
CityBench: Evaluating the Capabilities of Large Language Model as World Model

Jie Feng*, Jun Zhang*, Junbo Yan†, Xin Zhang†, Tianjian Ouyang†, Tianhui Liu†,
Yuwei Du†, Siqi Guo†, Yong Li‡

Department of Electronic Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Abstract

Large language models (LLMs) with powerful generalization ability has been widely used in many domains. A systematic and reliable evaluation of LLMs is a crucial step in their development and applications, especially for specific professional fields. In the urban domain, there have been some early explorations about the usability of LLMs, but a systematic and scalable evaluation benchmark is still lacking. The challenge in constructing a systematic evaluation benchmark for the urban domain lies in the diversity of data and scenarios, as well as the complex and dynamic nature of cities. In this paper, we propose *CityBench*, an interactive simulator based evaluation platform, as the first systematic evaluation benchmark for the capability of LLMs for urban domain. First, we build *CitySim* to integrate the multi-source data and simulate fine-grained urban dynamics. Based on *CitySim*, we design 7 tasks in 2 categories of perception-understanding and decision-making group to evaluate the capability of LLMs as city-scale world model for urban domain. Due to the flexibility and ease-of-use of *CitySim*, our evaluation platform *CityBench* can be easily extended to any city in the world. We evaluate 13 well-known LLMs including open source LLMs and commercial LLMs in 13 cities around the world. Extensive experiments demonstrate the scalability and effectiveness of proposed *CityBench* and shed lights for the future development of LLMs in urban domain. The dataset, benchmark and source codes are openly accessible to the research community via <https://github.com/tsinghua-fib-lab/CityBench>.

1 Introduction

Recent years, large language models (LLMs) with strong generalization and reasoning capabilities have achieved excellent results in various fields [1, 42], e.g., programming [13], mathematics [48], VQA [23], common sense reasoning [40, 32] and so on. Furthermore, powerful LLMs enable many unimaginable research endeavors to become feasible, e.g., agent [44], embodied intelligence [36] and AGI [9]. These researchers postulate that LLMs, by acquiring extensive world knowledge and common sense, hold the key to unlocking promising outcomes in these challenging applications. Many works [1, 10, 37] have demonstrated that LLMs do indeed possess a wealth of world knowledge and can be regarded as world models to some extent, while other works [49, 53] indicate that LLMs are not real world models and they lack an comprehensive understanding of the real world. However, these research efforts have primarily focused on small-scale world modelling, such as those works conducted in virtual-home [35], while overlooking the large-scale modeling in urban space [2, 57].

*Equal contribution.

†Equal contribution.

‡Corresponding author, email: liyong07@tsinghua.edu.cn




Figure 1: The framework of global evaluation benchmark *CityBench*, which consists of a simulator *CitySim* and 7 representative urban tasks. We can select any city around the world to automatically build new benchmark for it.

Various works have explored the potential of LLMs in modeling urban space and solving urban tasks. For example, researchers evaluate the potential of LLMs on remote sensing understanding tasks [19, 55] and urban visual tasks [50, 12]. Gurnee et al. [10] and Roberts et al. [37] evaluate whether LLMs acquire the spatial knowledge of the world, such as cities and coordinates. Manvi et al. [31, 30] try to extract the geospatial knowledge in LLMs to conduct geospatial indicator prediction tasks [28]. Besides, researchers also explore how to apply LLMs into the realistic urban applications, e.g., traffic control [5, 20], traffic prediction [22], mobility prediction [46], visual language navigation [38] and so on. However, on the one hand, these existing works primarily focus on evaluating the static spatial knowledge of LLMs without considering the environment dynamics and interactivity, which are the key point for the world model [21]. On the other hand, most of them only focus on one type of task and one modality of data in the urban space, using small dataset that are not scalable globally. The root cause of their shortcomings is the insufficient integration of multi-source data for urban spaces and the lack of suitable interactive city simulators. Although there are some existing simulators for urban space such as game simulators [14] and traffic simulators [26], they are either not open-source, or tailored to specific problems. All of them do not support systematically evaluating the capability of LLMs as world models.

In this paper, we propose *CityBench*, a comprehensive evaluation platform for assessing the capability of LLMs as city-scale world models. It covers multiple modalities, supports interactive simulations, and is easily extensible globally. *CityBench* consists of two modules: a simulation module *CitySim* for integrating multi-source urban data and simulating urban dynamics, a evaluation module *Benchmark* for various evaluation of LLMs. In *CitySim*, we first collect three kinds of open source urban data: geospatial data from Open Street Map, urban vision data including from Google Map, and

human activity data from Foursquare and other websites. Then, we build an efficient GPU based engine to simulate individual behaviors in the urban environment and develop various interfaces for controlling the urban dynamics and sensing the urban environments. Furthermore, based on *CitySim*, we design a comprehensive *benchmark* to evaluate the capability of LLMs as city-scale world models, covering core research problems from various urban research fields. The evaluation benchmark comprises two levels of tasks: geospatial understanding tasks and decision-making tasks. In geospatial-understanding tasks, based on the integrated multi-source data from *CitySim*, we introduce street view&satellite image understanding and urban space knowledge understanding tasks to evaluate the basic capability of LLMs as city-scale world models. In decision-making tasks, we apply LLMs to interact with *CitySim* to complete the mobility prediction task, traffic signal control task and street navigation task which require comprehensive ability of LLMs as city-scale world models. In summary, our contribution are as follows,

