

# Towards Developing Socially Compliant Automated Vehicles: State of the Art, Experts Expectations, and A Conceptual Framework

Yongqi Dong <sup>a\*, b</sup>, Bart van Arem <sup>a</sup>, and Haneen Farah <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> Institute of Highway Engineering, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

## ABSTRACT

Automated Vehicles (AVs) hold promise for revolutionizing transportation by improving road safety, traffic efficiency, and overall mobility. Despite the steady advancement in high-level AVs in recent years, the transition to full automation entails a period of mixed traffic, where AVs of varying automation levels coexist with human-driven vehicles (HDVs). Making AVs socially compliant and understood by human drivers is expected to improve the safety and efficiency of mixed traffic. Thus, ensuring AVs compatibility with HDVs and social acceptance is crucial for their successful and seamless integration into mixed traffic. However, research in this critical area of developing Socially Compliant AVs (SCAVs) remains sparse. This study carries out the first comprehensive scoping review to assess the current state of the art in developing SCAVs, identifying key concepts, methodological approaches, and research gaps. An expert interview was also conducted to identify critical research gaps and expectations towards SCAVs. Based on the scoping review and expert interview input, a conceptual framework is proposed for the development of SCAVs. The conceptual framework is evaluated using an online survey targeting researchers, technicians, policymakers, and other relevant professionals worldwide. The survey results provide valuable validation and insights, affirming the significance of the proposed conceptual framework in tackling the challenges of integrating AVs into mixed-traffic environments. Additionally, future research perspectives and suggestions are discussed, contributing to the research and development agenda of SCAVs.

Keywords: Automated vehicles, Socially compliant driving, Mixed traffic, Conceptual model, Scoping review

## 1. Introduction

Automated vehicles (AVs) are expected to benefit traffic safety and efficiency (Greenblatt & Shaheen, 2015; Jamson et al., 2011; Talebpour & Mahmassani, 2016; Yaqoob et al., 2020). Although steady development of higher levels of AVs is gradually witnessed, their deployment will not happen overnight. Instead, a transition period is inevitable, during which AVs with various automation levels will share the same road environment with human drivers, leading to mixed traffic conditions.

The Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) defines six levels of driving automation (SAE International, 2021) ranging from No Driving Automation (Level 0) to Full Driving Automation (Level 5). Level 0 has no automation, and the driver is fully responsible for all aspects of driving. Levels 1 and 2 introduce partial automation, where the driver remains responsible for driving, even with the assistance of automated features, and must supervise these features continuously. The difference between Levels 1 and 2 lies in the scope of control supported: Level 1 supports either steering or brake/acceleration, while Level 2 supports both simultaneously, encompassing longitudinal and lateral control. At levels 3, 4, and 5 the automated system monitors the environment with full automation capabilities when the automated driving (AD) features are engaged. However, distinctions exist among these levels. At Level 3, known as conditional automation, drivers must be prepared to intervene and resume control when prompted by the AD features. While at Levels 4 and Level 5, the AD features will never make such requests. For

---

Manuscript submitted December 17, 2024.

\* Corresponding author.

Email: [yongqi.dong@rwth-aachen.de](mailto:yongqi.dong@rwth-aachen.de); Tel: +31 616619399

Mailing address: Mies-van-der-Rohe-Str. 1, 52074 Aachen, Germany

Level 4, the AD features can operate the vehicle only under specific conditions defined by the Operational Design Domain (ODD). In contrast, Level 5 allows the AD features to operate the vehicle under all conditions.

The deployment of AVs in mixed traffic introduces new challenges and novel interactions which may introduce uncertainties and issues that affect both road safety and efficiency (Fagnant & Kockelman, 2015; Farah et al., 2022; Fraedrich et al., 2015; Raju et al., 2022). Moreover, there is a pressing need to ensure the acceptance of AVs by human drivers to seamlessly integrate them into existing traffic systems (Łach & Svyetlichnyy, 2024; Orieno et al., 2024).

Regarding the development of AVs' driving behaviors, previous studies have traditionally prioritized aspects such as safety, efficiency, comfort, and energy consumption (Du et al., 2022; ElSamadisy et al., 2024; Vasile et al., 2023; M. Zhu et al., 2020). While these elements are essential, the growing complexity of mixed traffic environments—where AVs must coexist with human-driven vehicles (HDVs)—highlights the importance of ensuring that AVs' driving behaviors are socially compliant. Referring and upgrading upon the definition provided in (Schwartz et al., 2019), socially compliant driving of AVs can be defined as behaving predictably and complying with the social expectations of human drivers and other surrounding road users (including other AVs) when encountering social dilemmas during driving with intensive interactions (e.g., driving through unsignalized intersections, roundabouts, on-ramp/off-ramp merging, or unprotected left turning). This encompasses compliance with different local driving cultures, norms, cues, formal and informal traffic rules, and behaviors expected in specific contexts. The capability of AVs to drive in a predictable and socially compliant way is critical not only for enhancing safety and efficiency but also for fostering understanding and acceptance of AVs by human drivers. Consequently, there is a growing interest in designing and developing socially compliant automated driving systems. AVs with socially compliant driving capabilities, i.e., socially compliant AVs (SCAVs), generally correspond to Level 3 to Level 5 automation. While infrequent, certain aspects of socially compliant driving might also be observed at Level 2 or Level 1 automation, where partial driver assistance needs to be provided when requested. Nevertheless, the full potential of socially compliant AVs is most relevant and impactful at higher levels of automation, where AVs are expected to make independent decisions in complex traffic scenarios.

