

SimADFuzz: Simulation-Feedback Fuzz Testing for Autonomous Driving Systems

HUIWEN YANG, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China

YU ZHOU*, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, China

TAOLUE CHEN*, Birkbeck, University of London, United Kingdom

Autonomous driving systems (ADS) have achieved remarkable progress in recent years. However, ensuring their safety and reliability remains a critical challenge due to the complexity and uncertainty of driving scenarios. In this paper, we focus on simulation testing for ADS, where generating diverse and effective testing scenarios is a central task. Existing fuzz testing methods face limitations, such as overlooking the temporal and spatial dynamics of scenarios and failing to leverage simulation feedback (e.g., speed, acceleration and heading) to guide scenario selection and mutation. To address these issues, we propose SIMADFuzz, a novel framework designed to generate high-quality scenarios that reveal violations in ADS behavior. Specifically, SIMADFuzz employs violation prediction models, which evaluate the likelihood of ADS violations, to optimize scenario selection. Moreover, SIMADFuzz proposes distance-guided mutation strategies to enhance interactions among vehicles in offsprung scenarios, thereby triggering more edge-case behaviors of vehicles. Comprehensive experiments demonstrate that SIMADFuzz outperforms state-of-the-art fuzzers by identifying 32 more unique violations, including 4 reproducible cases of vehicle-vehicle and vehicle-pedestrian collisions. These results demonstrate SIMADFuzz's effectiveness in enhancing the robustness and safety of autonomous driving systems.

CCS Concepts: • **Software and its engineering** → **Software testing and debugging**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Autonomous Driving Systems, Fuzz Testing, Simulation-based Testing

ACM Reference Format:

Huiwen Yang, Yu Zhou, and Taolue Chen. 2024. SimADFuzz: Simulation-Feedback Fuzz Testing for Autonomous Driving Systems. 1, 1 (December 2024), 27 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Autonomous driving systems (ADS), such as Apollo¹ and Autoware², have made significant progress in recent years. Various technologies have been developed to enable vehicles to operate autonomously without human intervention [7, 9]. However, ensuring the safety and reliability of these systems remains a critical challenge [18]. As of March 2024, the California Department of Motor Vehicles reported 695 traffic accidents involving autonomous vehicles³, including 133 collisions in

*Corresponding author.

¹Apollo, <https://github.com/ApolloAuto/apollo>

²Autoware, <https://github.com/autowarefoundation/autoware>

³DMV Autonomous Vehicle Collision Reports, <https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/vehicle-industry-services/autonomous-vehicles/autonomous-vehicle-collision-reports/>

Authors' Contact Information: Huiwen Yang, yhw_yagol@nuaa.edu.cn, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing, China; Yu Zhou, zhouyu@nuaa.edu.cn, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, Nanjing, China; Taolue Chen, t.chen@bbk.ac.uk, Birkbeck, University of London, London, United Kingdom.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM XXXX-XXXX/2024/12-ART

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

2023. These incidents underscore the urgent need for comprehensive and effective testing of ADS before deployment.

Recent research has focused on leveraging various technologies to test the performance and reliability of ADS. For instance, adversarial attacks, widely used in computer vision, have been applied to test the robustness of ADS perception modules by exposing vulnerabilities in object detection and classification [54, 63]. Similarly, software testing techniques such as search-based testing [6] and fuzz testing [25–27, 62] have shown great potential in identifying defects and vulnerabilities in ADS. While these methods have achieved significant results, challenges remain in ensuring comprehensive coverage and scalability for real-world scenarios.

Simulation-based testing has emerged as a widely adopted method for evaluating ADS due to its efficiency and cost-effectiveness compared to real-road testing [41]. By generating diverse and realistic driving scenarios, simulation-based testing can evaluate ADS under various conditions, identifying potential violations such as collisions, unsafe lane changes, and traffic rule violations. This approach is indispensable for uncovering safety issues and improving the reliability of ADS.

The quality of simulation scenarios is critical to the effectiveness of simulation-based testing for ADS [11]. Various scenario generation methods, such as DriveFuzz [26] and Doppel [25], have been proposed. In general, these methods leverage genetic algorithms to generate offspring scenarios through selection, crossover, and mutation of parent scenarios. Scenarios are evaluated and prioritized using pre-designed fitness functions, often considering factors such as the behavior of the *ego vehicle*⁴ or minimum distances between vehicles. Random mutation strategies are then applied to generate offspring scenarios. However, these methods face several limitations:

- (1) *Limitations in scenario fitness evaluation.* Existing fitness functions typically prioritize scenarios based on simple aggregation methods, such as maximum, average, or median values. However, these approaches overlook the sequential nature of driving scenarios, which consist of discrete temporal scenes capturing dynamic interactions and behaviors. Simply aggregating attributes fails to account for these temporal dynamics, potentially leading to suboptimal prioritization.
- (2) *Limitations in mutation strategies.* Scenarios involve a large number of mutable elements, resulting in an enormous search space. While random mutation is a natural approach, it fails to consider the interactions between mutable elements, such as vehicles and pedestrians. As a result, this strategy may struggle to produce high-quality scenarios that effectively challenge the ADS.

In this paper, we propose SIMADFUZZ, a simulation-feedback fuzz testing method for ADS to address the limitations of existing methods. SIMADFUZZ monitors and collects simulation feedback, including the coordinates and physical states of vehicles, during the simulation. Based on genetic algorithms, it generates high-quality testing scenarios. Unlike previous work that primarily uses feedback for scenario selection, SIMADFUZZ innovatively leverages feedback to extract temporal features for scenario fitness evaluation and to design effective mutation strategies.

To address the limitations of scenario fitness evaluation, SIMADFUZZ optimizes scenario selection using model-based fitness evaluation methods. Specifically, it integrates a Transformer [52] encoder to capture the continuous and dynamic nature of driving scenarios. The scenarios are embedded into a high-dimensional feature space, enabling the evaluation of scenario priority through violation prediction models that assess the likelihood of triggering unsafe behaviors.

Additionally, to overcome the limitations of mutation strategies, SIMADFUZZ adopts a distance-guided mutation strategy. This strategy dynamically adjusts the mutation probability of NPC vehicles based on their proximity to ego vehicles, increasing the likelihood of interactions. By

⁴The vehicle controlled by ADS is referred to as the *ego vehicle*, while other vehicles are referred to as *NPC vehicles*.

prioritizing NPC vehicles closer to the ego vehicle for mutation, SIMADFuzz generates offspring scenarios that are more likely to expose potential safety issues while maintaining scenario diversity.

We conduct extensive experiments on InterFuser, a top-tier agent that secured 2nd place on the CARLA leaderboard⁵. The results show that SIMADFuzz detects 10 more unique violations than the baselines, which employs random selection and mutation strategies. Moreover, SIMADFuzz discovers 32, 27 and 9 more violations than AV-Fuzzer [27], DriveFuzz [26] and TM-Fuzzer [30], respectively. In the end, SIMADFuzz totally found 4 collisions triggered by InterFuser, which shows the effectiveness in detecting ADS violations.

The main contributions of this paper are summarized as follows:

- (1) We propose a novel fuzz testing method for ADS, named SIMADFuzz, which leverages simulation feedback to generate high-quality scenarios. SIMADFuzz effectively discovers violations in ADS by dynamically analyzing vehicle states and interactions during simulation.
- (2) We develop a model-based scenario fitness evaluation approach. By utilizing violation prediction models and incorporating a Transformer encoder, SIMADFuzz captures the temporal features of driving scenarios, enabling more accurate prioritization of high-risk scenarios.
- (3) We introduce distance-guided mutation strategies that mutate NPC vehicles based on their proximity to ego vehicles. This approach increases the likelihood of interactions, generating diverse and challenging scenarios that expose potential safety issues in ADS.
- (4) We conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of SIMADFuzz. Results demonstrate that SIMADFuzz detects significantly more violations compared to state-of-the-art methods, including collisions and lane invasion. To facilitate reproducibility and further research, we release the implementation publicly.

Structure. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the preliminaries of simulation-based testing and genetic algorithms. Section 3 illustrates the limitations of existing methods through a motivating example. Section 4 details the design and implementation of SIMADFuzz. Section 5 presents the experimental results and discusses potential threats to validity. Section 6 reviews related work in the field. Finally, Section 7 concludes the paper and proposes directions for future research.

2 Preliminaries

Simulation-based testing is a widely adopted approach to evaluate the performance and reliability of ADS [14, 31, 59]. This method uses virtual scenarios as structured test cases to execute and validate target systems. Genetic algorithms [5, 35], inspired by natural selection, are commonly employed in fuzz testing to generate diverse and high-quality test cases. Several fuzz testing methods, such as AV-Fuzzer [27], DriveFuzz [26], Doppel [25], and TM-Fuzzer [30], have been proposed for simulation-based ADS testing.