- We build *CitySim*, an efficient simulator for integrating multi-source urban data and simulating fine-grained individual behaviors in the urban environments. It provides ease-of-use APIs for controlling urban dynamics and sensing urban environments.
- We propose *CityBench*, a comprehensive evaluation benchmark for evaluating the capability of LLMs as city-scale world models, which includes 4 multi-modal geospatial understanding tasks and 3 interactive urban decision-making tasks.
- Extensive experiments on *CityBench* with 13 well-known open source and commercial LLMs demonstrate the effectiveness of *CityBench* as evaluation benchmark and also present the limitation of applying LLMs as world models in urban tasks.

2 Related Work

LLM Evaluation for Urban Space Researchers from various urban related fields have conduct extensive evaluations of LLM in urban space from different aspects. Zhang et al [55] and Kuckreja et al. [19] evaluate the performance of multi-modal LLMs on several remote sensing related tasks. Yang et al. [52] propose V-IRL benchmark to evaluate the performance of multi-modal LLMs on street view image related tasks including localization and recognition tasks. Mai et al. [28] and Manvi et al. [31] use LLMs to predict social indicators like population and education level. Gurnee et al. [10] and Bhandari et al. [3] try to testify whether LLMs know the coordinates of geospatial entity. Mooney et al. [33] and Deng et al. [6] use GIS exams to understand the geospatial skills of LLMs. Roberts et al. [37] design GPT4GEO to evaluate the geospatial capacity of LLM with limited case studies. Different from these works with single aspect, our work covers most of the above problems in one benchmark with different modalities and views. Furthermore, we also support interactive simulation based various decision making task evaluation which enable more realistic and challenging performance evaluation.

Interactive Decision Making and Urban Simulator Beyond the above static evaluation, researchers also evaluate the capacity of LLMs in the interactive decision making tasks with customized simulators, e.g., web agent [24, 54] with web environment and embodied intelligence [53] with virtual home [35]. In the urban domain, Schumann et al. [38] apply LLM to do the visual language navigation task in Touchdown [4] and Lai [20] apply LLMs as the traffic light controller in CityFlow [56] to manage the road traffic. Besides, Yang et al. [52] design V-IRL as the environment of street view image related tasks and propose a global scale virtual intelligence benchmark. These works only evaluate the potential of LLMs in single urban decision making task and most of their results rely on small-scale datasets in limited regions. Different from them, our work builds on an efficient urban simulator with global scale and supports three representative urban decision making tasks with different modality in one benchmark, including mobility prediction [46], traffic control [5] and street navigation. In the future, it will support more kinds of urban tasks, e.g., urban planning [58].

3 CitySim

In the section, we present an overview of the simulation module *CitySim*. The module first integrates multi-source urban data to support multi-modal urban sensing and urban dynamic simulation. Next, in order to reconstruct real urban dynamics and individual behaviors, the module also provides a efficient GPU-based simulation engine with ease-to-use sensing and controlling APIs.

3.1 Datasets

To present a complete picture of the city’s geospatial structure, semantic features, and human activities, *CitySim* integrates the following globally available data from multiple sources.

Geospatial Data Geospatial data, represented by maps, is the most fundamental data for describing the urban structure including buildings, road networks, green areas, etc. OpenStreetMap (OSM) ¹ is an open source map data provider that provides researchers with globally available geospatial data. However, the raw data provided by OSM cannot support the simulation of urban dynamics directly, and the relationship between different elements is incomplete such as the connection between buildings and roads. Therefore, we provide a globally available map building tool ² that reconstructs lanes, lane topology, and building-lane connections based on the raw OSM data. The reconstructed map is used as the geospatial base and simulation input in *CitySim*. Based on the map, APIs such as search by ID, search by relationship, and search by spatial range are provided in the *CitySim* module to help LLMs access the city geospatial information.

Urban Visual Data Street view data and satellite images are two types of urban data that contains rich semantic information, which can be used to evaluate the capacity of multi-model LLMs. In addition, the two types of data are also publicly available globally. Therefore, *CitySim* also integrates the two types of data, the former obtained via Google Maps API and Baidu Maps API, and the latter using the Esri World Imagery³ as data source. In the *CitySim* module, street view data is accessed through spatial location and facing direction, and satellite images are acquired through spatial ranges.

Human Activities Data We use the open-source global Foursquare-checkin [51] data and a synthetic global origin-destination data (OD data) [25] as the proxy of human activities to enable the fine-grained human movement simulation. The Foursquare-checkin [51] dataset is a long-term user checkin data collected from Foursquare ⁴ around 415 cities in the world. Origin-destination data is generated by a diffusion model with population from Worldpop⁵ and satellite image from Esri World Imagery as input. While all the user information are anonymized, we follow the license from Foursquare-checkin [51] to protect the public privacy.