Some preliminary efforts have been made in the domain of socially compliant driving, e.g., (Hang et al., 2021; Kolekar et al., 2020; Schwartz et al., 2019; W. Wang et al., 2022). These studies have laid important groundwork by exploring various aspects of social compliance of AVs, including modeling social interactions, understanding the dynamics between HDVs and AVs, and developing models for socially aware perception, decision-making, or trajectory planning. However, despite these advancements, research on this emerging topic remains relatively limited, particularly in areas such as the modeling of different driving norms and implicit communication in different cultural backgrounds. The current studies lack a comprehensive, integrated approach that fully addresses the complexities, multidisciplinary, and multifaceted nature of socially compliant driving. Therefore, there is a clear and pressing need for the development of an integrated conceptual framework that can guide future research, providing a holistic understanding of socially compliant driving and helping to design a research agenda to bridge the gaps in the current literature.

To advance research in the domain of SCAVs, this study embarks on a comprehensive approach employing an integrated research method. It begins with a scoping review of the current state of the art, aimed at identifying key concepts, methodological approaches, and research gaps. Additionally, an informal expert interview was conducted to gather insights into critical issues and research expectations towards socially compliant AVs. Subsequently, leveraging the findings from the scoping review and expert interview, a conceptual framework is proposed. This framework incorporates all aspects deemed necessary, based on the scoping review and expert interviews, for the development of SCAVs. To validate and refine the proposed conceptual framework as well as gain further insights, an online survey was developed and responses from experts worldwide were collected. The survey results provide valuable validation and insights, affirming the significance of the framework for developing SCAVs to safely and efficiently integrate them into mixed traffic environments. Additionally, suggestions for

future enhancements are elicited, contributing to the continuous development of AV technology and guiding potential directions for further research and development.

## **2. Scoping Literature Review**

In this study, a scoping review is adopted to synthesize the current research evidence and state of the practice in scientific peer-reviewed publications, as well as identify the key concepts, predominant research approaches, and research gaps related to SCAVs.

A scoping review was selected over a systematic review due to the exploratory nature of the research objective. Compared to systematic reviews which aim to provide a synthesis and critical appraisal of the published evidence (Munn et al., 2018), scoping reviews are more suitable to summarize and report the research evidence on emerging and burgeoning topics, where evidence is limited and not yet systematically consolidated. As outlined in (Arksey & O'Malley, 2005; Tafidis et al., 2022), scoping reviews aim to provide a broad overview of available research, identifying relevant key concepts, methodologies, and gaps that require further investigation. Considering that AVs, especially SCAVs, are still in the early stages of development, with a relatively small body of research, a scoping review approach is more appropriate for mapping the current state of the field.

The scope of the review specifically targets methodologies and technical developments (i.e., the methods, algorithms, platforms, tools, and datasets that have been employed), as well as the substantive content of reviewed studies (e.g., what has been done, what scenarios/maneuvers have been covered), that are relevant to SCAVs. This focus aligns with the study's goal of proposing a conceptual framework to guide future research and development. The descriptive nature of the scoping review allows for an expansive exploration of the research landscape, offering a foundation for conceptualizing SCAVs in the context of mixed-traffic environments. It is important to note that detailed analyses and discussions of the findings and conclusions from the reviewed studies are beyond the scope of this study, as the primary focus is on synthesizing key methodological insights to inform the proposed framework.

### **2.1 Five-step approach**

In this study, a five-step scoping review was utilized to identify and report related existing literature and map the results. The five steps of the methodological approach are:

Step 1: Setting up eligibility criteria and information sources

Step 2: Developing search strategy and process

Step 3: Screening and selecting studies

Step 4: Charting and visualizing the studies

Step 5: Summarizing, synthesizing, and reporting the results

This five-step approach is a condensed version of the well-designed PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) (Tricco et al., 2018), developed in consultation with an international panel of experts to enhance research and scientific publications.

#### **2.1.1 Step 1: Setting up eligibility criteria and information sources**

In this step, eligibility criteria and information sources are established to guide the selection of studies for the scoping review. In principle, only peer-reviewed research papers published in journals and conference proceedings in English up till May 21, 2024, were considered eligible for the scoping review. It is essential that the pertinent studies involve the social interactions between AVs and HDVs, as well as between AVs and other road users (e.g., cyclists, and pedestrians). Publications solely discussing and modeling the social interactions and behaviors among humans (e.g., drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians) without insights into SCAVs are deemed ineligible and thus excluded from the review process. There have been a few review papers including such publications, e.g., (Crosato, Tian, et al., 2023; W. Wang et al., 2022). Therefore, the main difference and key contribution of the literature review part in this study lie in its dedicated focus on socially compliant driving, specifically emphasizing interactions involving AVs or insights toward this goal as a core criterion.

Various academic databases and repositories were used, including Scopus, Web of Science (*Web of Science All Databases* not the *Web of Science Core Collection*), IEEE Xplore, and Transport Research International Documentation (TRID). The four databases provide access to a wide range of peer-reviewed research papers published in journals and conference proceedings, offering comprehensive coverage of scholarly literature in the field of transportation and automated driving research.

### 2.1.2 Step 2: Developing search strategy and process

In this step, a systematic search strategy is developed to identify relevant studies for inclusion in the scoping review. The search strategy encompasses a combination of keywords and controlled vocabulary terms related to socially compliant automated driving, social-aware automated driving, social interaction, automated driving, and other associated concepts. Recognizing the varied terminologies used in the domain of automated driving, the search includes different spellings, synonyms, and variants of related concepts to ensure inclusivity. The keywords for each associated term are illustrated in **Table 1**, facilitating a nuanced and exhaustive search process.

Table 1. