

GSON: A Group-based Social Navigation Framework with Large Multimodal Model

Shangyi Luo*, Ji Zhu*, Peng Sun*, Yuhong Deng, Cunjun Yu, Anxing Xiao, Xueqian Wang

Abstract—As the number of service robots and autonomous vehicles in human-centered environments grows, their requirements go beyond simply navigating to a destination. They must also take into account dynamic social contexts and ensure respect and comfort for others in shared spaces, which poses significant challenges for perception and planning. In this paper, we present a group-based social navigation framework (*GSON*) to enable mobile robots to perceive and exploit the social group of their surroundings by leveling the visual reasoning capability of the Large Multimodal Model (LMM). For perception, we apply visual prompting techniques to zero-shot extract the social relationship among pedestrians and combine the result with a robust pedestrian detection and tracking pipeline to alleviate the problem of low inference speed of the LMM. Given the perception result, the planning system is designed to avoid disrupting the current social structure. We adopt a social structure-based mid-level planner as a bridge between global path planning and local motion planning to preserve the global context and reactive response. The proposed method is validated on real-world mobile robot navigation tasks involving complex social structure understanding and reasoning. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of the system in these scenarios compared with several baselines. (Video¹)

I. INTRODUCTION

The growth of service robots has spurred significant research into autonomous systems capable of navigating human-centered environments [1]–[4]. However, many navigation system focus primarily on individual trajectory prediction for obstacle avoidance [5]–[7], often neglecting complex contextual interactions in crowds, such as situations where someone is photographing another or the presence of queues, as illustrated in Fig. 1. These kinds of social structures capture the patterns of interaction and spatial relationships between individuals in a crowd that are shaped by semantic group dynamics and social norms [8]. In this work, we focus on developing a robot navigation system that can understand and respect such complex social structures, enabling socially-aware navigation that takes into account group-based interactions and adheres to social norms.

The core issue behind building such a socially aware navigation system is how to accurately identify social structure among dynamic and unpredictable human interactions, and exploit this social structure to guide the motion planning system. For the perception, traditional methods that rely




Fig. 1: Example of a social navigation scenario: The robot needs to navigate through a queue. The robot should avoid walking between two people in a queue and instead walk around the queue.

on naive predefined rules or in-domain training [5], [6], [9], [10] struggle to handle the complexity of open-world environments, primarily due to data scarcity and the wide visual variability encountered in open-world settings. To address this, we utilize the visual understanding ability of LMMs to enable zero-shot reasoning of social structure. The LMMs are added on top of the perception pipeline that supports reliable detection and tracking to predict the social group. Given the predicted social group, the robot must generate socially appropriate motions that take these social structures into account. Traditional reactive controllers often struggle to avoid disrupting such social structure due to the short planning horizon [11]–[13]. The end-to-end method, which avoids the perception-planning decomposition, usually overfits the demonstration or is unable to interpret complex context in the image [14]–[16]. We address this issue by adapting a mid-level planner as a bridge between global path planning and local motion planning to enable global awareness of the social structure and reactive speed, ensuring the robot’s behavior aligns with social norms.

Overall, we develop a group-based social navigation framework (*GSON*) to address both the perception and planning issues in social navigation tasks. We conducted intensive experiments both in simulation and real world with several daily social interaction scenarios. Comparative experiments indicate that *GSON* outperforms all baseline methods in terms of minimizing perturbations to the social structure.

A. Related Work

1) *Social Structure Detection in Robot Navigation.*: To infer the social structure, especially the dynamic group detection plays a critical role in the navigation of social robots. Social group detection and tracking can be studied from both exo-centric and ego-centric perspectives. The exo-centric

* indicates equal contribution.

Correspondence to: wang.xq@sz.tsinghua.edu.cn

Shangyi Luo, Ji Zhu, Peng Sun and Xueqian Wang are with the Center for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics, Tsinghua Shenzhen International Graduate School, Shenzhen, China.

Yuhong Deng, Cunjun Yu, and Anxing Xiao are with School of Computing, National University of Singapore, Singapore.

¹Video demonstration: https://youtu.be/S_o-hvIBg5M.