3.2 Simulation

Cities have strong dynamics triggered by human activities, such as traffic flow. Such dynamics are a strong challenge to the capacity of LLMs. To simulate urban dynamics, we implement GPU-accelerated individual-level simulations of human activities. The simulator takes the map reconstructed from OSM and the travel demand described by the synthetic OD data, and simulates the mobility behaviors through individual motion models such as the car-following model [43] and the lane-change model [18] to obtain the information about the dynamics of all pedestrians and vehicles in the city every second. The simulator also provides a series of sensing and control APIs. Through the sensing APIs, LLM can obtain data about urban dynamics such as pedestrian location, vehicle speed, and road average speed. Through the control API, LLM can intervene in the city’s operation, such as modifying traffic signal lights, modifying the speed limit of the road, etc.

Overall, with the *CitySim* module, we provide globally available integrated multi-source data with an interactive urban dynamic simulator to multi-model LLMs.

4 CityBench

Based on *CitySim*, we introduce a global multi-modal urban evaluation benchmark *CityBench* to evaluate the capability of multi-modal LLMs as the city-scale world models with 7 urban tasks. These tasks are 4 perception and understanding tasks and 3 decision making tasks, detailed design of these tasks are introduced as follows.

¹<https://openstreetmap.org/>

²<https://github.com/tsinghua-fib-lab/mosstool>

³<https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=10df2279f9684e4a9f6a7f08febac2a9>

⁴<https://foursquare.com/>

⁵<https://www.worldpop.org/>

4.1 Perception and Understanding

In this section, we introduce the perception and understanding task group. The first task is the street view image geolocalization task from the urban visual intelligence [8]. Following are social indicator prediction and infrastructure inference tasks from remote sensing field. Finally, we adapt GeoQA [29] task into urban environment.

4.1.1 Image Geolocalization

Image geolocalization task is to predict the precise location of image based its context. Street view image is regarded as the recording of urban appearance and play an important role in understanding the urban environment and dynamics [8]. Thus, we query multi-modal LLM with street view image and require it to directly generate the city name of its location and precise latitude and longitude coordinates. A good multi-modal LLM should recognize the important objects from the street image and mapping them into the potential locations. Following [11], we define two metrics: city inference accuracy and accuracy within 1km/25km of the correct location to measure the performance.

4.1.2 Geospatial Prediction

Geospatial predictions are important for understanding the global sustainable development especially for developing countries, e.g., poverty estimation [15] and population density estimation [41]. One of the most widely used solutions is using satellite images with machine learning methods to predict these socioeconomic indicators. In the benchmark, following the setting from [31], we query multi-modal LLM with a satellite image as context to predict the population density of it. We use population dataset from Worldpop [41] as the groundtruth and Pearson’s r^2 and RMSE as metrics.

4.1.3 Infrastructure Inference

Besides, we also introduce the infrastructure inference task which means to recognize the urban infrastructures from the satellite images. This task require the ability of scene understand and object segmentation of urban environment. The groundtruth of urban infrastructure of each satellite image is extracted from the OSM by matching predefined infrastructure key words within a fixed spatial range. Given the satellite image and the list of all kinds of infrastructures, multi-modal LLM is required to generate the infrastructure names appeared in the image. In the benchmark, we pay attention to the following infrastructures: Airport, Harbor, Stadium, Bridge, Roundabout and Train Station.

4.1.4 GeoQA for City Elements

Beyond understanding the urban space from the visual perspective, we introduce geographic question answer(GeoQA) [29] to test whether LLMs comprehends the fundamental spatial elements [27] in a city from the concept view, such as road, landmarks and boundary. For example, we directly ask LLM about the relation between different roads in a city. Following [27], we classify the spatial elements into six groups and design several single choice problems for each group. These six groups are node, path, landmark, boundary, districts and others.

4.2 Planning and Decision Making

Different from the static evaluation introduced in the last section, we design three interactive decision making tasks to evaluate the capability of LLMs in dynamic and partial observed environments which are more challenging and realistic. With the interaction with the *CitySim* simulator and dynamic human activities, LLM needs to understand the important mechanisms and regularity in the urban environments to complete the decision marking tasks. Detailed design of decision making tasks are introduced as follows.

4.2.1 Mobility Prediction

Mobility prediction task is one of the fundamental task for understanding the human behaviors and urban dynamics. Mobility prediction task is to predict the next location of user in the next time window with given the past mobility trajectory. Here we use the the global foursquare checkin data

as the proxy of human mobility and integrate it into the simulator to support the mobility prediction task. We follow [46] to conduct the mobility prediction task via LLMs.

4.2.2 Street Navigation

Street navigation task is widely used in neurocognitive science [7] and visual language navigation [38] as the important benchmark for evaluating the spatial cognition of human and models. Here, we also define a text based street navigation task to evaluate the zero-shot navigation capability of LLMs in a new city. Different from the visual language navigation which require model to follow the language instruction and understand the scene via street view image, our street navigation task require model to explore the region via the local information (e.g. accessed road names) provided by the simulator during action and its intrinsic knowledge of the whole urban environment.