Figure 1 illustrates the framework of simulation-based fuzz testing for ADS. This framework takes the ADS under test as input and produces violation reports as output. It consists of three main components: seed scenario generation, simulation, and genetic operators. First, seed scenarios are generated and executed in the simulation environment. During the execution, feedback information such as vehicle coordinates and velocities is collected from the simulator to evaluate the fitness of each scenario. Based on these fitness scores, the most promising scenarios are selected. These selected scenarios undergo crossover or mutation to produce offspring scenarios, which are then executed in the simulation environment for subsequent generations. During execution, the simulation environment detects various types of violations, such as collisions, unsafe lane changes,

⁵The 1st place agent, ReasonNet, has not made its code publicly available. Cf. CARLA leaderboard, <https://leaderboard.carla.org/leaderboard/>

and traffic rule violations. This fuzzing process is repeated until the testing budget (e.g., time) is exhausted. At the end of the process, a report summarizing the detected violations is generated to aid in evaluating the ADS's performance and identifying potential issues.




Fig. 1. Simulation-based Fuzz Testing Framework for ADS

In this framework, *scenario selection*, *crossover*, and *mutation* are the three main genetic operators that define the core of genetic algorithms. For scenario selection, genetic algorithms identify promising scenarios based on several metrics and evaluate their fitness scores using single- or multi-objective search methods. These evaluations are performed using fitness functions, which quantify the likelihood of a scenario causing violations [1]. Table 1 summarizes the commonly used metrics in simulation-based testing for ADS. As shown in Table 1, the fitness function evaluates scenarios to estimate their probability of triggering violations. For scenario crossover and mutation, random strategies are widely used. For instance, DriveFuzz [26] employs random mutation by altering weather conditions (e.g., wind, cloud cover, and rain) or modifying pedestrian behaviors without utilizing any crossover operator. Similarly, Doppel [25] adopts random mutation by adding or removing traffic participants or modifying the starting and destination points of ego vehicles. On the other hand, Doppel's crossover operator swaps ego vehicles between two scenarios when their routes intersect.

In this paper, we aim to optimize two key genetic operators: *scenario selection* and *mutation*. The details of these optimizations are presented in Section 4.

3 A Motivating Example

This section presents an example to illustrate the limitations of existing methods and discusses the necessity of introducing model-based fitness evaluation and distance-guided mutation strategies.

As shown in Figure 2(a), the scenario involves three vehicles converging at a T -junction. The red vehicle intends to proceed straight, the white vehicle is making a left turn, and the green vehicle is turning right. The traffic light for the east-west direction is green, allowing all vehicles to proceed legally.

At time point 2, while the white vehicle is turning left, it encounters the red vehicle travelling straight. The red vehicle brakes to avoid a collision, maintaining a minimum distance of 5 meters ($md_{t_2} = 5$) between them. At time point 3, the green vehicle completes its right turn, causing the red vehicle to brake again to prevent a rear-end collision, with a minimum distance of 7 meters ($md_{t_3} = 7$). Finally, at time point 4, all three vehicles successfully navigate through the T -junction without incident.

Table 1. Fitness metrics used in AV-Fuzzer, DriveFuzz, and Doppel

Method	Factor	Description
AV-Fuzzer[27]	d_{safe}	The maximum distance without colliding with other actors
	d_{stop}	The distance the vehicle will travel before coming to a complete stop
	Fitness score	$= d_{safe} - d_{stop}$
DriveFuzz[26]	ha	The times of hard acceleration
	hb	The times of hard braking
	ht	The times of hard turn
	os	The times of oversteer
	us	The times of understeer
	md	The minimum distances from ego vehicle to other actors
	Fitness score	$= -(ha + hb + ht + os + us - 1/md)$
Doppel[25]	$f_{min_distance}$	The minimum distances from ego vehicle to other actors
	$f_{decision}$	The total number of unique decisions being made by all ego vehicles
	$f_{conflict}$	The total number of pairs of actors whose trajectory overlaps with another
	$f_{violation}$	The total number of violations across all ego vehicles
	Fitness score	Based on NSGA-2




Fig. 2. Multi-Vehicle Interaction at a T-junction

Both DriveFuzz and Doppel incorporate the minimum distance (md) between vehicles as a key metric in their fitness functions. For example, DriveFuzz evaluates fitness based on the minimum distance and the number of hard braking (hb) events by the ego vehicle, while Doppel considers the minimum distance between all vehicles and integrates additional metrics using the NSGA-II algorithm [65]. However, both methods rely on aggregate functions, such as *minimum* or *count*, to evaluate the overall scenario fitness. As a result, DriveFuzz computes the fitness for the red vehicle as $hb = 2$ and $md = \min(md_{t2}, md_{t3}) = 5$, while Doppel similarly incorporates $md = 5$. These approaches overlook the potential collision risk at time point 3, where the red and green vehicles maintain a distance of 7 meters ($md_{t3} = 7$).

Furthermore, DriveFuzz only counts the number of hard braking events, without considering the spatial or temporal context of these events. By reducing such events to simple numerical values, it fails to capture critical details that could indicate higher-risk scenarios.

In summary, the complex scenario illustrated in Figure 2 should be prioritized for mutation to further explore potential risks. However, due to the reliance on insufficient aggregate functions (*cf.* the first limitation), existing methods may assign the same or even lower fitness scores to such scenarios compared to simpler ones, leading to missed opportunities in identifying safety-critical behaviors of ADS.

Furthermore, dangerous or violating behaviors usually occur during interactions with other traffic participants. With more frequent interactions comes a higher risk of violations [37]. Consider another scenario shown in Figure 2(b), where the white vehicle is driving away from the other two vehicles. As the interactions decrease, it becomes less likely to exhibit further violating behaviors. Consequently, the white vehicle should be prioritized for mutation to increase interaction. However, both DriveFuzz and Doppel randomly select vehicles for mutation (*cf.* the second limitation), which inevitably results in redundant offspring scenarios.

To address these challenges, we propose SimADFuzz, a fuzz testing method that employs a Transformer encoder to effectively analyze the temporal dynamics within scenarios and evaluate the overall scenario using violation prediction models. Additionally, SimADFuzz integrates distance-guided mutation strategies to enhance the likelihood of interactions between vehicles, thereby improving the quality and relevance of offspring scenarios.

4 Approach

Figure 3 presents an overview of SimADFuzz, which comprises three modules: the simulation test engine, the simulation-feedback genetic algorithm, and the violation detector.




Fig. 3. Overview of SimADFuzz

First, SimADFuzz sends seed scenarios to the simulation test engine for execution. The simulation engine collects feedback information, including the coordinates and physical states of vehicles, as detailed in § 4.1.

Second, the simulation-feedback genetic algorithm processes the collected feedback information to extract temporal features and road attributes. It then evaluates the fitness score based on the

violation prediction model and SDC-Scissor (described in § 4.2.1). The fitness scores guide the selection of scenarios, which are subjected to crossover (§ 4.2.2) and mutation (§ 4.2.3) to generate offspring scenarios that promote more interactions between vehicles and increase the likelihood of triggering violation behaviors.

Finally, the violation detector analyzes the interactions between vehicles, pedestrians, and traffic lights to identify five types of violations. Violation reports, along with the corresponding scenarios that can reproduce the violations, are output to assist ADS developers and testers in identifying defects, as detailed in § 4.3.

In the following section, we present the key components of SIMADFuzz in detail.

4.1 Simulation Test Engine and Feedback Collection

To implement simulation-based testing, we design a simulation test engine that incorporates an autonomous vehicle simulator and a simulation-feedback collector.

The autonomous vehicle simulator is maintained by high-fidelity platforms (e.g., CARLA [12], LGSVL [40]), or simulation tools designed for specific ADS (e.g., Dreamview [2], AWSIM [50]). These simulators provide realistic environments, deploy vehicles and pedestrians at specific coordinates, and return sensor data such as RGB cameras, radar, GPS, and inertial measurement units.

Among these, CARLA and LGSVL have emerged as two widely used platforms in fuzz testing methods. However, LGSVL ceased maintenance and updates in 2022, limiting access to certain maps and assets. In contrast, CARLA has continuously improved its maps and API integrations, offering more comprehensive simulation capabilities that are well-suited for fuzz testing. Additionally, CARLA hosts official ADS performance benchmarks through the CARLA Leaderboard, making it a preferred choice for both research and industry. Consequently, SIMADFuzz prioritizes CARLA as the primary simulation environment for generating driving scenarios, deploying ADS, and conducting fuzz testing.

The simulation-feedback collector gathers real-time feedback information by calling APIs provided by the simulator. Specifically, SIMADFuzz collects two types of vehicle-related information, as shown in Table 2, i.e., (1) vehicle coordinates, which indicate the vehicle’s location and trajectory; and (2) physical states, which reflect the vehicle’s behavior, including attributes such as speed and acceleration. This information captures the temporal features of vehicles during simulation and is used to evaluate scenario fitness through a model-based approach.

Table 2. Feedback Information collected by SIMADFuzz

Type	Name	Description
Vehicle coordinates	loc_x	X-coordinate of the ego vehicle
	loc_y	Y-coordinate of the ego vehicle
Physical states	$speed_x$	X-direction speed of the ego vehicle
	$speed_y$	Y-direction speed of the ego vehicle
	acc_x	X-direction acceleration of the ego vehicle
	acc_y	Y-direction acceleration of the ego vehicle
	yaw	Heading of the ego vehicle

4.2 Simulation-Feedback Genetic Algorithm

Figure 4 illustrates the process of the simulation-feedback genetic algorithm. In SIMADFuzz, the genetic representation (i.e., chromosome) of a scenario used for simulation is composed of four

parts. The green and red part shown in Figure 4 represent the routes of the ego vehicle and NPC vehicles, respectively, defined by their start and end points. The yellow part represents the routes of pedestrians, while the blue part encodes weather conditions, such as rain or fog levels.