Fig. 2: **GSON Framework**. GSON integrates RGB cameras and 2D LiDAR data for dynamic crowd perception, combining human detection, foot detection, and tracking. The large multimodal model allows group detection and enables the planning system to perform socially-aware navigation.

approach [17] relies on external sensors to detect groups and requires prior knowledge of pedestrian characteristics. However, this method typically requires a large number of sensors, making it difficult to implement in practice. In contrast, our method utilizes an egocentric perception system that uses 2D LiDAR and cameras to detect and track social group in real time. Previous approaches to crowd grouping often use probability-based methods [18]–[20], graph-based methods [8], [21], or clustering methods [22]. However, these techniques focus only on the movement of the crowd, neglecting the semantic aspects of the crowd interactions. In *GSON*, we leverage the zero-shot visual reasoning capabilities of Large Multimodal Models (LMMs) to enable semantic detection of social groups given limited sensors.

2) *Motion Planning in Group-based Social Navigation*: Integrating dynamic human grouping into social navigation has been shown to improve the navigation performance. Previous works [23], [24] show that treating human groups as obstacle representations improves the safety of robot planners. Several approaches have focused on leveraging social groups for motion planning or RL [24], [25], but the prediction of social group information is based solely on the position and velocity or the pedestrian, ignoring the semantic context of the environments. Another issue is that this short horizon planning will lead the system into local minimum solution, such as stack in front of a queue. The *GSON* framework addresses these limitations by employing a mid-level planner between global and local planning, allowing both global context and reactive behavior. And by integrating Nonlinear Model Predictive Control (NMPC) as the local planner, *GSON* also ensures both safety and real-time responsiveness even in highly dynamic environments.

3) *Foundation Models in Navigation*: Currently, foundational models in the field of navigation are mainly used for several specific tasks, including the generation of macro-action functions based on scene context, and the identification and classification of various objects in the scene [26]–

[28]. However, these models primarily serve as high-level decision makers [29], [30]. Recent works also explore directly applying the LMM to predict the speed control [31] or select the predefined behavior [32]. However, the LMM is known to be not good at directly outputting accurate grounding results [33]. In *GSON*, we propose a social structure estimation method based on visual prompting with LMM and integrate it into the subsequent path planning. This approach fully utilizes the semantic understanding capability of LMM and provides interpretability.

II. OVERVIEW

A. Problem Formulation

We consider the problem of social robot navigation in a 2D Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^2 . This space is populated by n dynamic pedestrians H_i with a specific social structure. We consider the social structure as m social groups G_j . The robot is initialized with a 2D occupancy map M at the start position S_s and a target position S_g in the map. Given the 2D lidar point cloud P^t and the RGB image observation I^t , the goal is to enable the robot to safely navigate to the goal position while minimizing the time it spends trespassing any social group. The robot must infer the social groups of pedestrians from the limited observation and generate an appropriate trajectory T . We focus on designing the method to estimate the social group with the aid of the Large Multimodal Model and integrate the estimated result into the navigation system.

B. System Overview

The proposed *GSON* developed in this work is illustrated in Fig. 2. The robot is equipped with RGB cameras, a 2D lidar sensor, and a mobile base with differential drive. There are two critical modules in the system: the social group estimation module and the socially aware planning module. The social group estimation module takes the current observation RGB image I^t , 2D point clouds P^t , and the current robot pose S^t from the SLAM module as input and generates the




Fig. 3: The framework of Pedestrians Detection and Tracking

estimated social group score \hat{G} . The estimated social group score is sent to the socially aware planning modules. The socially aware planning modules consist of a global path planner, a mid-level planner, and a local motion planner. The proposed mid-level planner uses the estimated social group and generates the intermediate reference to guide the local planner to navigate through the crowd while minimizing the risk of trespassing the social groups.