4.2.3 Traffic Signal Control

Traffic signal control task is one of the widely studied realistic urban decision making task in recent years [47]. It is challenging for existing methods due to the dynamic traffics and the generalization issues. Traffic signal control task is to generate the future traffic signal schedule by considering the current traffic states and the future traffics. Lai et al. [20] propose LLMLight to solve the single traffic signal control in simple intersection and demonstate the generalization of LLMs. Follow this work, we extend it into multiple traffic signal control in a region with more than one intersections, which are more challenging and require cooperation between different intersections.

5 Benchmark and Experiments

5.1 Settings

Dataset We collect multi-source data for 13 cities around the world, including street view& satellite image, geospatial data and human activity data. Detailed information about these dataset are presented in Table 1. Our platform can expand to any city in the world with just inputting its name. The effortless evaluation across various regions and cultures makes it a effective world model evaluator of LLMs. *CityBench* complies with the Google Maps Platform license⁶, the Baidu Maps Platform license⁷ and the Esri Master License Agreement⁸.

Baselines We select state-of-the-art open source LLMs and commercial API to evaluate the performance of LLMs on the benchmark. For multi-modal LLMs, open source LLMs are LLaVa-NeXT [23], CogVLM-v2 [45], MiniCPM-LLama3-V-2.5 [34], commercial APIs are Qwen-VL-plus and GPT4o. For LLMs, open source LLMs are LLama3-8B, LLama3-70B, Mistral-7B-v0.2 [16], Mixtral-8x22B-v0.1 [17] and DeepSeekv2 [39], commercial APIs are GPT3.5, GPT4 [1]. We test most of the open-source LLMs by using the API from DeepInfra⁹, while the commercial models using their official APIs¹⁰. We also deploy several multi-modal LLMs with 1 A100 GPU, including LLaVa-NeXT [23], CogVLM-v2 [45], MiniCPM-LLama3-V-2.5 [34].

Evaluation Metrics We follow the common practice of each task to define the metrics. Metrics and instances for each task are presented in Table 2. For each task with results from 13 cities, we report the mean value and standard deviation value of them in the following section.

5.2 Main Results

5.2.1 Perception and Understanding

Results of visual perception tasks of multi-modal LLMs are presented in Table 3. In general, commercial LLMs like GPT4o performs best in most tasks, achieving the best results in 5 out of 7 metrics. Among the open source models, LLaVA-NeXT-34B performs best with achieving 3 second

⁶<https://cloud.google.com/maps-platform/terms>

⁷<https://map.baidu.com/zt/client/service/index.html>

⁸<https://www.esri.com/en-us/legal/terms/full-master-agreement>

⁹<https://deepinfra.com/>

¹⁰<https://platform.openai.com/docs/api-reference/introduction>

Table 1: Multi-source data for 13 cities around the world. For simplifying the processing steps, we have defined these spatial range of collected data within rectangular boundaries. Most cities only include the central part of the city’s administrative boundaries, which may lead to some inaccuracies. Specific coordinate settings can be found in the appendix.

World	Cities	Visual Data		GeoSpatial Data		Human Activity Data	
		Satellite Image	Street View (sampling)	Roads	PoI/AoIs	OD flow (>10)	Checkins
Asia	Beijing	1764	1000	17043	276090	1905025	21015
	Shanghai	5925	1000	33321	57731	845188	33129
	Mumbai	638	1000	6296	60245	309147	31521
	Tokyo	1120	1000	33174	1146094	969865	1044809
Europe	London	1710	1000	14418	83892	1401404	173268
	Paris	238	1000	4443	21950	28362	85679
	Moscow	1558	1000	9850	28289	979064	836313
Americas	NewYork	320	1000	5414	349348	71705	390934
	SanFrancisco	345	1000	4171	73777	61367	100249
	SaoPaulo	1332	1000	28714	1681735	311830	808754
Africa	Nairobi	336	1000	2972	264101	135332	25727
	CapeTown	896	1000	5947	151711	525578	11591
Oceania	Sydney	1935	1000	21390	141997	438763	54170

Table 2: Detailed information of 7 evaluation tasks in *CityBench*, including data modality, metric and data instances. Task settings across different cities keep consistent.

CityBench	Tasks	Modality	Metrics	Instances
Perception& Understanding	Image Geolocalization	Image	Accuracy, Accuracy@1km/25km	500 × 13 cities
	Geospatial Prediction	Image	r^2 , RMSE	~500 × 13 cities
	Infrastructure Inference	Image	Accuracy, Recall	~500 × 13 cities
	GeoQA for City	Text	Accuracy	~1000 × 13 cities
Planning& Decision Making	Mobility Prediction	Text	Top1-Acc, F1	500 × 13 cities
	Street Navigation	Text	Steps, Success Rate	50 × 13 cities
	Traffic Signal Control	Text	Travel Time, Queue Length, Throughput	1 regions × 3600s × 13 cities

best results in 7 metrics. Besides, we can find that the performance of open source LLM varies significantly across different cities which indicates significant geospatial bias of open source LLMs. Detailed analysis about this can refer to section 5.2.3. Results of geospatial knowledge QA task of LLMs are presented in Table 4. As Table 4 shows, commercial LLMs GPT4-Turbo performs best in 4 out of 6 tasks and the left two performs second best. In summary, in terms of geospatial knowledge about urban spaces, the open-source LLMs lag far behind the commercial LLMs.