After the parent scenario completes simulation, SIMADFuzz collects the coordinates and physical states of vehicles. These collected features are then used in a sequential process involving scenario selection, crossover, and mutation to generate offspring scenarios for the next generation of simulations.

We detail the key components of the simulation-feedback genetic algorithm, including model-based fitness evaluation, scenario selection, crossover strategies, and mutation strategies, in the following sections.




Fig. 4. Process of the Simulation-Feedback Genetic Algorithm

4.2.1 Model-based Fitness Evaluation and Scenario Selection. In general, a driving scenario is a sequence composed of several scenes, where each scene represents a snapshot of the simulation world [51]. Scenes may include actions, events, and other objects that characterize the driving environment. Based on this definition, we formalize a driving scenario S as a sequence (s_1, \dots, s_T) of T scenes with fixed time intervals. Each scene s_t is represented as (v_1^t, \dots, v_m^t) , where m is the number of vehicles in S , and v_i^t refers to the features of vehicle v_i , including its coordinates and physical states at scene s_t .

However, these features only represent individual scenes within the scenario and fail to capture interactions between vehicles or behaviors such as turning or sudden braking. These interactions are critical for evaluating the potential of a scenario to trigger violations.

To address this limitation, we construct a neural network model based on the Transformer encoder to embed driving scenarios into high-dimensional feature representations. The model extracts temporal relationships and interactions among vehicles through its encoding layers. Based on these feature representations, we design a violation prediction model (VPM) to evaluate the fitness of driving scenarios by predicting the probability of triggering violations. This fitness score guides the selection of scenarios for further optimization and mutation. The VPM consists of two main layers, *i.e.*, driving scenario encoder and violation prediction layer.

Driving Scenario Encoder. The driving scenario encoder is designed to learn patterns from scene sequences using sequence models, which are effective in capturing relevant information from

temporal data. Sequence models such as LSTM [22] and Transformer have been widely applied to tasks like driving behavior intention recognition [17] and trajectory/velocity prediction [16, 19, 33]. In this work, we adopt the Transformer for the driving scenario encoding task due to its superior performance in trajectory forecasting [20, 58]. In SIMADFUZZ, the Transformer encoder takes feedback information as input, represented as a tensor with the shape $T \times N_{info}$. Here, T denotes the number of scenes, and N_{info} represents the total amount of information collected for all vehicles in the scenario. Specifically, $N_{info} = 7 \times m$, where m is the number of vehicles, and the 7 features include coordinates, speed, acceleration, and heading. By leveraging the multi-head attention mechanism, the Transformer encoder embeds the scenario into a high-dimensional feature space, which is then used to predict the probability of violations.

Violation Prediction Layer. The violation prediction layer is designed to estimate the probability of violations, which serves as the fitness score for the scenario. It consists of a fully connected (FC) layer with a single output node, producing a scalar probability value. The FC layer combines and models relationships among features extracted from the entire scene sequence, capturing high-level interactions and temporal dependencies. Scenarios with higher predicted probabilities indicate a greater likelihood of causing violations in the ADS. Consequently, these scenarios are prioritized for selection in generating offspring scenarios during the optimization process.

The VPM evaluates scenarios and prioritizes them for crossover and mutation in the genetic algorithm. However, relying solely on a single fitness metric can be misleading, as it may fail to capture other critical characteristics of the scenarios being tested [13]. As shown in Table 1, existing works commonly evaluate scenarios using multiple fitness metrics to ensure a more comprehensive assessment. To address this limitation, we augment the SIMADFUZZ with three additional fitness metrics: minimum distance, number of unique violations [10, 25], and SDC-Scissor (Self Driving Cars Cost Effective Test Selector) [4].

- The minimum distance is the smallest observed distance between the ego vehicle and other vehicles throughout the scenario simulation. A smaller distance typically indicates a higher likelihood of collisions or other violations, reflecting an increased level of risk in the scenario.
- The number of unique violations refers to the total number of distinct violations triggered by the ego vehicle after filtering out duplicates and highly similar violations. A higher count of unique violations suggests a more risky and complex scenario, potentially exposing more defects in the ADS by challenging its performance in diverse ways.
- SDC-Scissor is a method that leverages machine learning models to identify and filter unlike scenarios to detect faults in ADS before executing them. It extracts static road attributes (as shown in Table 3) and sends them into trained models to classify scenarios as safe or unsafe. Complementarily, SIMADFUZZ focuses on capturing temporal features, such as dynamic interactions between vehicles over time. Combining these static and temporal features enhances the overall fitness evaluation by leveraging the strength of both approaches.

To this end, we combine the VPM with three additional fitness metrics, treating scenario selection as a multi-objective optimization task. The goal is to identify solutions (*i.e.*, scenarios) that balance multiple objectives, such as increasing violation probabilities and risk exposure, or reducing the distance between vehicles. To achieve this, we leverage the Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithm II (NSGA-2) [65], a widely used multi-objective optimization algorithm, to select scenarios based on the Pareto-optimal frontier.

NSGA-2 identifies a set of solutions that are not dominated by any other solutions, meaning that no other solutions perform better across all objectives. By employing non-dominated sorting and crowding distance techniques, NSGA-2 ensures a diverse set of Pareto-optimal scenarios, effectively exploring the simulation search space while avoiding premature convergence to local optima.

Table 3. Name and Description of SDC-Features [4]

Name	Description
Direct distance	Euclidean distance between start and finish
Length	Total length of the driving path
Number L Turns	Number of left turns on the driving path
Number R Turns	Number of right turns on the driving path
Number Straight	Number of straight segments on the driving path
Total angle	Cumulative turn angle on the driving path
Median, Std, Max, Min, Mean angle	Median/Std/Maximum/Minimum/Average turn angle on the driving path
Median, Std, Max, Min, Mean radius	Median/Std/Maximum/Minimum/Average turn radius of the driving path
Full road diversity	The cumulative diversity of the full road composed of all segments
Mean road diversity	The mean diversity of the segments of a road

4.2.2 Crossover Strategy. The crossover operator combines two parent scenarios to generate two offspring scenarios. SIMADFuzz performs the crossover operation by swapping the routes of NPC vehicles and pedestrians, while keeping the other two parts (the route of the ego vehicle and the weather conditions) unchanged.

For the pedestrian swap operation, SIMADFuzz randomly swaps half of the pedestrians between the two scenarios, increasing the diversity of pedestrian routes and behaviors.

For the NPC vehicle swap operation, SIMADFuzz is designed to enhance the interaction likelihood between the ego vehicle and NPC vehicles. Specifically, for two parent scenarios S_1 and S_2 , SIMADFuzz checks whether the trajectory of an NPC vehicle $NPC_i^{S_1}$ in S_1 intersects with the trajectory of the ego vehicle EGO^{S_2} in S_2 . If it is the case, there might be a potential interaction between EGO^{S_2} and $NPC_i^{S_1}$, and SIMADFuzz randomly selects one NPC vehicle from S_2 and swaps it with $NPC_i^{S_1}$, generating two offspring scenarios.

4.2.3 Mutation Strategy. Mutation operators generate offspring scenarios based on a parent scenario. As shown in Figure 4, the chromosome of a scenario is categorized into three components: vehicles (including the ego and NPC vehicles), pedestrians, and weather. Among these, vehicles play a critical role in contributing to dynamic scenario variations. To enhance the likelihood of interactions with the ego vehicle, we focus on vehicle mutation and propose a distance-guided mutation strategy.

Distance-guided Mutation for Vehicles. Vehicles are essential traffic participants in creating dynamic scenarios for testing. As discussed in Section 3, *the probability of interactions and subsequent violations decreases as the distance between vehicles increases*. To address this, SIMADFuzz employs a distance-guided mutation strategy to identify and remove vehicles with low interaction potential. Specifically, two types of vehicles are removed:

- Vehicles that remain nearly stuck throughout the simulation, contributing minimally to scenario dynamics.
- Vehicles that consistently move away from other vehicles, reducing the likelihood of interactions.

The process of distance-guided mutation is detailed in Algorithm 1. The algorithm takes the following inputs: the set of NPC vehicles in the parent scenario (C), the ego vehicle in the parent

scenario (e), the distance matrix (m_{dis}), a threshold for identifying stuck vehicles (w), and a time window size for identifying leaving vehicles (u). The algorithm outputs a modified set of NPC vehicles for the offspring scenario.

The m_{dis} is represented as a three-dimensional matrix with shape $T \times |V| \times |V|$, where T denotes the number of time steps, and $|V|$ represents the number of vehicles. Each element $m_{dis}(t, v_1, v_2)$ represents the Euclidean distance between vehicles v_1 and v_2 at timestamp t . The distance is computed as:

$$m_{dis}(t, v_1, v_2) = \begin{cases} \|v_1^t - v_2^t\|_2, & \text{if } v_1 \neq v_2 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where $\|v_1^t - v_2^t\|_2$ denotes the Euclidean distance between the positions of vehicles v_1 and v_2 at time t .

Algorithm 1: Distance-guided Mutation Process

Input : C - NPC vehicles in the parent scenario,
 e - Ego vehicle in the parent scenario,
 m_{dis} - Distance matrix,
 w - Threshold for identifying stuck vehicles,
 u - Time window size for identifying leaving vehicles

Output : C - Mutated NPC vehicles

```

1  $D \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
2 for  $v \in C$  do
3    $\Delta_{route} \leftarrow \sum_{t=1}^T \|v^t - v^{t-1}\|_2$ ;
4   if  $\Delta_{route} < w$  then
5      $D \leftarrow D \cup \{v\}$ ;
6     continue;
7    $flag \leftarrow True$ ;
8   for  $t \in [u, T]$  do
9      $\Delta_{dis} \leftarrow \sum_{i=t-u}^t (m_{dis}(i+1, v, e) - m_{dis}(i, v, e))$ ;
10    if  $\Delta_{dis} < 0$  then
11       $flag \leftarrow False$ ;
12      break;
13  if  $flag$  then
14     $D \leftarrow D \cup \{v\}$ ;
15  $C \leftarrow C \setminus D$ ;
16 MUTATE_ROUTE( $C$ );
17 MUTATE_ROUTE( $e$ );
18 ADD_VEHICLES( $C, |D|$ );
19 return  $C$ ;

```

Algorithm 1 begins by initializing an empty set D to record NPC vehicles marked for removal. Each vehicle $v \in C$ is evaluated based on two criteria:

1. **Stuck Vehicles:** The algorithm computes the total route length Δ_{route} for each vehicle v by summing the Euclidean distances between its positions at consecutive timestamps. If $\Delta_{route} < w$, indicating minimal movement throughout the simulation, the vehicle is added to D .

2. Leaving Vehicles: For each vehicle v , the algorithm computes the cumulative distance trend Δ_{dis} relative to the ego vehicle e over a sliding time window of size u . If Δ_{dis} remains positive (≥ 0) across all examined windows, the vehicle is marked as consistently moving away and added to D .

Vehicles in D are removed from the scenario. The function `MUTATE_ROUTE` modifies the routes of the remaining vehicles and the ego vehicle e , ensuring the mutated routes remain on the same road segment for contextual consistency. The function `ADD_VEHICLES` then replenishes the removed vehicles with new NPC vehicles, generating routes with randomly selected start and end points to explore new routes. The final mutated set of NPC vehicles is returned as part of the offspring scenario.

Figure 5 illustrates an example of distance-guided mutation. In the parent scenario (left), the red vehicle is identified as a *stuck vehicle*, as it remains stationary at a long red traffic light, while the yellow one is identified as a *leaving vehicle*, as its trajectory indicates it is consistently moving away from the ego vehicle (the blue vehicle), reducing the likelihood of interactions. These two vehicles are removed during the mutation process.

In the offspring scenario (right), two new vehicles are added to replace the removed ones. One of the new vehicles intersects with the ego vehicle's trajectory at a roundabout, thereby enhancing the potential for interactions in the offspring scenario.




Fig. 5. An Example of Distance-guided Mutation

Mutation for Pedestrians and Weather Conditions. `SIMADFUZZ` also mutates pedestrians and weather conditions. Pedestrians are spawned near the ego vehicle to improve interaction likelihood, as their relatively low speed makes distant interactions unlikely. Weather conditions are randomly sampled from predefined ranges, such as rain intensity (0–100) and sun altitude (-90° to 90°), to explore diverse environmental scenarios.

4.3 Violation Detector and Reproduction

The violation detector module is responsible for identifying misbehavior and violations triggered by ego vehicles during simulation. `SIMADFUZZ` supports detecting the following violations:

Collision: Collisions are one of the most fundamental violations that an ADS must avoid. Collisions are detected when the ego vehicle comes into physical contact with other static or dynamic objects. This detector is implemented using CARLA's built-in collision sensors.

Lane Invasion: Lane invasions are detected when the ego vehicle crosses restricted road lanes, such as crossing solid lines that indicate non-crossable lane boundaries during lane changes. This detector is implemented using CARLA's built-in lane invasion sensors.

Speeding: Speeding violations are detected when the ego vehicle’s speed consistently exceeds the specific road’s speed limit for a duration $T_{speeding}$. This detector is implemented by analyzing the ego vehicle’s historical speed data and comparing it against the speed limit.

Running Red Lights: Running red light violations are detected when the ego vehicle drives through an intersection during a red light. This detector is implemented by monitoring the traffic light state and the ego vehicle’s coordinates within the intersection.

Stuck: Stuck behaviors often indicate ADS failures or system disablement but may also result from external factors such as traffic congestion. These violations are detected when the ego vehicle remains stationary beyond a predefined duration T_{stuck} . This detector is implemented by analyzing the ego vehicle’s historical speed data and verifying whether the speed remains consistently zero over the duration T_{stuck} .

When SIMADFuzz identifies a violation, it saves the entire scenario (including the states of the ego vehicle, NPC vehicles, pedestrians and weather conditions) to facilitate reproduction. Additionally, SIMADFuzz utilizes CARLA’s API (`Client.start_recorder`) to record scenarios with more detailed information (such as the states of traffic lights and vehicle dynamics). SIMADFuzz supports replaying both types of scenario recordings to reproduce violations, and supports further analysis, including root cause investigation and ADS performance evaluation.

5 Evaluation and Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of SIMADFuzz, we conducted experiments aimed at addressing the following research questions, covering various perspectives:

- RQ1** To what extent can optimization strategies in scenario selection and mutation components of SIMADFuzz improve its effectiveness in detecting violations?
- RQ2** How effective is SIMADFuzz in detecting violations in ADS compared to state-of-the-art fuzzers?
- RQ3** Does the strategy used in SIMADFuzz impact the diverse generation of scenarios?

5.1 Experimental Settings

5.1.1 ADS Under Test. The ADS system evaluated in our experiments is InterFuser [42]. InterFuser utilizes a Transformer-based architecture for interpretable sensor fusion, integrating sensor data to generate control commands for the ego vehicle. It has demonstrated its effectiveness in autonomous driving tasks by achieving high driving scores on the CARLA Leaderboard. Additionally, InterFuser is open-source, and the weights of its models are publicly available. These features make it a suitable choice for evaluating the performance of SIMADFuzz.

5.1.2 Fuzzing Configurations. To evaluate the scenarios generated by SIMADFuzz, we utilize the CARLA simulator, configured to run at a frame rate of 20 Hz. Each simulation lasts up to 10 minutes but may terminate earlier if the ego vehicle collides with other vehicles or pedestrians, or if it successfully reaches its destination.

The simulation environment is based on the Town03 map provided by CARLA, which represents a large urban area resembling a downtown district. This map includes roundabouts, underpasses, overpasses, and other complex road structures, offering diverse and challenging driving scenarios for testing.

Each testing scenario includes ten pedestrians and three vehicles, one of which is configured as the ego vehicle deployed with InterFuser. Figure 6 illustrates six typical scenarios generated by SIMADFuzz: two vehicles driving in the same or opposite directions, vehicles encountering each other at the roundabout, pedestrians crossing intersections under different lighting conditions, and multiple participants meeting at an intersection.




Fig. 6. Scenarios Generated During the Fuzz Testing

The population size for fuzzing is set to 20, with crossover and mutation probabilities fixed at 0.5. To ensure a fair comparison across different fuzzing methods, the same seed scenarios are utilized for all experiments. These seed scenarios are generated by randomly selecting ego vehicle routes from the Town03 map.

There are several hyperparameters in *SimADFuzz*, as shown in Table 4. The first three are related to the violation prediction model (VPM), including parameters for the Transformer encoder. The remaining three are associated with mutation strategies, including two parameters mentioned in Algorithm 1 and the maximum distance between pedestrians and the ego vehicle when generating pedestrians.

Table 4. Hyperparameters of *SimADFuzz*

Category	Hyperparameter Description	Value
VPM-related	embedding dimension	128
	head number	3
	encoder layer number	3
Mutation-related	threshold for identifying stuck vehicles	10 meters
	time window size for identifying leaving vehicles	10 seconds
	maximum distance between pedestrian and the ego vehicle	20 meters

We generate 1,000 simple and short driving scenarios, each with a simulation time constrained to 2 minutes, and collect feedback information to train the violation prediction model and the SDC-Scissor model. The SDC-Scissor model is trained using a Logistic Regression classifier, which has been shown to effectively performance in the study by Birchler et al. [3]. For the violation

prediction model, the Adam optimizer is used with a learning rate of 0.001, and binary cross-entropy is employed as the loss function. To mitigate overfitting, an early stopping strategy with a patience threshold of 10 epochs is implemented.

5.1.3 Baselines and Evaluation Metrics. We compare SIMADFuzz against three different fuzzers:

AV-Fuzzer, which employs genetic algorithms to minimize the ego vehicle’s safety potential. It generates offspring scenarios by altering the positions of NPCs.

DriveFuzz, which designs a fitness function based on hard acceleration and other behaviors to evaluate scenarios. It mutates the weather conditions, NPC positions, and pedestrian navigation types to generate diverse driving scenarios.

TM-Fuzzer, which dynamically manages traffic flow to increase interactions with the ego vehicle. It also incorporates clustering analysis to generate diverse test scenarios.

We use the number of unique violations (UVs) as the evaluation metric. UVs are defined as violations that occur at different times or locations. This metric is widely used in ADS fuzz testing [10, 25] and serves as a reliable indicator of a fuzzer’s performance in detecting violations.

In our evaluation, we define a temporal threshold of ± 10 seconds and a spatial threshold of ± 30 meters to determine unique violations.

5.2 Experimental Results

5.2.1 RQ1: Components Effective. To validate the effectiveness of the violation prediction model, SDC-Scissor, and distance-guided mutation strategies, we conducted ablation experiments on several variants of SIMADFuzz. Each variant was fuzzed for a total of 3 hours.

The results are shown in Figure 7, where each line represents a variant $X + Y$. Here, X indicates the components activated during scenario selection, which can be VS (using both the violation prediction model and SDC-Scissor, representing the complete fuzzer of SIMADFuzz), V (using only the violation prediction model), S (using only SDC-Scissor), or R (randomly selecting scenarios). Y indicates the components activated during mutation, which can be D (using distance-guided mutation strategies) or R (randomly mutating scenarios).

As shown in Figure 7, the complete fuzzer $VS + D$ outperforms all other variants, discovering 24 UVs over a total of 3 hours of fuzzing, while the random baseline ($R + R$) only discovers 14 UVs. This indicates that the optimization components for both scenario selection and mutation greatly improve the ability to detect violations in ADS.

Focusing on scenario selection, $V+D$ and $S+D$ outperform $R+D$, indicating that both the violation prediction model and SDC-Scissor improve the effectiveness of selecting high-risk scenarios. The combination of these two models ($VS + D$) further refines the selection process by leveraging temporal features from the violation prediction model and static road features from SDC-Scissor.

In terms of scenario mutation, variants with random mutation strategies ($VS+R$, $V+R$, $S+R$, and $R+R$) perform worse than their counterparts with distance-guided mutation strategies. Furthermore, $VS+R$ shows a stagnation in the number of unique violations detected during fuzzing. This suggests that random mutation strategies may generate low-quality scenarios with limited interaction between traffic participants. Table 5 supports this observation by showing that distance-guided mutation increases the number of NPC vehicles near the ego vehicle (*i.e.*, within 50 meters). This increased proximity enhances interactions, influencing the ADS’s perception and decision-making, and ultimately leading to more detected violations.




Fig. 7. The number of UVs detected by variants of `SimADFuzz`. Each variant is denoted as $X + Y$, where X represents the components activated during scenario selection (with V for the violation prediction model, S for SDC-Scissor, and R for random selection), and Y represents the components activated during mutation (with D for distance-guided mutation strategies and R for random mutation strategies).

Table 5. The number of NPC vehicles near by the ego vehicle

Fuzzer variants	Fuzzing Time	Num of Vehicle
VS+R	1h	7
	2h	16
	3h	23
VS+D (<code>SimADFuzz</code>)	1h	8
	2h	25
	3h	35

Answer to RQ1: The model-based fitness evaluation and distance-guided mutation strategies significantly enhance the performance of `SimADFuzz`, detecting 10 more unique violations compared to variants using random strategies over 3 hours fuzz testing.

5.2.2 *RQ2: Performance Compared to SOTA Fuzzers.* We conducted experiments to compare the performance of `SimADFuzz` with other state-of-the-art fuzzers, including `AV-Fuzzer`, `DriveFuzz`, and `TM-Fuzzer`. Each fuzzer was executed for a total of 6 hours.

The results are shown in Figure 8, illustrating that the performance gap between `SimADFuzz` and other fuzzers becomes increasingly significant as fuzzing progresses. After 6 hours, `SimADFuzz` detected 35 UVs, outperforming `TM-Fuzzer` (26 UVs), `DriveFuzz` (18 UVs), and `AV-Fuzzer` (3 UVs). Additionally, `SimADFuzz` identified its first collision violation within 17 minutes, compared to 21 minutes for `TM-Fuzzer`, demonstrates `SimADFuzz`'s superior efficiency in detecting critical violations. Specifically, `SimADFuzz` detected 35 UVs, including 4 collisions, 20 lane invasions, and 11 stuck violations.

Notably, none of the fuzzers detected speeding or red light violations during testing with InterFuser. We attribute this to InterFuser’s conservative configuration, including a strict speed limit of 5 m/s and a confidence threshold of 0.3 for detecting red traffic lights. These configurations make the ego vehicle behave as a cautious driver, avoiding overspeeding or moving when uncertain about the traffic light state.




Fig. 8. The number of UVs detected by SIMADFuzz and baselines

To further analyze the results, we categorized the violations discovered by SIMADFuzz according to their types. Table 6 summarizes six types of violations, briefly describing their scenarios and participants. Importantly, all scenarios were confirmed to be reproducible using SIMADFuzz .

Table 6. Violation Types and Scenario Descriptions

Violation Types	ID	Scenarios Description
Collision	#1	Ego vehicle failed to respond appropriately to a pedestrian jaywalking, resulting in a side collision.
	#2	Ego vehicle collides with another vehicle while changing lanes to exit a crossroads.
	#3	Ego vehicle collides with another vehicle while changing lanes at an intersection.
	#4	Ego vehicle collides with another vehicle due to insufficient steering while turning right.
Lane Invasion	#5	Ego vehicle illegally crosses the solid line while passing through an intersection.
	#6	Ego vehicle illegally crosses the solid line while turning right.
Stuck	#7	Ego vehicle failed to change lanes when the pedestrian in front remained stationary for too long.
	#8	Ego vehicle misjudged the state of the traffic lights, resulting in being stuck on a downhill ramp.

Regarding collision violations, SIMADFuzz detects 4 unique violations. We manually inspect each detected collision and categorize them into pedestrian and vehicle collisions. Below, we present three case studies (#1, #2, #3 and #4 in Table 6), all of which can be reproduced using SIMADFuzz .

Case Study#1: Pedestrian Collision by InterFuser. As shown in Figure 9, the collision occurs at night under low-light conditions. Although SIMADFuzz ensures that vehicle headlights are activated when the sun altitude falls below 90 degrees, the driving conditions remain more challenging than in daylight. InterFuser successfully detects a moving object at timestamp t_1 (Figure 9(b)), but it fails to recognize the pedestrian at timestamps t_2 and t_3 . From the control signals generated by InterFuser (highlighted in blue in the controller display at the bottom-right),

we observe that the ego vehicle does not apply any braking at timestamps t_2 and t_3 . Although the pedestrian's behavior contributed to the collision, InterFuser's failure to take appropriate actions (*i.e.*, braking) also makes it partially responsible for the accident.




Fig. 9. Pedestrian Collision under Low-Light Conditions (#1)

Case Study#2, #3 and #4: Vehicle Collision by InterFuser. As shown in Figure 10, the ego vehicle rear-collides with a van when changing lanes to exit the roundabout. At the time, the van is stationary in the ego vehicle's path. From Figure 10(c), we can see that while InterFuser successfully detects an object to the right of the ego vehicle, it misjudges the size of the obstacle. This misjudgment results in insufficient left steering by the ego vehicle, ultimately causing the collision. Figure 11

Figure 11 illustrates a collision caused by an improper lane change. At t_1 , two vehicles are turning left at an intersection, with the front vehicle controlled by InterFuser. Then, at t_2 , the ego vehicle merges into the side lane while a red car is driving alongside it on the left. Although InterFuser identified the red car, it failed to yield and persisted in making the lane change despite the situation. At t_3 , a side collision occurred due to an incorrect estimation of the red vehicle's speed.



Fig. 10. Vehicle Collision during Lane Change at the Roundabout (#2)




Fig. 11. Vehicle Collision during Lane Change at the Intersection (#3)

Figure 12 shows a more severe frontal collision. The ego vehicle, turning right at an intersection with insufficient steering, drives into the opposite lane. Unfortunately, a white truck is approaching from the opposite direction. Although the truck is braking, and InterFuser immediately outputs a brake signal (as shown in Figure 12(c)), trying to avoid the collision by stopping in front of the

truck. However, the ego vehicle's speed is too high to stop in time, and ultimately, the two vehicles collide head-on.



Fig. 12. Vehicle Collision during Turn Right (#4)

Answer to RQ2: SIMADFuzz reveals 32, 27, and 9 more unique violations than AV-Fuzzer, DriveFuzz, and TM-Fuzzer, demonstrating its effectiveness in generating high-quality scenarios for simulation-based testing.

5.2.3 RQ3: Diversity of Scenarios. The main goal of SIMADFuzz is to generate more diverse and interactive driving scenarios. One of the metrics used to evaluate diversity is ego vehicle trajectory coverage on the map [23]. We mark the waypoints on the Town03 map at 5-meter intervals and define trajectory coverage as the number of waypoints covered by the ego vehicle's route divided by the total number of waypoints on the map.