III. METHOD

A. Social Group Estimation with Large Multimodal Models

1) **Pedestrians Detection and Tracking:** Before using LMM to infer social group information, we first built a robust pipeline for pedestrian detection and tracking. Since the 2D LiDAR captures the point cloud data of the environment P^t , we first use an auto-regressive model proposed in [34] for preliminary pedestrian detection. Then, to remove the noise level of the result, we combine the information from RGB images to filter out the misidentified point cloud data using YOLO-V5 [35]. The predicted pedestrian coordinates $p_i = [x_i, y_i, z_i]$ are projected into the camera coordinate system and filtered by the bounding box result output by YOLO-V5. After the filtering, we can get the 2D detected pedestrian coordinates as $p_i = [x_i, y_i, z_i]$. Finally, we apply Hungarian algorithm and Kalman filter for estimating and predicting the position of each individual with a unique ID for further social group detection.

2) **Social Group Detection with Visual Prompting:** The social group detection is building on top of the detection and tracking results of pedestrians. We use LMM to understand human behavior and detect social groups within crowds. Leveraging commonsense knowledge from extensive internet data, these models can identify individuals' social structures and group people based on their activities or social structure given the RGB image observation. Before we query the LMM, we reuse the detection result from III-A.1 for each tracked person and apply the Segment Anything model to generate masks. The bounding boxes, masks, and corresponding tracking ID are annotated in the cameras for the LMM to predict the social group. In the example illustrated in Fig. 4, each person is annotated with the bounding box, mask, and corresponding tracking ID. The LMM² is instructed to predict the them based on detected behaviors or interactions, for example, queuing, photography, and chatting. In the input prompt, we define

²We use gpt-4o-2024-08-06 in the implementation.

Input Image:

Input Text:

Task:
Assume you are a social robot and you need to avoid the crowds in the picture and not disturb the same group of people. Please group the people in the picture accordingly.

Visual Prompting:
The numbers in the image are for identification only and do not reflect social structure. Each number represents a person with visible numbers as: {0, 1, 2, 3, 4}.

Remember:
Group those interacting or close to each other. Ensure all individuals are included. Focus on each individual's position and interaction to accurately form groups.

Answer Format:
Return Only the groups in the format 'group:number', like 'group1:1,2 \n group2:3,4'. One line for one group.

LMM Output:
Group 1: [2, 1, 0, 4, 3]

Fig. 4: The LMM identifies people's social structure and social grouping.

the task description, the meaning of visual prompting, and the output format. The output will be interpreted by the script automatically and maintain the social group relationship in the tracking system. Given the image observation I , text prompt T , annotation function A and the estimated pedestrians P . The social group can be computed by

$$G = \mathbf{LMM}(A(I, P), T)$$

As the inference speed constrain, instead of quering the LMM in a high frequency, we maintains a keyframe that contains the image with the most people appearing within the last 3 seconds, along with the actual position and speed corresponding to each person. The LMM is only queried when the keyframe is updated.

B. Socially Aware Planning Module

1) **Mid-level planning:** We introduce a mid-level planning algorithm that leverages social structure predictions from the Large Multimodal Model (LMM) to provide socially aware guidance for local motion planning.

The robot begins by performing global path planning on a known cost map C , generating global reference paths R . The cost map is constructed by using an occupied map built by the Gmapping algorithm. Simultaneously, the LMM module analyzes keyframe images to detect and extract social group structures within the scene, producing grouping information for the individuals present. The social space, \mathcal{S} , is then defined by constructing the convex hull of the detected group configuration \mathcal{G} . Each edge of the hull is approximated by ellipses, collectively forming the boundaries of the social group space. The cost map C is updated by marking the




Fig. 5: **Grouping Result of LLMs.** The results demonstrate that LLMs can accurately capture social structures using appropriate visual prompts, providing a strong foundation for the implementation of GSON.

social group space, *Socialspace*, as a high-cost area to avoid, resulting in an enhanced cost map C^+ . If the global reference paths R intersect with the social space on the updated cost map, the robot re-plans its path. The robot retrieves its current pose, x_{start} , and samples a new goal position, x_{goal} , located at a fixed distance from the original reference path, outside of the social space. The BIT* planning algorithm is then employed to compute a new path on the updated cost map C^+ , yielding a revised path, *Seclusionpath* S , which avoids social group interactions. The algorithm, as shown in 1, integrates the group detection through a large model, allowing the cost map to be dynamically updated. This ensures that the robot can safely avoid disturbing social groups while navigating.