5.2.2 Panning and Decision Making

Table 5 presents the results of mobility prediction task and street navigation task, the performance difference between LLMs in decision making tasks are much smaller than the last section. It is amazing to observe that open source LLMs (e.g., LLama3-70B) performs better than commercial LLMs in these two tasks. Results of traffic signal control task are presented in Table 6. Here, we report results from three cities with various traffic volume and environment. In general, commercial LLMs

Table 3: Results of multi-modal LLMs on three representative visual understanding tasks. For most metrics, higher values are better, except for RMSE. In the table, **bold** denotes the best results, underline denotes the second best results.

Models	Image Geolocalization			Population Density		Infrastructures		
	City Accuracy	Accuracy @1km	Accuracy @25km	r^2	RMSE	Precision	Accuracy	
Open Source	LLaVA-NeXT-8B	0.267±0.322	0.0097±0.0269	0.221±0.337	-0.764±0.582	3.31±0.823	0.245±0.301	0.796±0.187
	LLaVA-NeXT-34B	0.501±0.387	0.0123±0.0328	0.408±0.413	-0.163±0.603	2.61±0.643	0.262±0.297	0.804±0.187
	CogVLM2	0.559±0.333	0.0067±0.0176	0.326±0.335	-0.301±0.737	2.75±0.504	0.287±0.320	0.726±0.262
	MiniCPM-V2.5	0.262±0.267	0.0061±0.0124	0.223±0.270	-1.054±0.740	3.57±0.621	0.251±0.323	<u>0.806±0.197</u>
Commercial API	Qwen-VL-plus	0.793±0.288	0.0052±0.0039	0.645±0.313	-1.028±1.667	3.14±1.016	0.203±0.233	0.454±0.170
	GPT4o	0.862±0.079	0.0187±0.0375	0.797±0.148	0.122±0.309	2.32±0.664	0.248±0.306	0.812±0.195

Table 4: Results of different LLMs on GeoQA for city, a geospatial knowledge question answering task for urban space. Here, the higher value is better, **bold** denotes the best results, underline denotes the second best results.

	Models	Nodes	Landmarks	Paths	Districts	Boundary	Others
Open Source	LLama3-8B	0.2322±0.0150	0.2765±0.0143	0.3173±0.0054	0.2627±0.0163	0.3569±0.0109	0.3365±0.0225
	Mistral-7B	0.2286±0.0167	0.1950±0.0083	0.2054±0.0179	0.1511±0.0150	0.3269±0.0232	0.2688±0.0186
	LLama3-70B	0.2646±0.0076	0.3304±0.0320	0.4048±0.0334	0.2532±0.0429	0.3727±0.0112	0.3485±0.0185
	Mixtral-8x22B	0.2633±0.0155	<u>0.3569±0.0367</u>	0.3652±0.0201	0.2730±0.0370	0.3415±0.0125	0.3239±0.0241
Commercial API	DeepSeekV2	0.2904±0.0065	0.3035±0.0165	0.4133±0.0208	0.3518±0.0399	0.4650±0.0363	0.3264±0.0232
	GPT3.5-Turbo	0.2477±0.0260	0.2627±0.0128	0.3222±0.0255	0.1909±0.0244	0.3788±0.0137	0.3050±0.0244
	GPT4-Turbo	0.3429±0.0095	0.3938±0.0393	0.5249±0.0349	0.3054±0.0412	0.4485±0.0198	0.3707±0.0219

Table 5: Results of LLMs on mobility prediction and street navigation tasks. The arrow next to the metric indicates the direction of improvement, an upward arrow indicates that higher values of the metric are better.

	Models	Mobility Prediction		Street Navigation	
		Top1 Accuracy ↑	F1 ↑	Success Rate ↑	Average Steps ↓
Open Source	LLama3-8B	0.130±0.0320	0.094±0.030	0.747±0.140	5.304±2.059
	Mistral-7B	0.090±0.0255	0.087±0.031	0.730±0.134	5.382±1.982
	LLama3-70B	0.159±0.0430	0.130±0.034	0.796±0.085	4.941±1.592
	Mixtral-8x22B	<u>0.155±0.0419</u>	0.136±0.042	0.745±0.133	5.339±1.961
Commercial API	DeepSeekV2	0.126±0.0520	0.101±0.044	0.698±0.119	5.739±1.812
	GPT3.5-Turbo	0.152±0.0388	0.113±0.035	0.719±0.143	5.473±2.015
	GPT4-Turbo	0.147±0.0357	0.125±0.035	<u>0.757±0.091</u>	5.184±1.520

like GPT-3.5 or GPT-4 performs better but small open source LLMs can also achieve competitive results in some cases. One interesting direction is to investigate these difference and find out the underlying factors behind them.

5.2.3 Geospatial Bias Analysis

To further investigate the difference between LLMs, we report the detailed results of mobility prediction task and image geolocalization tasks from 13 cities in Figure 2. Based on the above results, we have made several interesting discoveries. First, we find that the performance of different LLMs varies a lot across different cities, no LLM can always perform best in mobility prediction tasks. Second, we find that the performance of multi-modal LLMs on visual task like image geolocalization task are significantly biased. Most LLMs perform well in major international cities, but poorly in some lesser-known cities (e.g., CapeTown). The variability in evaluation results demonstrate the necessity of establishing a global evaluation benchmark, and also highlights the potential shortcomings and areas for improvement of LLMs.

