego vehicle, scenario diversity, road coverage.

For the same-generation scenario programs generated by adaptive evolutionary search, when all of them have been executed, they are further manipulated by adaptive crossover and adaptive mutation to generate new scenarios. Among these new scenario programs and their parents, LEADE selects the top  $k$  ones as the new generation by using Pareto optimality. When the saved scenario programs in three consecutive generations keep the same, LEADE will generate differential seed scenarios for the next generation.

**(1) Fitness Function.** To search for more safety-critical and diverse scenarios, a fitness function that contains the objectives above is designed to calculate the fitness score of each generated test scenario. The fitness function consists of the following metrics: 1) the minimum distance between ego vehicle and participants during ego vehicle's driving; 2) the average difference between participants' trajectories and discovered safety-violation scenarios; 3) the newly covered waypoint range by participants' trajectories.

For the first metric, LEADE records the trajectory of ego vehicle (represented as  $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n)$ ) and each participant (represented as  $(p_1, p_2, \dots, p_n)$ ) every 1 second during ego vehicle's driving, and computes the distance between participant's trajectory and ego vehicle's trajectory. The calculation is shown as below.

$$\min_{t \in [1, n]} \sqrt{(p_t.x - e_t.x)^2 + (p_t.y - e_t.y)^2} \quad (1)$$

For the second metric, LEADE uses the average Euclidean distance to compute the differences between participants' trajectories in different scenarios. For two scenarios  $i$  and  $j$ , the calculation of Euclidean distance of two NPC vehicles  $n$  and  $m$  (vehicle  $n$  is in scenario  $i$ , vehicle  $m$  is in scenario  $j$ ) is shown as below, and that of pedestrians are calculated in the same way.

$$D_{in,jm} = \sum_{k=0}^{\mu} \sqrt{(x_{ink} - x_{jmk})^2 + (y_{ink} - y_{jmk})^2} \quad (2)$$

The calculation of average Euclidean distance for two scenarios are shown as below (the number of NPC vehicles/pedestrians in scenario  $i$  and  $j$  are represented as  $l$  and  $c$  respectively).

$$D_{i,j} = \frac{\sum_{n=0}^l \sum_{m=0}^c D_{in,jm}}{l * c} \quad (3)$$

For the third metric, LEADE counts the waypoints that are covered by the participants' trajectories in each scenario. For each newly generated scenario, LEADE calculates the newly covered waypoints. The calculation is shown as below.  $l$  is the number of participants.  $Tr_n$  represents the trajectory of participant  $n$ , and  $w_d$  represents the  $d$ -th waypoint of  $Tr_n$ .

$$\sum_{n=1}^l \sum_{d=0}^f (w_d \in Tr_n \cap w_d \notin E) \quad (4)$$

The fitness score of each scenario is calculated at the end of execution. When all scenarios of this generation have been executed, they will be diversified by adaptive mutation and adaptive crossover. Among these individuals and their parents, LEADE selects the top  $k$  ones as the next generation by using Pareto optimality.

**(2) Adaptive Variation.** To increase the heritability of high-fitness scenarios and the mutation of low-fitness scenarios, the

adaptive-crossover and adaptive-mutation probability are adopted during the evolution of population.

**Adaptive Crossover:** the scenario with greater fitness has a higher crossover probability, and vice versa. Specifically, for the scenario program  $i$  with fitness  $f_i$ , LEADE first sets the crossover probability interval  $[PC_{min}, PC_{max}]$  (here we set  $PC_{min} = 0.4, PC_{max} = 1$ , others can change values according to actual needs), and then calculate the average fitness  $f_{avg}$  and maximum fitness  $f_{max}$  of this generation. The crossover probability  $PC_i$  is computed as follows.

$$PC_i = PC_{max} - (PC_{max} - PC_{min}) \frac{f_{max} - f_i}{f_{max} - f_{min}}$$

If  $PC_i > threshold_c$ , the scenario program will be added into the crossover candidate set. For the scenarios with  $PC \geq threshold_c$ , LEADE will conduct participant exchange or environment condition exchange across each two scenarios.