Algorithm 1 Mid-level Planning

```

1: Input: Global reference paths  $R$ , cost map  $C$ .
2: Output: Seclusionpath  $S$  or  $R$ .
3:  $G \leftarrow \text{LMMmodule}(\text{keyframe})$ 
4:  $\mathcal{G} \leftarrow \text{ConvexHull}(G)$ 
5:  $\text{Socialspace} \leftarrow \text{EllipsesEnclose}(\mathcal{G})$ 
6:  $C^+ \leftarrow \text{UpdateCostmap}(\text{Socialspace}, C)$ 
7: if  $\text{iscollided}(R, C^+)$  then
8:    $x_{\text{start}} \leftarrow \text{GetRobotPose}()$ 
9:    $x_{\text{goal}} \leftarrow \text{GetNewGoal}()$ 
10:   $S \leftarrow \text{BITstarPlanning}(x_{\text{start}}, x_{\text{goal}}, C^+)$ 
11:  return  $S$ 
12: else
13:  return  $R$ 
14: end if

```

2) **Local Motion Planning:** Given the high-level guidance from the mid-level planner, the local motion planning needs to generate safe trajectory for the robot to execute. Two advanced control strategies that have gained significant traction in recent years are Model Predictive Control (MPC) and Control Barrier Functions (CBF) and the combination of the two has achieved excellent results in both static and dynamic obstacle avoidance [36]. Consequently, we adapt an MPC-CBF as the local planner similar to [37]. In our work, we define the control barrier function as follows:

$$h(x) = (x - x_p)^2 + (y - y_p)^2 - d_{\text{safe}}^2, \quad (1)$$

where $x_p = [x_p, y_p]^T$ denotes the position of pedestrians and d_{safe} a predefined safety distance. The planning task then is

formulated as a nonlinear model predictive control (NMPC):

$$\min_{\{\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k\}} \|\mathbf{x}_N - \mathbf{x}_{\text{goal}}\|_{P_f}^2 + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \|\mathbf{u}_k\|_{Q_u}^2 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \mathbf{x}_{k+1} = f(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{x}_{\text{init}} \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathcal{X}, \mathbf{u}_k \in \mathcal{U} \quad (5)$$

$$\Delta h_{\text{ob}}^i(\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{u}_k) + \lambda_k h_{\text{ob}}^i(\mathbf{x}_k) \geq 0. \quad (6)$$

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this experiment, we aim to address the following research questions through both simulated and real-world tests:

- (1) *Can LLMs accurately capture social structures with appropriate visual prompts?*
- (2) *Can GSON outperform existing methods in socially-aware navigation?*
- (3) *Can GSON generalize to complex and large-scale real-world scenarios?*

A. Evaluation of LMM Social Group Prediction

To evaluate the capability of LLMs to predict the social group from RGB observations, we created a dataset of 50 scenarios, each depicting clear group interactions in social contexts, such as queuing, walking, talking, and taking pictures. Four LLMs—GPT-4v, GPT-4o, Gemini 1.5-pro, and Claude 3.5-sonnet—were used to analyze these images. Ground-truth labels representing the correct groupings of individuals were created for comparison. To account for variability in LLM responses, each image was tested 10 times with each model, allowing us to assess model robustness and calculate final grouping accuracy. Results were classified into four categories: (1) *Accurate*: completely correct groupings, (2) *Miss*: missing one or more individuals, (3) *Extra*: including individuals from incorrect groups, and (4) *Error*: misgrouping of individuals. Fig. 5 shows the grouping performance results. All four LLMs achieved a correct grouping rate above 50%, with GPT-4o showing the highest performance at 73%. In addition, GPT-4o shows a combined accuracy rate of nearly 90% when considering both the Accurate and Extra (if a solution exists, it does not disrupt the group) categories. These results strongly suggest that LLMs can effectively capture social group structure from visual prompts, with GPT-4o outperforming the other models. As a result, GPT-4o is integrated into our system for real-world deployment.




Fig. 6: **Real-World Experiment Results.** GSON shows comparable performance on traditional navigation metrics, including smooth curvature, low roughness, and slightly higher jerk. In addition, it excels in key social navigation metrics, demonstrating its effectiveness in navigating complex social structures and semantically rich crowd environments.