Table 6: Results of LLMs on traffic signal tasks on three cities with representative traffic volume. We used real-world mobility demands to generate traffic to support the simulation. The traffic signals we actually control in the experiment are only a part of the trajectory path, while the remaining signals are operated according to the default fixed-time scheduler.

Models	Throughput	Paris		Throughput	Newyork		Throughput	Beijing	
		Travel Time	Queue Length		Travel Time	Queue Length		Travel Time	Queue Length
LLama3-8B	205	2936.579	652.157	580	<u>2635.365</u>	86.993	2128	1873.757	40.941
Mistral-7B	183	2940.694	651.413	574	2634.054	87.807	1696	2059.84	57.759
Llama3-70B	193	2937.528	650.855	516	2664.102	89.116	2031	1893.517	43.475
Mixtral-8x22B	179	2938.643	653.168	526	2655.111	88.567	1604	2093.986	63.006
DeepSeekv2	193	2938.567	653.532	495	2682.194	89.914	<u>2233</u>	<u>1754.923</u>	<u>32.771</u>
GPT3.5-Turbo	214	2935.621	651.704	544	2649.214	87.926	2199	1778.963	34.965
GPT4-Turbo	191	2937.580	652.026	495	2670.238	89.706	2240	1746.608	32.234




Figure 2: Detailed results of LLMs on mobility prediction task(left) for different cities and image geolocalization task(right) for different models. In left figure, the order of cities in each group is decided by the prediction performance of GPT3.5: Tokyo, Paris, London, Mumbai, Moscow, CapeTown, Nairobi, SanFrancisco, Sao Paulo, Shanghai, Sydney, NewYork, Beijing.

6 Discussion

Limitations. While our platform is based on the public data from various sources, the quality of different data may play a important role in the evaluation results. For example, The varying levels of map data and street view data quality across different regions worldwide may significantly negatively impact the results. Besides, due to the limitation of global label data for various task, we only select 7 urban tasks in current benchmark which only cover portion of the research problems in urban domain. In the future, we plan to collect more kinds of tasks with global scale groundtruth data to further improve the reliability and representativeness of benchmark.

Ethical considerations and potential societal impact. Our benchmark is designed for enable the global evaluation of LLMs for various cities with different cultures and countries. We try our best to improve the ease-of-use and fairness for cities with different development levels. However, as discussed in section 5.2.3, due to the limitation of accessed data, the evaluation results for different cites varies a lot. Therefore, the variation in evaluation results caused by data quality may lead to a certain degree of misunderstanding regarding the performance on some urban problems. We call the whole community for attention to this issue to improve the usability of LLMs across different races and countries, promoting fairness and sustainable development of the world.

Develop foundation model for urban domain. Based on the results of our benchmark, we find existing LLMs perform poorly on many urban tasks, even worse than some classic simple baseline algorithms. Developing LLMs tailored for urban domain is urgently necessary. We hope our benchmark can accelerate this development and we look forward to a more comprehensive and robust evaluation framework for urban domain.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose *CityBench*, a systematic evaluation benchmark for LLMs in urban domain. In *CityBench*, we first build *CitySim* to integrate multi-source urban data and provide the interactive ability of simulating fine-grained urban dynamics. Based on *CitySim*, we design 7 important urban tasks to constitute the *CityBench* for evaluating the capabilities of LLMs in the urban domain from various aspects. Results on 13 cities around the world demonstrate the effectiveness and scalability of *CityBench*. In the future, we plan to further expand *CityBench* to include a wider range of tasks, thereby facilitating more robust and representative evaluation of LLMs for urban domain research.