**Adaptive Mutation:** the scenario with smaller fitness has a higher mutation probability, and vice versa. Specifically, for the scenario program  $i$  with the fitness  $f_i$ , LEADE first sets the mutation probability interval  $[PM_{min}, PM_{max}]$  (here we set  $PM_{min} = 0, PM_{max} = 0.6$ , others can change their values according to actual needs). The crossover probability  $PM_i$  is computed as follows:

$$PM_i = (PM_{max} - PM_{min}) \frac{f_{max} - f_i}{f_{max} - f_{min}}$$

If  $PM_i > threshold_m$ , LEADE will select the participant with the minimum distance between ego vehicle during ego vehicle's driving, and then conduct value mutation on the participant's waypoints or environment parameters. Note that for each trajectory generated by mutation, LEADE checks its feasibility by the general constraints mentioned in 2.2.2 (2). For the infeasible trajectory, LEADE will re-generate it by mutation.

### 3.2.3 Feedback-guided LLM's Differential Seed Scenario Generation.

For the generated scenarios, LEADE executes them in the simulator to test the ADS. During the adaptive evolutionary search, we find that as the iterations increase, the evolutionary search is prone to falling into local optimality, causing the newly generated safety-violation scenarios to be similar as those generated in previous generations. To address the problem, when the evolutionary search gets stuck, LEADE generates differential seed scenarios for the next generation, which can facilitate to exploring finding more diverse safety-critical scenarios.

Specifically, when the saved individuals in three consecutive generations keep the same, LEADE selects the safety-violation scenarios generated by the previous iterations (represented as  $se$ ), and generates the feedback prompt using the rule 1 in Table 6. The prompt generated by rule 1 is to promote LLM learn from the characteristics of previously generated safety-violation scenarios and create differential seed scenarios to explore more search space. LEADE inputs the feedback prompt into the LLM, to utilize the reasoning ability to generate differential seed scenarios.

However, the introduced differential seed scenarios may reduce evolutionary search efficiency for safety-critical scenarios. To solve the potential negative impacts of differential seed scenarios, during the search process, when no safety-violation scenario occurs in three consecutive generations, LEADE selects two representative individuals (the scenario with highest fitness and lowest fitness in that generation) from each of the previous three generations, and generates the feedback prompt using rule 2 in Table 6. *sf*

**Table 6: Rules for feedback prompt generation**

Rule 1	The ego vehicle occurred safety violations in <i>se</i> . So they are what we want. Please substantially alter them to generate new scenarios different from <i>se</i>
Rule 2	<i>sl</i> create no challenge for ego vehicle. <i>sf</i> create challenges for ego vehicle, but not leading to safety violation of it. Please add new npc vehicles or pedestrians, or substantially alter values of parameters to generate more challengeable scenarios

are the selected high-fitness scenarios and *sl* are the selected low-fitness scenarios. LEADE inputs the feedback prompt into the LLM, which facilitates it modifying the scenarios most likely to lead to safety violation of ego vehicle, to assisting find the safety-violation scenario faster.

## 4 EVALUATION

To demonstrate the ability of LEADE, we apply it to test an industrial-grade full-stack ADS, Apollo 7.0, which is widely used to control AVs on public roads. To evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of LEADE, we answer the following research questions:

**RQ1:** How effective and efficient is LEADE in finding diverse safety violations of Apollo?

**RQ2:** How beneficial is LEADE to creating high-quality first-generation scenarios and addressing the local optimal?

### 4.1 Experiment Setup

We conducted the experiments on Ubuntu 20.04 with 500 GB memory, an Intel Core i7 CPU, and an NVIDIA GTX2080 TI. SORA-SVL (an end-to-end AV simulation platform which supports connection with Apollo) and San Francisco map are selected to execute the generated scenarios. During the experiments, all modules of Apollo are turned on, including perception module, localization module, prediction module, routing module, planning module, and control module. Apollo is equipped with a wide range of sensors, including two camera sensors (one at the top and another in front of ego vehicle), one GPS, one radar, one lidar.