TABLE I: Social Evaluation Metrics of Planners

Metrics	Explanation	Calculation
Time of Disturbing Individual	The time the robot was within 1.2m in front of the person	$\sum_i t_i$, if $\ \mathbf{d}_{\text{robot}} - \mathbf{d}_{\text{person}_i}\ < 1.2\text{m}$ and $ Yaw_{\text{robot}} - Yaw_p < 90^\circ$, \mathbf{p} shows vector from the person to the robot
Time of Disturbing Group	The time when the robot entered the convex hull of the social group	$\sum_i t_i$, if robot is in convex of any social group
Comfort Distance	The average shortest distances between robot and group	$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i d_i$, $d_i = \begin{cases} \min \ \mathbf{d}_{\text{robot}} - \mathbf{d}_{\text{convex}_j}\ & \text{robot not in convex of group} \\ -\max \ \mathbf{d}_{\text{robot}} - \mathbf{d}_{\text{convex}_j}\ & \text{robot in convex of group} \end{cases}$




Fig. 7: **Simulation Experiment Results.** GSON outperforms across all three metrics, demonstrating its effectiveness under ideal perception conditions.

B. Evaluation the Planner in Simulation

In this evaluation, we focus on evaluating GSON’s planning performance with the correct group prediction. We conducted extensive simulation experiments using *Arena-Rosnav2.0* [38], a platform designed to simulate realistic human behaviors. The experiments focused on four common social scenarios: walking, queuing, conversing, and taking pictures. For each scenario, a minimum of 20 tests were performed with varying pedestrian positions and randomly generated social groups. The baseline for in the simulation included several planners: the Timed Elastic Band (TEB) planner [11], the Dynamic Window Approach (DWA) [12] for collision avoidance, time-optimal nonlinear model predictive control (MPC) [39], a navigation system using the DRL-VO policy (TRAIL) [40], and ROSNav [41], a system integrating DRL-based local planners into conventional navigation. All these methods were implemented in the simulator for comparison. Traditional navigation performance was evaluated using established metrics such as roughness, curvature, jerk, angular deviation from the planned path, and velocity [38], [42]. To assess social navigation, we introduced additional metrics to quantify the robot’s impact on individuals and groups. Following guidelines from prior

work [3], we considered an individual disturbed if the robot approached within 1.2 meters directly in front of them. For social groups, the robot was marked as disturbing if it entered the convex hull formed by the group members. We specifically tracked the duration of group disturbance and also calculated the “comfort distance”, which reflects the average shortest distance between the robot and social groups. The social navigation evaluation metrics are summarized in Table I. As shown in Fig. 7, GSON consistently outperformed the baseline methods on social navigation metrics, demonstrating superior ability to navigate in socially sensitive environments.

C. Real-world Evaluation of the GSON

We validated the effectiveness of GSON in real-world environments using the EAI-Bot E2, a two-wheeled mobile robot equipped with a YDLIDAR-G4 2d lidar and two RGB cameras. This platform was chosen for its suitability for social robot applications in service industries where high-speed navigation is not required. These experiments evaluated GSON’s performance in navigating around groups of people, with a focus on short-range interactions. The small-scale experiments included scenarios with group sizes of 2 to 4 people performing actions such as talking, walking, taking pictures, and standing in line. These setups varied participants’ initial positions, trajectories, and movement speeds to reflect complex social structures. We compared GSON’s performance against established methods, including classical planners like TEB and DWA, as well as more recent approaches such as SACSON [16], a imitation learning based method, a Group-based Motion Prediction Controller (GMPC) [23], and a distributed DRL method for multi-robot collision avoidance (RLCA) [43]. The evaluation metrics are the same from IV-B to measure the personal and




Fig. 8: **Demonstration of Real-world Long Experiment.** The figure illustrates the main segment of the long real-world experiment, comprising four smaller scenarios spanning nearly 100 meters from start to finish. The route includes a narrow corridor and an outdoor area with uneven terrain. The robot reached the endpoint with a high success rate, avoiding disturbing social groups, as confirmed by participant feedback.