References

- [1] J. Achiam, S. Adler, S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, I. Akkaya, F. L. Aleman, D. Almeida, J. Altenschmidt, S. Altman, S. Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] M. Batty, K. W. Axhausen, F. Giannotti, A. Pozdnoukhov, A. Bazzani, M. Wachowicz, G. Ouzounis, and Y. Portugali. Smart cities of the future. *The European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 214:481–518, 2012.
- [3] P. Bhandari, A. Anastasopoulos, and D. Pfoser. Are large language models geospatially knowledgeable? In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, pages 1–4, 2023.
- [4] H. Chen, A. Suhr, D. Misra, N. Snively, and Y. Artzi. Touchdown: Natural language navigation and spatial reasoning in visual street environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 12538–12547, 2019.
- [5] L. Da, M. Gao, H. Mei, and H. Wei. Llm powered sim-to-real transfer for traffic signal control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.14284*, 2023.
- [6] C. Deng, T. Zhang, Z. He, Q. Chen, Y. Shi, L. Zhou, L. Fu, W. Zhang, X. Wang, C. Zhou, et al. Learning a foundation language model for geoscience knowledge understanding and utilization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05064*, 2023.
- [7] R. A. Epstein, E. Z. Patai, J. B. Julian, and H. J. Spiers. The cognitive map in humans: spatial navigation and beyond. *Nature neuroscience*, 20(11):1504–1513, 2017.
- [8] Z. Fan, F. Zhang, B. P. Loo, and C. Ratti. Urban visual intelligence: Uncovering hidden city profiles with street view images. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(27):e2220417120, 2023.
- [9] T. Feng, C. Jin, J. Liu, K. Zhu, H. Tu, Z. Cheng, G. Lin, and J. You. How far are we from agi. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.10313*, 2024.
- [10] W. Gurnee and M. Tegmark. Language models represent space and time. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02207*, 2023.
- [11] L. Haas, S. Alberti, and M. Skreta. Pigeon: Predicting image geolocations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.05845*, 2023.
- [12] X. Hao, W. Chen, Y. Yan, S. Zhong, K. Wang, Q. Wen, and Y. Liang. Urbanvlp: A multi-granularity vision-language pre-trained foundation model for urban indicator prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16831*, 2024.
- [13] S. Hong, X. Zheng, J. Chen, Y. Cheng, J. Wang, C. Zhang, Z. Wang, S. K. S. Yau, Z. Lin, L. Zhou, et al. Metagpt: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352*, 2023.
- [14] P. Interactive. "cities: Skylines ii", 2023.
- [15] N. Jean, M. Burke, M. Xie, W. M. Davis, D. B. Lobell, and S. Ermon. Combining satellite imagery and machine learning to predict poverty. *Science*, 353(6301):790–794, 2016.
- [16] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Mensch, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. I. Casas, F. Bressand, G. Lengyel, G. Lample, L. Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023.
- [17] A. Q. Jiang, A. Sablayrolles, A. Roux, A. Mensch, B. Savary, C. Bamford, D. S. Chaplot, D. d. I. Casas, E. B. Hanna, F. Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [18] A. Kesting, M. Treiber, and D. Helbing. General lane-changing model mobil for car-following models. *Transportation Research Record*, 1999(1):86–94, 2007.
- [19] K. Kuckreja, M. S. Danish, M. Naseer, A. Das, S. Khan, and F. S. Khan. Geochat: Grounded large vision-language model for remote sensing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.15826*, 2023.
- [20] S. Lai, Z. Xu, W. Zhang, H. Liu, and H. Xiong. Large language models as traffic signal control agents: Capacity and opportunity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.16044*, 2023.
- [21] Y. LeCun. A path towards autonomous machine intelligence version 0.9. 2, 2022-06-27. *Open Review*, 62(1), 2022.

- [22] C. Liu, S. Yang, Q. Xu, Z. Li, C. Long, Z. Li, and R. Zhao. Spatial-temporal large language model for traffic prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10134*, 2024.
- [23] H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024.
- [24] X. Liu, H. Yu, H. Zhang, Y. Xu, X. Lei, H. Lai, Y. Gu, H. Ding, K. Men, K. Yang, et al. Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03688*, 2023.
- [25] looffeeey. Generate origin-destination matrix based-on public available information on the internet, 2024.
- [26] P. A. Lopez, M. Behrisch, L. Bieker-Walz, J. Erdmann, Y.-P. Flötteröd, R. Hilbrich, L. Lücken, J. Rummel, P. Wagner, and E. Wießner. Microscopic traffic simulation using sumo. In *The 21st IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*. IEEE, 2018.
- [27] K. Lynch. *The image of the city*. MIT press, 1964.
- [28] G. Mai, W. Huang, J. Sun, S. Song, D. Mishra, N. Liu, S. Gao, T. Liu, G. Cong, Y. Hu, et al. On the opportunities and challenges of foundation models for geospatial artificial intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.06798*, 2023.
- [29] G. Mai, K. Janowicz, R. Zhu, L. Cai, and N. Lao. Geographic question answering: challenges, uniqueness, classification, and future directions. *AGILE: GIScience series*, 2:8, 2021.
- [30] R. Manvi, S. Khanna, M. Burke, D. Lobell, and S. Ermon. Large language models are geographically biased. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02680*, 2024.
- [31] R. Manvi, S. Khanna, G. Mai, M. Burke, D. Lobell, and S. Ermon. Geollm: Extracting geospatial knowledge from large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06213*, 2023.
- [32] G. Mialon, C. Fourier, C. Swift, T. Wolf, Y. LeCun, and T. Scialom. Gaia: a benchmark for general ai assistants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12983*, 2023.
- [33] P. Mooney, W. Cui, B. Guan, and L. Juhász. Towards understanding the geospatial skills of chatgpt: Taking a geographic information systems (gis) exam. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Workshop on AI for Geographic Knowledge Discovery*, pages 85–94, 2023.
- [34] OpenBMB. Minicpm-llama3-v 2.5, 2024.
- [35] X. Puig, K. Ra, M. Boben, J. Li, T. Wang, S. Fidler, and A. Torralba. Virtualhome: Simulating household activities via programs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 8494–8502, 2018.
- [36] S. Reed, K. Zolna, E. Parisotto, S. G. Colmenarejo, A. Novikov, G. Barth-Maron, M. Gimenez, Y. Sulsky, J. Kay, J. T. Springenberg, et al. A generalist agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.06175*, 2022.
- [37] J. Roberts, T. Lüddecke, S. Das, K. Han, and S. Albanie. Gpt4geo: How a language model sees the world’s geography. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.00020*, 2023.
- [38] R. Schumann, W. Zhu, W. Feng, T.-J. Fu, S. Riezler, and W. Y. Wang. Velma: Verbalization embodiment of llm agents for vision and language navigation in street view. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18924–18933, 2024.
- [39] Z. Shao, D. Dai, D. Guo, and B. Liu. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model. 2024.
- [40] M. Suzgun, N. Scales, N. Schärli, S. Gehrmann, Y. Tay, H. W. Chung, A. Chowdhery, Q. V. Le, E. H. Chi, D. Zhou, et al. Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.09261*, 2022.
- [41] A. J. Tatem. Worldpop, open data for spatial demography. *Scientific data*, 4(1):1–4, 2017.
- [42] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [43] M. Treiber, A. Hennecke, and D. Helbing. Congested traffic states in empirical observations and microscopic simulations. *Physical review E*, 62(2):1805, 2000.