The major safety requirements that LEADE concerns include: the ADS should avoid collision with participants in scenarios, the ADS should reach the destination. To monitor whether the ego vehicle satisfies the safety requirements above, we define two specifications: the distances between ego vehicle and participants during the execution of scenarios, and the distances of ego vehicle and destinations at the ending of scenario execution. Note that during the scenario execution, AVUnit can ensure NPC vehicles and pedestrians move along the defined waypoints while following traffic regulations (e.g, avoid colliding to other participants and ego vehicle, move within the maximum speed of road, follow the lane direction). Thus the collisions between ego vehicle and participant are caused by the safety violations of ego vehicle.

There are some parameters of LEADE that needs to be defined:  $threshold_m$ ,  $threshold_c$ ,  $k$ .  $threshold_m$  is the threshold for individual mutation and  $threshold_c$  is the threshold for individual crossover. To determine them, we tested different values within the range of thresholds that existing genetic algorithms recommends [25], and chose 0.3 for  $threshold_m$  and 0.7 for  $threshold_c$  respectively.  $k$  is the number of selected optimal individuals in each generation. To balance the search effects and evolving costs, LEADE randomly generates  $k \in [4, 8]$  for the adaptive evolutionary search process.

### 4.2 Experiment Design

**For RQ1**, we run LEADE to generate scenarios and execute them in the simulator to test Apollo. For the found safety-violation scenarios, we design a set of classification criteria to classify them, and analyze the potential deficiencies and correct operations of modules in Apollo.

We evaluate LEADE in comparison to two state-of-art techniques that use genetic algorithm to find safety-violation scenarios of Apollo: AV-Fuzzer and MOSAT. AV-Fuzzer evolves participant behaviors to expose safety violations, while MOSAT generates test scenarios using atomic maneuvers and motif patterns. Both techniques employ genetic algorithms for scenario optimization. We run LEADE, AV-Fuzzer and MOSAT for the same amount of time, and compare their effectiveness and efficiency from the following aspects:

- How many types of Apollo safety violations can be found?
- How much time does it take to generate one scenario?
- How many scenarios are generated on average to find one safety-violation of Apollo?
- How long does it take on average to expose the first safety violation and all found types of safety violations of Apollo?

**For RQ2**, to evaluate the benefit of LEADE’s first-generation scenario creation to efficiently finding safety violations of Apollo, and that of LEADE’s addressing local optimal to effectively finding more diverse types of safety violations of Apollo, we conduct the ablation experiments of LEADE. Two variant versions  $LEADE_r$  and  $LEADE_n$  are implemented.  $LEADE_r$  creates the first-generation individuals by random initialization of test scenarios, and  $LEADE_n$  evolves the test scenarios without differential random seed scenarios. We run LEADE,  $LEADE_r$  and  $LEADE_n$  for the same amount of time, and compare their effectiveness and efficiency.

To answer the research questions above, we run each experiment for 24 hours. Note that to account for the randomness of search-based techniques, the experiments were repeated 5 times, and the results were computed and compared in the following.

### 4.3 Result Analysis: RQ1


For each run, on average, 3756 scenarios (min 3346 and max 4015) are generated by LEADE and 313 (min 292 and max 355) out of them have safety violations of ego vehicle. To better analyze the potential deficiencies of Apollo, for each found safety-violation scenario, we identify the *essential participants* that cause ego vehicle’s safety violation. For an example, a found safety-violation scenario is shown as Figure 5(a), the corresponding safety-violation scenario with only essential participants is shown as Figure 5(b), which means if any participant in (b) is removed from the scenario, the safety violation of ego vehicle will not occur. To identify essential participants of each safety-violation scenario, LEADE first replays it by removing its participants one by one, and checking whether the safety violation of ego vehicle can be reproduced.