As shown in Figure 13, SIMADFuzz (*i.e.*, VS+D) achieved 61.25% trajectory coverage, significantly improving upon AV-Fuzzer (3.04%), which does not mutate the ego vehicle's route but only the NPCs, and DriveFuzz (13.85%), which mutates the ego vehicle's route only after the cycle and mutation process are completed. TM-Fuzzer, which aims to increase interactions by dynamically controlling traffic flow, achieved a trajectory coverage of 24.88%.

Recall that SIMADFuzz detects more violations than other fuzzers, which indicates that SIMADFuzz not only increases the diversity of the ego vehicle's trajectory across the map but also improves the quality of the scenarios for detecting risky behaviors.

Answer to RQ3: The strategies used in SIMADFuzz enhance the coverage of the ego vehicle's trajectory on the map, thereby improving the diversity of the generated scenarios.

5.3 Threats to Validity

5.3.1 Internal Validity. One potential threat to internal validity is the implementation of SIMADFuzz. We developed SIMADFuzz based on the DEAP and CARLA simulator and extended it by (1) enhancing the simulation information collector through analysis of actions determined by InterFuser, (2) integrating a model-based fitness evaluation using a deep neural network model and adapting the fitness score to the NSGA-2 algorithm provided by DEAP, and (3) customizing the scenario mutation procedure by introducing a distance-guided mutation strategy. Although the implementation of SIMADFuzz has undergone peer review, there may still be issues that could affect the experimental results. To mitigate this risk, we have made the source code of SIMADFuzz publicly available, allowing the community to reproduce the results and validate the implementation.




Fig. 13. Trajectory Coverage of Fuzzers in Town03

5.3.2 External Validity. A potential threat to external validity is that we evaluate the effectiveness of `SIMADFUZZ` only on `InterFuser`, which may limit the generalizability of the results to other ADS. However, it is important to note that `InterFuser` has achieved top-performing results on the CARLA Leaderboard. In future work, we plan to extend `SIMADFUZZ` to other ADS (e.g., Apollo and Autoware) and validate its effectiveness across a broader range of systems.

5.3.3 Construct Validity. The primary threat to construct validity lies in the metrics used to evaluate the effectiveness of `SIMADFUZZ`. In our experiment, we focus solely on the number of unique violations detected by each fuzzer. The violation oracle used in `SIMADFUZZ`, its variants, and other fuzzers are identical. Therefore, comparing the number of unique violations provides a fair assessment of the performance of `SIMADFUZZ`. Furthermore, the number of unique violations is a widely accepted metric in the evaluation of fuzz testing for ADS [10, 25], and it effectively reflects the capability of `SIMADFUZZ` in detecting violations within ADS.

6 Related Work

SIMADFUZZ leverages fuzzing techniques for simulation-based testing, and proposes novel scenario selection and mutation strategies to generate offspring scenarios. This section reviews the related work on simulation-based testing for ADS and optimization techniques for fuzz testing.

6.1 Simulation-based Testing for ADS

Simulation-based testing presents a viable and efficient alternative, enabling the exploration of a broad spectrum of scenarios and environments in a controlled and safe setting [38]. However, as the complexity of simulated environments increases, the number of configurable and variable elements also grows, leading to a vast space of possible scenarios. Therefore, simulation-based testing methods for ADS focus on how to generate critical scenarios.

Wang et al. [53] presented AdvSim, a framework that generates safety-critical scenarios by adversarially altering the trajectories of actors within traffic scenarios to test the LiDAR-based ADS. Gambi et al. [15] presented ASFault, which creates road networks to simulate driving scenarios and employs a genetic algorithm to generate tests aimed at exposing unsafe behaviors in lane-keeping systems.

Moreover, Sun et al. [47] and Zhang et al. [61] expanded the oracle of violations beyond collisions to traffic laws. They presented LawBreaker and GFlowNet, respectively, which assess the "distance" between the behavior of ego vehicles and traffic laws using signal temporal logic [34], thereby generating scenarios that more closely resemble violations. Huai et al. [25] presented Doppel, which replaces non-intelligent agents in the simulation with the ego vehicle, ensuring that all violations are triggered by the ego vehicle and reducing false positives. Lu et al. [32] proposed DeepCollision based on the Deep Q-Learning (DQN) algorithm [36], which calculates the safety distance and current distance to evaluate the collision probability, and designs reward functions to make the DQN output the optimal action, thereby increasing the possibility of detecting collision behaviors. Tian et al. proposed MOSAT [48] and CRISCO [49]. MOSAT represents vehicle driving behavior as a gene sequence composed of atomic driving maneuvers. It considers fitness metrics such as the estimation time to collision (ETTC) and leverage NSGA-2 to select scenarios, then the maneuver sequence are mutated to generate offspring driving scenarios. CRISCO extracts influential behavior patterns from historical traffic accidents, and assigns participants to move along specified trajectories during scenario generation. Additionally, CRISCO leverages ETTC to evaluate the criticality of driving scenarios, selecting more critical scenarios to challenge the ADS.

Haq et al. [21] focus on DNN-enabled systems and propose an online testing method that utilizes MOSA/FITEST as the multi-objective search algorithm to guide the generation of test cases. In contrast, SIMADFUZZ employs the NSGA-2 algorithm, which is orthogonal to MOSA/FITEST. While both aim to optimize multiple objectives, they do so through different methodologies and strategies, offering unique advantages in different contexts, such as exploration vs. exploitation trade-offs.

AV-Fuzzer [27], AutoFuzz [62], DriveFuzz [26], TM-Fuzzer [30], scenoRITA [24] and ScenarioFuzz [55] are representative methods that utilize fuzz testing techniques to generate scenarios for autonomous driving simulations. These fuzzers adapt their scenario generation strategies based on simulation feedback. For instance, AV-Fuzzer retains scenarios with higher potential safety risks when interacting with other actors. AutoFuzz evaluates objectives such as the ego vehicle's speed during collisions and the minimum distance to other actors. Similarly, DriveFuzz incorporates metrics such as hard braking, steering, and minimum distances as driving quality scores, selecting the scenarios with the highest fitness to generate offspring. TM-Fuzzer utilizes real-time traffic management and diversity analysis to search and generate critical and unique scenarios. scenoRITA optimize mutation strategies force on obstacles states (e.g., vehicles, pedestrians and bikes) and

proposed a technique to eliminate duplicate scenarios to enhance testing efficiency. The most similar work with SIMADFuzz is ScenarioFuzz, which builds a graph neural network to predict and filter out high-risk scenarios, while we leverage Transformer model to embed the scenarios by considering the temporal features of the ego vehicle and NPC vehicles. Note that SIMADFuzz selects scenarios based on multi-objective search algorithm NSGA-2, so it is convenient to adapt other fitness (such as confidence level proposed by ScenarioFuzz) to further refine our method.

6.2 Optimization Techniques for Fuzz Testing

Fuzz testing is a dynamic software analysis and testing technique that employs random inputs as test cases, which are then executed within the programs under test (PUT) [29]. The quality of test cases is pivotal to the efficacy of fuzz testing; high-quality test cases facilitate the exploration of more diverse execution paths within the program, while low-quality test cases may lead to inefficient resource allocation and reduced testing effectiveness. Thus, recent work focused on optimizing seed selection and mutation strategies to generate high-quality test cases.

For seed selection, Memlock [56] prioritizes seeds based on coverage and memory consumption to uncover vulnerabilities related to memory usage in PUT. Truzz [60] favors seeds that generate new edge coverages, thereby improving the code coverage. K-Scheduler [45] assigns different probabilities for selection based on the centrality of each seed. Cerebro [28] calculates a comprehensive score for seeds based on the complexity of unexplored code near the execution path. AFLSmart [39] computes the effectiveness ratio of seeds, with higher effectiveness seeds being allocated more resources, thus increasing the likelihood of generating effective offspring test cases.

For seed mutation, several works leverage machine learning models to optimize mutation strategies. Neuzz [44] employs a neural network model to smoothen complex PUT, establishing a relationship between test case byte sequences and branch coverage, identifying key byte positions through gradients for targeted mutation. MTFuzz [43] uses a Multi-Task neural network to learn a compact embedding of the input space for multiple related tasks, guiding the mutation process by focusing on high-gradient areas of the embedding. Wu et al. [57] proposed PreFuzz, which enhances gradient guidance through a resource-efficient edge selection mechanism and a probabilistic byte selection mechanism to improve mutation effectiveness.