Fig. 9: The setting of real-world long range navigation task

group disruption. The results are displayed in Fig. 7. While Curvature, Jerk, and Roughness show similar performance across methods, GSON excels in reducing Time of Disturbing Individuals and Groups, minimizing its impact on others’ movements. It also maintains a higher Comfort Distance, ensuring respect for personal space. These advantages make GSON particularly effective in environments requiring socially-aware navigation.

D. Real-world Long Range Social Navigation

We conducted a long-range demonstration test within a structured large-scale building which comprised a hall, corridors, and an open square. This extended demonstration integrated four smaller scenarios into a larger, more complex setting, where the robot was tasked with accurately identifying social structures and navigating through these environments, see Fig. 9. We define the start and goal points on the two sides of the map. Fig. 8 demonstrate some key frame of the navigation process in this long-range social navigation task. At approximately 10 seconds, the robot encounters a small group of individuals walking ahead. Using its perception and path planning algorithms, it identifies the group and adjusts its path, successfully avoiding the two people. At around 60 seconds, the robot approaches the entrance of an elevator where a queue of people has formed. It recognizes the queue and modifies its route to avoid trpass from it, without causing any disturbance. By

146 seconds, inside a narrow corridor, the robot detects a group of people engaged in conversation. Based on the group result, it calculates a seclusion path to avoid the group and maintain smooth navigation through the confined area. Finally, at about 191 seconds, upon entering an outdoor square, the robot encounters a group of individuals involved in photographing activities. It identifies their positions and reroutes its path around the group, ensuring unobstructed progress while respecting their activities. In summary, the long-range demonstration experiment successfully validated the robot’s ability to navigate through diverse, real-world social environments while maintaining seamless interaction with its surroundings. The robot’s performance in various challenging social scenarios, ranging from avoiding walking individuals to avoiding groups in narrow corridors and open spaces, highlights its advanced social structure reasoning capabilities.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we present a novel approach that integrates the visual reasoning capabilities of Large Multimodal Models (LMM) with a social structure-aware perception and planning system for mobile robots operating in human-centered environments. Our method utilizes the common sense reasoning ability of LMM by applying the visual prompting to predict the social relationships among pedestrians, which allows our planning system to generate socially aware behavior. Through extensive real-world navigation experiments, our approach demonstrated superior performance and robustness compared to baseline methods, illustrating its potential for improving social awareness and interaction in autonomous robot navigation. Future work could explore extending this framework to more dense social interactions and environments, combining the system with compact state representation [44], and also explore distilling knowledge into smaller models for faster inference.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Thrun, M. Beetz, M. Bennewitz, W. Burgard, A. B. Cremers, F. Dellaert, D. Fox, D. Haehnel, C. Rosenberg, N. Roy *et al.*, “Probabilistic algorithms and the interactive museum tour-guide robot minerva,” *The international journal of robotics research*, vol. 19, no. 11, pp. 972–999, 2000.
- [2] B. Xia, H. Luan, Z. Zhao, X. Gao, P. Xie, A. Xiao, J. Wang, and M. Q.-H. Meng, “Collaborative trolley transportation system with autonomous nonholonomic robots,” in *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 8046–8053.
- [3] A. Francis, C. Pérez-D’Arpino, C. Li, F. Xia, A. Alahi, R. Alami, A. Bera, A. Biswas, R. Biswas, R. Chandra, H.-T. L. Chiang, M. Everett, S. Ha, J. Hart, J. P. How, H. Karnan, T.-W. E. Lee, L. J. Manso, R. Mirksy, S. Pirk, P. T. Singamaneni, P. Stone, A. V. Taylor, P. Trautman, N. Tsoi, M. Vázquez, X. Xiao, P. Xu, N. Yokoyama, A. Toshev, and R. Martín-Martín. Principles and Guidelines for Evaluating Social Robot Navigation Algorithms.
- [4] P. T. Singamaneni, P. Bachiller-Burgos, L. J. Manso, A. Garrell, A. Sanfeliu, A. Spalanzani, and R. Alami, “A survey on socially aware robot navigation: Taxonomy and future challenges,” *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, p. 02783649241230562, 2024.
- [5] G. Ferrer and A. Sanfeliu, “Proactive kinodynamic planning using the extended social force model and human motion prediction in urban environments,” in *2014 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 1730–1735.
- [6] Y. F. Chen, M. Everett, M. Liu, and J. P. How, “Socially aware motion planning with deep reinforcement learning,” in *2017 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1343–1350.
- [7] Y. Chen, Z. Xu, Z. Jian, G. Tang, L. Yang, A. Xiao, X. Wang, and B. Liang, “Quadruped guidance robot for the visually impaired: A comfort-based approach,” in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 12 078–12 084.
- [8] L. Feng and B. Bhanu, “Tracking people by evolving social groups: an approach with social network perspective,” in *2015 IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 109–116.
- [9] A. Wang and A. Steinfeld, “Group split and merge prediction with 3d convolutional networks,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1923–1930, 2020.
- [10] A. Gupta, J. Johnson, L. Fei-Fei, S. Savarese, and A. Alahi, “Social gan: Socially acceptable trajectories with generative adversarial networks,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 2255–2264.