To classify the found safety-violation scenarios into distinct categories, we design a set of classification criteria considering the following aspects: road type, driving task of ego vehicle, behaviors of participants, the driving error of Apollo. Based on the criteria, the safety-violation scenarios with only essential participants are categorized into 10 distinct types (shown as Table 7), which are all



**Table 7: The found types of safety violations of Apollo**

Type	Road type	Driving task of EV	Participants			Driving Error of Apollo
			type	initial position relative to EV	behavior	
1	Intersection	Turn left	2 NVs	left/right vertical lanes	cross	Misidentifying the speed of NPC vehicles driving one after the other as the same, leading to misjudgement of the speed of later vehicles
		Turn right	2 NVs	left vertical lanes	cross	
2	Multi-lanes Straight road	Change lane left/Change lane right	2 NVs	ahead on left/right lane behind on left/right lane	drive along accelerate	Ignore acceleration of NPC vehicle behind on adjacent lane, leading to not keeping the safe distance
3	Intersection	Cross	2 NVs	left vertical lanes	cross turn left	Mispredicting behaviors of vehicles driving side by side on vertical lanes as the same, ignoring behavior changes of the one arriving later
4	Intersection	Turn left/Cross	1 NV	left vertical lanes	turn left	When turning at connection area of junction, there is a delay in processing and responding to right of way of turning vehicle
5	Multi-lanes Straight road	Drive through	2 NVs	ahead on the same lane ahead on adjacent lane	stop decelerate	Disable to change lane again during driving
6	Intersection	Turn right	1 NV	left vertical lanes	stop at entrance of EV's turn-in lane	Disable to adjust route to another incoming lane during turning
7	Intersection	Turn left	2 NVs	the opposite side lanes of the intersection	cross	Inaccurate calculation of the distance and motion status of two consecutive NPC vehicles passing through an intersection
		Cross	2 NVs	left/right vertical lanes	cross	
8	Intersection	Cross	1 NV 1 P	ahead on left/right lane left/right vertical lane	follow lane cross	When participants in front perform abnormally actions (e.g., emergency braking), EV is lack of prediction of potential dangers nearby
9	Multi-lanes Straight road	Drive through	2 NVs	ahead on the same lane	drive slowly	Insufficient ability to cope with multiple slow-speed vehicles ahead, leading to colliding with it when performing slow overtaking
10	Intersection	Turn right	truck	left vertical lane	cross	Lack of response to large vehicle dimensions when EV accelerates, leading to no adjustment for lateral spacing
		Cross	truck	right vertical lane	turn right	




**Figure 5: An example of safety-violation scenario**


revealed in the first 14 hours of each experiment. EV represents the ego vehicle. NV represents NPC vehicles (2 NVs represents two NPC vehicles), and P represents pedestrians. As the page limitation, we select two types of safety-violation scenarios and explain them in the following (EV represents the ego vehicle). The illustration for other types of safety violations can be found in the safety violation folder of <https://github.com/ADStesting-test/Leade>.

**Examples of safety violation 7:** As shown in Figure 6, in the first scenario, EV is turning left. Vehicle *a* is crossing the intersection from the opposite side lanes, and vehicle *b* is following *a* to cross the intersection. Before EV starts to turn at the entrance of junction, it identifies the right of way of *a* and stops to let *a* pass. When *a* pass the junction, EV accelerates due to wrongly calculation of the distance and speed of *b*, causing collision to *b*. The safety violation of the second scenario is caused by the same error of EV.

**Examples of safety violation 10:** as shown in Figure 7, EV is turning right. The truck *a* on the left vertical lanes is crossing. When EV starts to turn, *a* is driving close to the adjacent lane of



**Figure 6: Two examples of safety violation 7**



**Figure 7: An example of safety violation 10**

EV's destination. EV decelerates and turns right close to the right corner and keeps a safe distance with *a*. However, when EV finishes the turning, it accelerates close to the lane marking, not considering the big size of *a* and leading to the collision.