- [44] L. Wang, C. Ma, X. Feng, Z. Zhang, H. Yang, J. Zhang, Z. Chen, J. Tang, X. Chen, Y. Lin, et al. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6):1–26, 2024.
- [45] W. Wang, Q. Lv, W. Yu, W. Hong, J. Qi, Y. Wang, J. Ji, Z. Yang, L. Zhao, X. Song, J. Xu, B. Xu, J. Li, Y. Dong, M. Ding, and J. Tang. Cogvlm: Visual expert for pretrained language models, 2023.
- [46] X. Wang, M. Fang, Z. Zeng, and T. Cheng. Where would i go next? large language models as human mobility predictors. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15197*, 2023.
- [47] H. Wei, G. Zheng, V. Gayah, and Z. Li. A survey on traffic signal control methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.08117*, 2019.
- [48] J. Wei, Y. Tay, R. Bommasani, C. Raffel, B. Zoph, S. Borgeaud, D. Yogatama, M. Bosma, D. Zhou, D. Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022.
- [49] J. Xiang, T. Tao, Y. Gu, T. Shu, Z. Wang, Z. Yang, and Z. Hu. Language models meet world models: Embodied experiences enhance language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2024.
- [50] Y. Yan, H. Wen, S. Zhong, W. Chen, H. Chen, Q. Wen, R. Zimmermann, and Y. Liang. Urbanclip: Learning text-enhanced urban region profiling with contrastive language-image pretraining from the web. In *The Web Conference 2024*, 2024.
- [51] D. Yang, D. Zhang, and B. Qu. Participatory cultural mapping based on collective behavior data in location-based social networks. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 7(3):1–23, 2016.
- [52] J. Yang, R. Ding, E. Brown, X. Qi, and S. Xie. V-irl: Grounding virtual intelligence in real life. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03310*, 2024.
- [53] M. Yang, Y. Du, K. Ghasemipour, J. Tompson, D. Schuurmans, and P. Abbeel. Learning interactive real-world simulators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06114*, 2023.
- [54] A. Zeng, M. Liu, R. Lu, B. Wang, X. Liu, Y. Dong, and J. Tang. Agenttuning: Enabling generalized agent abilities for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12823*, 2023.
- [55] C. Zhang and S. Wang. Good at captioning, bad at counting: Benchmarking gpt-4v on earth observation data. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2401.17600*, 2024.
- [56] H. Zhang, S. Feng, C. Liu, Y. Ding, Y. Zhu, Z. Zhou, W. Zhang, Y. Yu, H. Jin, and Z. Li. Cityflow: A multi-agent reinforcement learning environment for large scale city traffic scenario. In *The world wide web conference*, pages 3620–3624, 2019.
- [57] Y. Zheng, L. Capra, O. Wolfson, and H. Yang. Urban computing: concepts, methodologies, and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 5(3):1–55, 2014.
- [58] Z. Zhou, Y. Lin, D. Jin, and Y. Li. Large language model for participatory urban planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17161*, 2024.

A Appendix

A.1 Parameter Settings

In the experiments, the default generation parameters for LLMs are presented in Table 7. Besides, we modify some parameters for some experiments. For street navigation tasks, the temperature is changed to 0.7 for better exploration. For multi-modal LLM, the temperature of CogVLM2 is 0.8 and the temperature of MiniCPM-V-2.5 is 0.7.

Table 7: Generation parameter settings for LLMs during the experiments.

Pameters	Open Source LLM(DeepInfra)	Commercial API	Open Source MLLM	Commercial API for MLLM
temperature	0	0	0.2	1.0
top p	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0(GPT4o), 0.8(Qwen-VL-plus)
max tokens	512	512	512	100
presence penalty	0	0	0	0
frequency penalty	0	0	0	0
repetition penalty	1	1	1	1

A.2 Spatial range of 13 Cities

Selected spatial range of 13 cities are presented in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Maps for Beijing, Shanghai, Cap Town, London, Moscow, Mumbai, Nairobi, San Francisco, Sao Paulo, Sydney, Tokyo.