- [11] C. Rösmann, F. Hoffmann, and T. Bertram, “Timed-elastic-bands for time-optimal point-to-point nonlinear model predictive control,” in *2015 european control conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 3352–3357.
- [12] D. Fox, W. Burgard, and S. Thrun, “The dynamic window approach to collision avoidance,” *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 23–33, 1997.
- [13] D. Q. Mayne, J. B. Rawlings, C. V. Rao, and P. O. M. Scokaert, “Constrained model predictive control: Stability and optimality,” *Automatica*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 789–814, 2000.
- [14] Z. Xie, P. Xin, and P. Dames, “Towards safe navigation through crowded dynamic environments,” in *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 4934–4940.
- [15] L. Tai, J. Zhang, M. Liu, and W. Burgard, “Socially compliant navigation through raw depth inputs with generative adversarial imitation learning,” in *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1111–1117.
- [16] N. Hirose, D. Shah, A. Sridhar, and S. Levine, “Sacson: Scalable autonomous control for social navigation,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [17] P. Trautman, J. Ma, R. M. Murray, and A. Krause, “Robot navigation in dense human crowds: the case for cooperation,” in *2013 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 2153–2160.
- [18] M. Pfeiffer, U. Schwesinger, H. Sommer, E. Galceran, and R. Siegwart, “Predicting actions to act predictably: Cooperative partial motion planning with maximum entropy models,” in *2016 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 2096–2101.
- [19] M.-C. Chang, N. Krahnstoeber, and W. Ge, “Probabilistic group-level motion analysis and scenario recognition,” in *2011 International Conference on Computer Vision*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 747–754.
- [20] S. D. Khan, G. Vizzari, S. Bandini, and S. Basalamah, “Detection of social groups in pedestrian crowds using computer vision,” in *Advanced Concepts for Intelligent Vision Systems: 16th International Conference, ACIVS 2015, Catania, Italy, October 26-29, 2015. Proceedings 16*. Springer, 2015, pp. 249–260.
- [21] I. Chamveha, Y. Sugano, Y. Sato, and A. Sugimoto, “Social group discovery from surveillance videos: A data-driven approach with attention-based cues,” in *BMVC*, 2013.
- [22] F. Solera, S. Calderara, and R. Cucchiara, “Socially constrained structural learning for groups detection in crowd,” *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 995–1008, 2015.
- [23] A. Wang, C. Mavrogiannis, and A. Steinfeld, “Group-based motion prediction for navigation in crowded environments,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 871–882.
- [24] K. Katyal, Y. Gao, J. Markowitz, S. Pohland, C. Rivera, I.-J. Wang, and C.-M. Huang, “Learning a group-aware policy for robot navigation,” in *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 11 328–11 335.
- [25] F. Yang and C. Peters, “Social-aware navigation in crowds with static and dynamic groups,” in *2019 11th International Conference on Virtual Worlds and Games for Serious Applications (VS-Games)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 1–4.
- [26] D. Shah, B. Osiński, S. Levine *et al.*, “Lm-nav: Robotic navigation with large pre-trained models of language, vision, and action,” in *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 492–504.
- [27] X. Liang, F. Zhu, L. Li, H. Xu, and X. Liang, “Visual-language navigation pretraining via prompt-based environmental self-exploration,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.04006*, 2022.
- [28] B. Lin, Y. Zhu, Z. Chen, X. Liang, J. Liu, and X. Liang, “Adapt: Vision-language navigation with modality-aligned action prompts,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 15 396–15 406.
- [29] P. Anderson, Q. Wu, D. Teney, J. Bruce, M. Johnson, N. Sünderhauf, I. Reid, S. Gould, and A. Van Den Hengel, “Vision-and-language navigation: Interpreting visually-grounded navigation instructions in real environments,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 3674–3683.
- [30] Y. Jiang, A. Gupta, Z. Zhang, G. Wang, Y. Dou, Y. Chen, L. Fei-Fei, A. Anandkumar, Y. Zhu, and L. Fan, “Vima: robot manipulation with multimodal prompts,” in *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023, pp. 14 975–15 022.
- [31] W. Wang, L. Mao, R. Wang, and B.-C. Min, “Srlm: Human-in-loop interactive social robot navigation with large language model and deep reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15648*, 2024.
- [32] D. Song, J. Liang, A. Payandeh, X. Xiao, and D. Manocha, “Socially aware robot navigation through scoring using vision-language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.00210*, 2024.
- [33] J. Yang, H. Zhang, F. Li, X. Zou, C. Li, and J. Gao, “Set-of-mark prompting unleashes extraordinary visual grounding in gpt-4v,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11441*, 2023.
- [34] D. Jia, A. Hermans, and B. Leibe, “Dr-spaam: A spatial-attention and auto-regressive model for person detection in 2d range data,” in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 10 270–10 277.
- [35] G. Jocher, “YOLOv5 by Ultralytics,” May 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/ultralytics/yolov5>
- [36] J. Zeng, Z. Li, and K. Sreenath, “Enhancing feasibility and safety of nonlinear model predictive control with discrete-time control barrier functions,” in *2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 2021.
- [37] A. Xiao, H. Luan, Z. Zhao, Y. Hong, J. Zhao, W. Chen, J. Wang, and M. Q.-H. Meng, “Robotic autonomous trolley collection with progressive perception and nonlinear model predictive control,” in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022.
- [38] L. Kästner, R. Carstens, H. Zeng, J. Kmiecik, T. Bhuiyan, N. Khorasandhi, V. Shcherbina, and J. Lambrecht, “Arena-rosnav 2.0: A development and benchmarking platform for robot navigation in highly dynamic environments,” in *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 11 257–11 264.