To compare the effectiveness and efficiency of LEADE to existing state-of-art techniques that uses genetic algorithm to find safety violations of Apollo, we run MOSAT and AV-Fuzzer on the same road in San Francisco as LEADE. For the sake of fairness, in each 24-hour running, the number of individuals in each generation of the three approaches are the same (ranging from 4 to 8 respectively in the 5 times). Note that for each found safety-violation scenario, we check whether the safety violation is caused by illegal actions



Figure 8: An example of safety violation not caused by EV

Table 8: Comparison results of LEADE, MOSAT, AV-Fuzzer

		LEADE	MOSAT	AV-Fuzzer
types of found SV		10	6	3
time for a scenario (second)	min	21.5	23.2	64.0
	max	25.8	26.9	49.8
	avg	23.0	24.4	55.0
number of scenarios to find one SV	min	10.1	61.0	96.4
	max	13.7	65.9	192.6
	avg	12	62.1	131
time to find the first SV (min)	min	6	22	89
	max	15	58	122
	avg	11	46	98
time to find all found types of SVs (hour)	min	11.3	16.0	15.7
	max	13.6	18.9	20.4
	avg	12.9	18.1	19.2

of participants in the scenario, and analyze the safety violations caused by ego vehicle. Figure 8 shows a safety violation that was not caused by ego vehicle. The NPC vehicle d changes to the lane of ego vehicle illegally and collides to the ego vehicle. For the found safety violations caused by ego vehicle, we use the same criteria to classify them. The experiment results are shown as Table 8. SV is the abbreviation for "safety violation".

In each 24-hour running, MOSAT can find 6 types of safety violations of Apollo, and AV-Fuzzer can find 3 types of safety violations of Apollo. On average, MOSAT generates 3541 test scenarios (min 3208 and max 3719), and 57 (min 49 and max 61) out of them occur safety violations of ego vehicle. AV-Fuzzer generates 1572 test scenarios (min 1350 and max 1734), and 12 (min 9 and max 14) out of them occur occur safety violations of ego vehicle.

LEADE finds 10 distinct types of safety violations of Apollo and all of them occur in the first 14 hours. MOSAT finds 6 types of safety violations and all of them occur in the first 19 hours. AV-Fuzzer finds 3 types of safety violations and all of them occur in the first 21 hours. Moreover, it takes LEADE less time to find the first safety violation of Apollo than MOSAT and AV-Fuzzer. Therefore, compared with MOSAT and AV-Fuzzer, LEADE can find more types of safety violations of Apollo in a shorter time. On average, one safety violation of Apollo occurs in 12 scenarios generated by LEADE. MOSAT generates 62 scenarios to find one safety violation of Apollo, and AV-Fuzzer generates 131 scenarios to find one safety violation of Apollo. The safety-violation exposure frequency in LEADE is higher, which shows that LEADE can efficiently generate more safety-critical scenarios. For the time cost of test scenario generation, LEADE takes 23 seconds to generate and run a scenario to test Apollo. The time cost for one test scenario of MOSAT is 24 seconds and that of AV-Fuzzer is 55 seconds. LEADE generates and executes test scenarios with almost the same time cost as MOSAT, which is less than AV-Fuzzer. The comparison results show that LEADE can effectively generate more diverse safety-violation scenarios.

Table 9: Comparison results of LEADE,  $LEADE_r$  and  $LEADE_n$

	LEADE	$LEADE_r$	$LEADE_n$
types of found SV	10	10	6
time to find the first SV	11min	39min	17min
generations to find all SVs	14h	15h	22h

#### 4.4 Result Analysis: RQ2

We run LEADE,  $LEADE_r$  and  $LEADE_n$  for 24 hours using the same input scenario programs. We compare the three approaches from the following aspects, and the results are shown as Table 9.

- How many types of safety violations of Apollo can be found?
- How long does it take on average to find the first safety-violation scenario?
- How long does it take on average to find all found types of safety-violation scenarios?

Table 9 shows that  $LEADE_r$  takes the most time to generate the first safety-violation scenario. It can be seen from Figure ?? that in early-generation scenarios, the number of safety violations exposed by  $LEADE_r$  is the least. We can conclude that LEADE's first-generation individual creation is helpful for generating high-quality first-generation scenarios than random initialization.


For  $LEADE_n$ , the number of found safety violation types of ego vehicle is fewer than LEADE and  $LEADE_r$ , and it takes more time to generate all found types of ego vehicle's safety violations. As the iterations of evolutionary search increase, the growth of safety-violation scenarios generated by  $LEADE_n$  is slowest. We can conclude that the differential seed scenarios of LEADE can help address the local optimal and find more diverse types of ego vehicle's safety violations.