Existing seed selection and mutation optimization strategies cannot be directly applied to fuzz testing for ADS, because the scenarios are well-defined structured data compared to byte sequences. Inspired by SmarTest [46], which leverages language models to prioritize and generate transaction sequences (*i.e.*, test cases in the context of smart contracts), SIMADFuzz employs a model-based fitness score evaluation method to optimize scenario selection. Furthermore, by measuring the distance between the ego vehicle and other traffic participants, the mutation strategy is refined to increase the probabilities of interactions between vehicles, leading to more effective scenario generation.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed a novel fuzz testing method SIMADFuzz, which addressed the limitations of existing methods and generated high-quality scenarios for autonomous driving systems. SIMADFuzz combines a model-based fitness evaluation approach with distance-guided mutation strategies to improve the ability of fuzz testing in detecting violations. We have conducted extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of SIMADFuzz. The results show that compared to the state-of-art approaches AV-Fuzzer, DriveFuzz and TM-Fuzzer, SIMADFuzz can detect 32, 27 and 9 more violations and demonstrate its ability to identify potential issues in the ADS.

In future work, we aim to further enhance scenario selection and mutation strategies. For example, we plan to incorporate factors such as traffic signals and weather conditions into the

neural network model to improve the accuracy of fitness value evaluation. In addition, we intend to explore the use of sequence models such as Informer [64], which has demonstrated superior performance over Transformers in extracting temporal features from trajectory prediction [8], to enhance the effectiveness of the scenario violation prediction model. Furthermore, we aim to extend the application of SIMADFuzz to other autonomous systems, such as unmanned aerial vehicles.

References

- [1] Bushra Alhijawi and Arafat Awajan. 2023. Genetic algorithms: Theory, genetic operators, solutions, and applications. *Evolutionary Intelligence* (2023), 1–12.
- [2] Baidu Apollo. 2023. Dreamview. <https://developer.apollo.auto/platform/simulation.html>.
- [3] Christian Birchler, Nicolas Ganz, Sajad Khatiri, Alessio Gambi, and Sebastiano Panichella. 2022. Cost-effective simulation-based test selection in self-driving cars software with SDC-Scissor. In *2022 IEEE international conference on software analysis, evolution and reengineering (SANER)*. IEEE, 164–168.
- [4] Christian Birchler, Sajad Khatiri, Bill Bosshard, Alessio Gambi, and Sebastiano Panichella. 2023. Machine learning-based test selection for simulation-based testing of self-driving cars software. *Empirical Software Engineering* 28, 3 (2023), 71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10664-023-10286-y>
- [5] Marcel Böhme, Van-Thuan Pham, Manh-Dung Nguyen, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2017. Directed Greybox Fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Dallas, Texas, USA) (CCS '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2329–2344. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3133956.3134020>
- [6] Ezequiel Castellano, Ahmet Cetinkaya, and Paolo Arcaini. 2021. Analysis of Road Representations in Search-Based Testing of Autonomous Driving Systems. In *2021 IEEE 21st International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security (QRS)*, 167–178. <https://doi.org/10.1109/QRS54544.2021.00028>
- [7] Ching-Yao Chan. 2017. Advancements, prospects, and impacts of automated driving systems. *International journal of transportation science and technology* 6, 3 (2017), 208–216.
- [8] Chongpu Chen, Xinbo Chen, Chong Guo, and Peng Hang. 2023. Trajectory Prediction for Autonomous Driving Based on Structural Informer Method. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering* (2023), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TASE.2023.3342978>
- [9] Chenyi Chen, Ari Seff, Alain Kornhauser, and Jianxiong Xiao. 2015. DeepDriving: Learning Affordance for Direct Perception in Autonomous Driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*.
- [10] Mingfei Cheng, Yuan Zhou, and Xiaofei Xie. 2023. Behaveexplor: Behavior diversity guided testing for autonomous driving systems. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 488–500.
- [11] Jiarun Dai, Bufan Gao, Mingyuan Luo, Zongan Huang, Zhongrui Li, Yuan Zhang, and Min Yang. 2024. SCTrans: Constructing a Large Public Scenario Dataset for Simulation Testing of Autonomous Driving Systems. In *Proceedings of the 46th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1–13.
- [12] Alexey Dosovitskiy, German Ros, Felipe Codevilla, Antonio Lopez, and Vladlen Koltun. 2017. CARLA: An open urban driving simulator. In *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 1–16.
- [13] Vinicius H. S. Durelli, Rafael S. Durelli, Simone S. Borges, Andre T. Endo, Marcelo M. Eler, Diego R. C. Dias, and Marcelo P. Guimarães. 2019. Machine Learning Applied to Software Testing: A Systematic Mapping Study. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 68, 3 (2019), 1189–1212. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TR.2019.2892517>
- [14] Alessio Gambi, Tri Huynh, and Gordon Fraser. 2019. Generating effective test cases for self-driving cars from police reports. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Tallinn, Estonia) (ESEC/FSE 2019)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 257–267. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3338906.3338942>
- [15] Alessio Gambi, Marc Müller, and Gordon Fraser. 2019. Asfalt: Testing self-driving car software using search-based procedural content generation. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE-Companion)*. IEEE, 27–30.
- [16] Hongbo Gao, Hang Su, Yingfeng Cai, Renfei Wu, Zhengyuan Hao, Yongheng Xu, Wei Wu, Jianqing Wang, Zhijun Li, and Zhen Kan. 2021. Trajectory prediction of cyclist based on dynamic Bayesian network and long short-term memory model at unsignalized intersections. *Science China Information Sciences* 64, 7 (2021), 172207.
- [17] Zhenhai Gao, Mingxi Bao, Fei Gao, and Minghong Tang. 2023. Probabilistic multi-modal expected trajectory prediction based on LSTM for autonomous driving. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering* (2023), 09544070231167906.
- [18] Joshua Garcia, Yang Feng, Junjie Shen, Sumaya Almanee, Yuan Xia, and Qi Alfred Chen. 2020. A comprehensive study of autonomous vehicle bugs. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (Seoul, South Korea) (ICSE '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 385–396. <https://doi.org/>

- 10.1145/3377811.3380397
- [19] Maosi Geng, Junyi Li, Yingji Xia, and Xiquan Michael Chen. 2023. A physics-informed Transformer model for vehicle trajectory prediction on highways. *Transportation research part C: emerging technologies* 154 (2023), 104272.
 - [20] Francesco Giuliani, Irtiza Hasan, Marco Cristani, and Fabio Galasso. 2021. Transformer Networks for Trajectory Forecasting. In *2020 25th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*. 10335–10342. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPR48806.2021.9412190>
 - [21] Fitash Ul Haq, Donghwan Shin, and Lionel C. Briand. 2022. Efficient Online Testing for DNN-Enabled Systems using Surrogate-Assisted and Many-Objective Optimization.. In *ICSE*. ACM, 811–822. <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/conf/icse/icse2022.html#Haq0B22>
 - [22] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation* 9, 8 (1997), 1735–1780.
 - [23] Zhisheng Hu, Shengjian Guo, Zhenyu Zhong, and Kang Li. 2021. Coverage-based scene fuzzing for virtual autonomous driving testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.00873* (2021).
 - [24] Yuqi Huai, Sumaya Almanee, Yuntianyi Chen, Xiafa Wu, Qi Alfred Chen, and Joshua Garcia. 2023. scenoRITA: Generating Diverse, Fully Mutable, Test Scenarios for Autonomous Vehicle Planning. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 10 (2023), 4656–4676. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2023.3309610>
 - [25] Yuqi Huai, Yuntianyi Chen, Sumaya Almanee, Tuan Ngo, Xiang Liao, Ziwen Wan, Qi Alfred Chen, and Joshua Garcia. 2023. Doppelgänger Test Generation for Revealing Bugs in Autonomous Driving Software. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Conference on Software Engineering (Melbourne, Victoria, Australia) (ICSE '23)*. IEEE Press, 2591–2603. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE48619.2023.00216>
 - [26] Seulbae Kim, Major Liu, Junghwan "John" Rhee, Yuseok Jeon, Yonghwi Kwon, and Chung Hwan Kim. 2022. DriveFuzz: Discovering Autonomous Driving Bugs through Driving Quality-Guided Fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (Los Angeles, CA, USA) (CCS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1753–1767. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3548606.3560558>
 - [27] Guanpeng Li, Yiran Li, Saurabh Jha, Timothy Tsai, Michael Sullivan, Siva Kumar Sastry Hari, Zbigniew Kalbarczyk, and Ravishankar Iyer. 2020. AV-FUZZER: Finding Safety Violations in Autonomous Driving Systems. In *2020 IEEE 31st International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering (ISSRE)*. 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSRE5003.2020.00012>
 - [28] Yuekang Li, Yinxing Xue, Hongxu Chen, Xiuheng Wu, Cen Zhang, Xiaofei Xie, Haijun Wang, and Yang Liu. 2019. Cerebro: context-aware adaptive fuzzing for effective vulnerability detection. In *Proceedings of the 2019 27th ACM Joint Meeting on European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering*. 533–544.
 - [29] Hongliang Liang, Xiaoxiao Pei, Xiaodong Jia, Wuwei Shen, and Jian Zhang. 2018. Fuzzing: State of the art. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability* 67, 3 (2018), 1199–1218.
 - [30] Shenghao Lin, Fansong Chen, Laile Xi, Gaosheng Wang, Rongrong Xi, Yuyan Sun, and Hongsong Zhu. 2024. TM-fuzzer: fuzzing autonomous driving systems through traffic management. *Automated Software Engineering* 31, 2 (2024), 61.
 - [31] Guannan Lou, Yao Deng, Xi Zheng, Mengshi Zhang, and Tianyi Zhang. 2022. Testing of autonomous driving systems: where are we and where should we go?. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM Joint European Software Engineering Conference and Symposium on the Foundations of Software Engineering (Singapore) (ESEC/FSE 2022)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 31–43. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3549111>
 - [32] Chengjie Lu, Yize Shi, Huihui Zhang, Man Zhang, Tiexin Wang, Tao Yue, and Shaukat Ali. 2023. Learning Configurations of Operating Environment of Autonomous Vehicles to Maximize their Collisions. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 49, 1 (2023), 384–402. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2022.3150788>
 - [33] Xiaolei Ma, Zhimin Tao, Yinhai Wang, Haiyang Yu, and Yunpeng Wang. 2015. Long short-term memory neural network for traffic speed prediction using remote microwave sensor data. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies* 54 (2015), 187–197.
 - [34] Oded Maler and Dejan Nickovic. 2004. Monitoring temporal properties of continuous signals. In *International Symposium on Formal Techniques in Real-Time and Fault-Tolerant Systems*. Springer, 152–166.
 - [35] Valentin J.M. Manès, HyungSeok Han, Choongwoo Han, Sang Kil Cha, Manuel Egele, Edward J. Schwartz, and Maverick Woo. 2021. The Art, Science, and Engineering of Fuzzing: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 47, 11 (2021), 2312–2331. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.2019.2946563>
 - [36] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Andrei A Rusu, Joel Veness, Marc G Bellemare, Alex Graves, Martin Riedmiller, Andreas K Fidjeland, Georg Ostrovski, et al. 2015. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *nature* 518, 7540 (2015), 529–533.
 - [37] Tobias Moers, Lennart Vater, Robert Krajewski, Julian Bock, Adrian Zlocki, and Lutz Eckstein. 2022. The exID Dataset: A Real-World Trajectory Dataset of Highly Interactive Highway Scenarios in Germany. In *2022 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. 958–964. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IV51971.2022.9827305>