- [39] C. Rösmann, “Time-optimal nonlinear model predictive control,” 2019.
- [40] X. Xiao, Z. Xu, Z. Wang, Y. Song, G. Warnell, P. Stone, T. Zhang, S. Ravi, G. Wang, H. Karnan *et al.*, “Autonomous ground navigation in highly constrained spaces: Lessons learned from the benchmark autonomous robot navigation challenge at icra 2022 [competitions],” *IEEE Robotics & Automation Magazine*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 148–156, 2022.
- [41] L. Kästner, T. Buiyan, L. Jiao, T. A. Le, X. Zhao, Z. Shen, and J. Lambrecht, “Arena-rosnav: Towards deployment of deep-reinforcement-learning-based obstacle avoidance into conventional autonomous navigation systems,” in *2021 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 6456–6463.
- [42] C. Mavrogiannis, F. Baldini, A. Wang, D. Zhao, P. Trautman, A. Steinfeld, and J. Oh, “Core challenges of social robot navigation: A survey,” *ACM Transactions on Human-Robot Interaction*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 1–39, 2023.
- [43] P. Long, T. Fan, X. Liao, W. Liu, H. Zhang, and J. Pan, “Towards optimally decentralized multi-robot collision avoidance via deep reinforcement learning,” in *2018 IEEE international conference on robotics and automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 6252–6259.
- [44] S. Chen, A. Xiao, and D. Hsu, “Llm-state: Expandable state representation for long-horizon task planning in the open world,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.17406*, 2023.