It's worth noting that, during the iterations of LEADE and  $LEADE_r$ , after a few types of safety violations have been found, the safety-violation scenario generation grows faster. We analyze that it benefits from the feedback-based differential seed scenario generation. As the amount and types of discovered safety-violation scenarios increase, that of feedback scenarios increase. LEADE can learn more experience from diverse safety-violation scenarios, which can improve the quality of the generated differential seed scenarios.


## 5 DISCUSSION

To leverage the LLM's capability, LEADE inputs the prompt into GPT-4 by sending API request, which brings extra time cost due to waiting for the output of GPT. Generally, the time cost for each request is about 40 seconds, which generates 6 scenarios on average. The extra time cost for a scenario generated by GPT is 7 seconds. In the future, we plan to solve it by employing the LLM locally, which can further improve the efficiency of LEADE.

In the execution of AVUnit scenario programs, NPC vehicles and pedestrians in the scenarios must strictly obey the traffic laws. While this constraint may lead to LEADE missing few safety-violation scenarios caused by anomalous actions of participants. Considering that they lack practical significance, currently, the goal of ADS testing is to find the safety violations caused by AV.



(a) The growth in the found safety violation types over time



(b) The growth in the number of generated safety-violation scenarios over time

Figure 9: The running results of LEADE, LEADER, LEADEn

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose an approach, LEADE, an LLM-enhanced scenario generation approach for ADS testing. It leverages LLMs' ability in program understanding to better comprehend the scenario generation task and generate high-quality scenarios of the first generation. Based on them, LEADE adopts an adaptive multi-objective genetic algorithm to search for diverse safety-critical scenarios. To guide the search away from the local optima, LEADE leverages LLMs' ability in quantitative reasoning to generate differential seed scenarios. The experimental results show that LEADE can effectively and efficiently generate safety-critical scenarios than two state-of-the-art search-based ADS testing techniques.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Autoware self-driving vehicle on a highway.
- [2] Avunit's documentation.
- [3] Baidu launches public robotaxi trial operation.
- [4] Baidu launches their open platform for autonomous cars and we got to test it.
- [5] Navigant research names waymo, ford autonomous vehicles, cruise, and baidu the leading developers of automated driving systems.
- [6] An open autonomous driving platform, 2013.
- [7] Nhtsa, 2022.
- [8] Pre-crash scenarios in nhtsa, 2022.
- [9] 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. doi: 10.1145/3238147.3238192.
- [10] Matthias Althoff and Sebastian Lutz. Automatic generation of safety-critical test scenarios for collision avoidance of road vehicles. In *2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1326–1333, 2018. doi: 10.1109/IVS.2018.8500374.
- [11] Aitor Arrieta, Shuai Wang, Urtzi Markiegi, Goiuria Sagardui, and Leire Etxeberria. Search-based test case generation for cyber-physical systems. In *2017 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, pages 688–697. IEEE, 2017. doi: 10.1109/CEC.2017.7969377.
- [12] Earl T Barr, Mark Harman, Phil McMinn, Muzammil Shahbaz, and Shin Yoo. The oracle problem in software testing: A survey. *IEEE transactions on software engineering*, pages 507–525, 2014. doi: 10.1109/TSE.2014.2372785.
- [13] Sai Krishna Bashetty, Heni Ben Amor, and Georgios Fainekos. Deepcrashtest: Turning dashcam videos into virtual crash tests for automated driving systems. In *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2020.
- [14] Raja Ben Abdesslem, Shiva Nejati, Lionel C Briand, and Thomas Stifter. Testing advanced driver assistance systems using multi-objective search and neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 31st IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 63–74, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2970276.2970311.
- [15] Michele Bertonecchio and Dominik Wee. Ten ways autonomous driving could redefine the automotive world. *McKinsey & Company*, 2015.
- [16] Yumeng Cao, Quinn Thibeault, Aniruddh Chandratre, Georgios Fainekos, Giulia Pedrielli, and Mauricio Castillo-Effen. Work-in-progress: towards assurance case evidence generation through search based testing. In *2021 International Conference on Embedded Software (EMSOFT)*, pages 41–42. IEEE, 2021.
- [17] Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Kashyap Chitta, Bernhard Jaeger, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. End-to-end autonomous driving: Challenges and frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.16927*, 2023.
- [18] Tommaso Dreossi, Alexandre Donzé, and Sanjit A Seshia. Compositional falsification of cyber-physical systems with machine learning components. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 63(4):1031–1053, 2019. doi: 10.1007/s10817-018-09509-5.
- [19] Shuo Feng, Xintao Yan, Haowei Sun, Yiheng Feng, and Henry X Liu. Intelligent driving intelligence test for autonomous vehicles with naturalistic and adversarial environment. *Nature communications*, pages 1–14, 2021. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-21007-8.
- [20] Daniel J Fremont, Tommaso Dreossi, Shromona Ghosh, Xiangyu Yue, Alberto L Sangiovanni-Vincentelli, and Sanjit A Seshia. Scenic: a language for scenario specification and scene generation. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 63–78, 2019.
- [21] Alessio Gambi, Tri Huynh, and Gordon Fraser. Generating effective test cases for self-driving cars from police reports. In *Proceedings of the ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, 2019.
- [22] An Guo, Yang Feng, Yizhen Cheng, and Zhenyu Chen. Semantic-guided fuzzing for virtual testing of autonomous driving systems. *Journal of Systems and Software*, page 112017, 2024.
- [23] Mark Harman. Automated test data generation using search based software engineering. In *Second International Workshop on Automation of Software Test (AST'07)*, pages 2–2. IEEE, 2007. doi: 10.1109/AST.2007.4.
- [24] Mark Harman, S Afshin Mansouri, and Yuanyuan Zhang. Search-based software engineering: Trends, techniques and applications. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 45(1):1–61, 2012. doi: 10.1145/2379776.2379787.
- [25] Randy L Haupt. Optimum population size and mutation rate for a simple real genetic algorithm that optimizes array factors. In *IEEE Antennas and Propagation Society International Symposium. Transmitting Waves of Progress to the Next Millennium. 2000 Digest. Held in conjunction with: USNC/URSI National Radio Science Meeting (C)*, volume 2, pages 1034–1037. IEEE, 2000. doi: 10.1109/APS.2000.875398.
- [26] Mohammad Hekmatnejad, Bardh Hoxha, and Georgios Fainekos. Search-based test-case generation by monitoring responsibility safety rules. In *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2020. doi: 10.1109/ITSC45102.2020.9294489.
- [27] Jean-Michel Jullien, Christian Martel, Laurence Vignollet, and Maia Wentland. Openscenario: a flexible integrated environment to develop educational activities based on pedagogical scenarios. In *2009 Ninth IEEE International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies*, pages 509–513. IEEE, 2009.
- [28] Florian Klück, Martin Zimmermann, Franz Wotawa, and Mihai Nica. Genetic algorithm-based test parameter optimization for adas system testing. In *2019 IEEE 19th International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security (QRS)*, pages 418–425. IEEE, 2019. doi: 10.1109/QRS.2019.00058.
- [29] Mark Koren, Saud Alsaif, Ritchie Lee, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Adaptive stress testing for autonomous vehicles. In *2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1–7. IEEE, 2018. doi: 10.1109/IVS.2018.8500400.
- [30] 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 *Proceedings of IEEE International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*, pages 25–36, 2020. doi: 10.1109/ISSRE5003.2020.00012.
- [31] Zhe Liu, Chunyang Chen, Junjie Wang, Xing Che, Yuekai Huang, Jun Hu, and Qing Wang. Fill in the blank: Context-aware automated text input generation for mobile gui testing. In *2023 IEEE/ACM 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 1355–1367. IEEE, 2023.
- [32] Phil McMinn. Search-based software test data generation: a survey. *Software testing, Verification and reliability*, 14(2):105–156, 2004. doi: 10.1002/stvr.294.

- [33] Athma Narayanan, Isht Dwivedi, and Behzad Dariush. Dynamic traffic scene classification with space-time coherence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12708*, 2019.
- [34] Shiva Nejati. Testing cyber-physical systems via evolutionary algorithms and machine learning. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 12th International Workshop on Search-Based Software Testing (SBST)*, pages 1–1. IEEE, 2019. doi: 10.1109/SBST.2019.00008.
- [35] Enrique Onieva, Unai Hernández-Jayo, Eneko Osaba, Asier Perallos, and Xiao Zhang. A multi-objective evolutionary algorithm for the tuning of fuzzy rule bases for uncoordinated intersections in autonomous driving. *Information Sciences*, 321:14–30, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2015.05.036.
- [36] Amir Rasouli, Iuliia Kotseruba, and John K Tsotsos. Are they going to cross? a benchmark dataset and baseline for pedestrian crosswalk behavior. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, pages 206–213, 2017.
- [37] Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatain, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco JR Ruiz, Jordan S Ellenberg, Pengming Wang, Omar Fawzi, et al. Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nature*, 625(7995):468–475, 2024.
- [38] Konstantinos I Roumeliotis and Nikolaos D Tselikas. Chatgpt and open-ai models: A preliminary review. *Future Internet*, 15(6):192, 2023.
- [39] Max Schäfer, Sarah Nadi, Aryaz Eghbali, and Frank Tip. An empirical evaluation of using large language models for automated unit test generation. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2023.
- [40] Seung Yeob Shin, Shiva Nejati, Mehrdad Sabetzadeh, Lionel C Briand, and Frank Zimmer. Test case prioritization for acceptance testing of cyber physical systems: a multi-objective search-based approach. In *Proceedings of the acm sigsoft international symposium on software testing and analysis*, pages 49–60, 2018. doi: 10.1145/3213846.3213852.
- [41] Sehajbir Singh and Baljit Singh Saini. Autonomous cars: Recent developments, challenges, and possible solutions. In *IOP conference series: Materials science and engineering*, volume 1022, page 012028. IOP Publishing, 2021.
- [42] Quinn Thibeault, Jacob Anderson, Aniruddh Chandratre, Giulia Pedrielli, and Georgios Fainekos. Psy-taliro: A python toolbox for search-based test generation for cyber-physical systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.02200*, 2021. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-85248-1\_15.
- [43] Haoxiang Tian, Yan Jiang, Guoquan Wu, Jiren Yan, Jun Wei, Wei Chen, Shuo Li, and Dan Ye. Mosat: finding safety violations of autonomous driving systems using multi-objective genetic algorithm. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*, pages 94–106, 2022.
- [44] Haoxiang Tian, Guoquan Wu, Jiren Yan, Yan Jiang, Jun Wei, Wei Chen, Shuo Li, and Dan Ye. Generating critical test scenarios for autonomous driving systems via influential behavior patterns. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, pages 1–12, 2022.
- [45] Cumhur Erkan Tuncali, Georgios Fainekos, Hisahiro Ito, and James Kapinski. Simulation-based adversarial test generation for autonomous vehicles with machine learning components. In *Proceedings of Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 1555–1562, 2018. doi: 10.1109/IVS.2018.8500421.
- [46] Shuai Wang, Shaukat Ali, Tao Yue, Yan Li, and Marius Liaaen. A practical guide to select quality indicators for assessing pareto-based search algorithms in search-based software engineering. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Software Engineering (ICSE)*, pages 631–642, 2016. doi: 10.1145/2884781.2884880.
- [47] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
- [48] Xudong Zhang and Yan Cai. Building critical testing scenarios for autonomous driving from real accidents. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 462–474, 2023.
- [49] Yuan Zhou, Yang Sun, Yun Tang, Yuqi Chen, Jun Sun, Christopher M Poskitt, Yang Liu, and Zijiang Yang. Specification-based autonomous driving system testing. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 2023.
- [50] Marc René Zofka, Florian Kuhnt, Ralf Kohlhaas, Christoph Rist, Thomas Schamm, and J Marius Zöllner. Data-driven simulation and parametrization of traffic scenarios for the development of advanced driver assistance systems. In *2015 18th international conference on information fusion (FUSION)*, pages 1422–1428. IEEE, 2015.