- [38] Demin Nalic, Tomislav Mihalj, Maximilian Bäumler, Matthias Lehmann, Arno Eichberger, and Stefan Bernsteiner. 2020. Scenario based testing of automated driving systems: A literature survey. In *FISITA web Congress*, Vol. 10. 1.
- [39] Van-Thuan Pham, Marcel Böhme, Andrew E Santosa, Alexandru Răzvan Căciulescu, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2019. Smart greybox fuzzing. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* 47, 9 (2019), 1980–1997.
- [40] Guodong Rong, Byung Hyun Shin, Hadi Tabatabaee, Qiang Lu, Steve Lemke, Márton Možeiko, Eric Boise, Geehoon Uhm, Mark Gerow, Shalin Mehta, et al. 2020. Lgsvl simulator: A high fidelity simulator for autonomous driving. In *2020 IEEE 23rd International conference on intelligent transportation systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [41] Barbara Schütt, Markus Steimle, Birte Kramer, Danny Behnecke, and Eric Sax. 2022. A Taxonomy for Quality in Simulation-Based Development and Testing of Automated Driving Systems. *IEEE Access* 10 (2022), 18631–18644. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3149542>
- [42] Hao Shao, Letian Wang, Ruobing Chen, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. 2023. Safety-enhanced autonomous driving using interpretable sensor fusion transformer. In *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 726–737.
- [43] Dongdong She, Rahul Krishna, Lu Yan, Suman Jana, and Baishakhi Ray. 2020. MTFuzz: fuzzing with a multi-task neural network. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM joint meeting on European software engineering conference and symposium on the foundations of software engineering*. 737–749.
- [44] Dongdong She, Kexin Pei, Dave Epstein, Junfeng Yang, Baishakhi Ray, and Suman Jana. 2019. Neuzz: Efficient fuzzing with neural program smoothing. In *2019 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 803–817.
- [45] Dongdong She, Abhishek Shah, and Suman Jana. 2022. Effective seed scheduling for fuzzing with graph centrality analysis. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*. IEEE, 2194–2211.
- [46] Sunbeom So, Seongjoon Hong, and Hakjoo Oh. 2021. SmarTest: Effectively Hunting Vulnerable Transaction Sequences in Smart Contracts through Language Model-Guided Symbolic Execution. In *30th USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 21)*. USENIX Association, 1361–1378. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/usenixsecurity21/presentation/so>
- [47] Yang Sun, Christopher M Poskitt, Jun Sun, Yuqi Chen, and Zijiang Yang. 2022. LawBreaker: An approach for specifying traffic laws and fuzzing autonomous vehicles. In *Proceedings of the 37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*. 1–12.
- [48] Haoxiang Tian, Yan Jiang, Guoquan Wu, Jiren Yan, Jun Wei, Wei Chen, Shuo Li, and Dan Ye. 2022. 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 (Singapore, Singapore) (ESEC/FSE 2022)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 94–106. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3540250.3549100>
- [49] Haoxiang Tian, Guoquan Wu, Jiren Yan, Yan Jiang, Jun Wei, Wei Chen, Shuo Li, and Dan Ye. 2023. 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 (Rochester, MI, USA) (ASE '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 46, 12 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3551349.3560430>
- [50] tier4. 2023. AWSIM. <https://github.com/tier4/AWSIM>.
- [51] Simon Ulbrich, Till Menzel, Andreas Reschka, Fabian Scholdt, and Markus Maurer. 2015. Defining and Substantiating the Terms Scene, Situation, and Scenario for Automated Driving. In *2015 IEEE 18th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*. 982–988. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC.2015.164>
- [52] A Vaswani. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2017).
- [53] Jingkan Wang, Ava Pun, James Tu, Sivabalan Manivasagam, Abbas Sadat, Sergio Casas, Mengye Ren, and Raquel Urtasun. 2021. AdvSim: Generating Safety-Critical Scenarios for Self-Driving Vehicles. In *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 9904–9913. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR46437.2021.00978>
- [54] Sen Wang, Zhuheng Sheng, Jingwei Xu, Taolue Chen, Junjun Zhu, Shuhui Zhang, Yuan Yao, and Xiaoxing Ma. 2022. ADEPT: A Testing Platform for Simulated Autonomous Driving. In *37th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering, ASE 2022, Rochester, MI, USA, October 10-14, 2022*. ACM, 150:1–150:4. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3551349.3559528>
- [55] Tong Wang, Taotao Gu, Huan Deng, Hu Li, Xiaohui Kuang, and Gang Zhao. 2024. Dance of the ADS: Orchestrating Failures through Historically-Informed Scenario Fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 1086–1098.
- [56] Cheng Wen, Haijun Wang, Yuekang Li, Shengchao Qin, Yang Liu, Zhiwu Xu, Hongxu Chen, Xiaofei Xie, Geguang Pu, and Ting Liu. 2020. Memlock: Memory usage guided fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. 765–777.
- [57] Mingyuan Wu, Ling Jiang, Jiahong Xiang, Yuqun Zhang, Guowei Yang, Huixin Ma, Sen Nie, Shi Wu, Heming Cui, and Lingming Zhang. 2022. Evaluating and improving neural program-smoothing-based fuzzing. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 847–858.
- [58] Yufei Xu, Yu Wang, and Srinivas Peeta. 2023. Leveraging transformer model to predict vehicle trajectories in congested urban traffic. *Transportation research record* 2677, 2 (2023), 898–909.

- [59] Chi Zhang, Yuehu Liu, Danchen Zhao, and Yuanqi Su. 2014. RoadView: A traffic scene simulator for autonomous vehicle simulation testing. In *17th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. 1160–1165. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC.2014.6957844>
- [60] Kunpeng Zhang, Xi Xiao, Xiaogang Zhu, Ruoxi Sun, Minhui Xue, and Sheng Wen. 2022. Path transitions tell more: Optimizing fuzzing schedules via runtime program states. In *Proceedings of the 44th International Conference on Software Engineering*. 1658–1668.
- [61] Xiaodong Zhang, Wei Zhao, Yang Sun, Jun Sun, Yulong Shen, Xuewen Dong, and Zijiang Yang. 2023. Testing automated driving systems by breaking many laws efficiently. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*. 942–953.
- [62] Ziyuan Zhong, Gail Kaiser, and Baishakhi Ray. 2022. Neural network guided evolutionary fuzzing for finding traffic violations of autonomous vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* (2022).
- [63] Husheng Zhou, Wei Li, Zelun Kong, Junfeng Guo, Yuqun Zhang, Bei Yu, Lingming Zhang, and Cong Liu. 2020. DeepBillboard: systematic physical-world testing of autonomous driving systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering (Seoul, South Korea) (ICSE '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 347–358. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3377811.3380422>
- [64] Haoyi Zhou, Shanghang Zhang, Jieqi Peng, Shuai Zhang, Jianxin Li, Hui Xiong, and Wancai Zhang. 2021. Informer: Beyond efficient transformer for long sequence time-series forecasting. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 11106–11115.
- [65] Eckart Zitzler and Lothar Thiele. 1999. Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: a comparative case study and the strength Pareto approach. *IEEE transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 3, 4 (1999), 257–271.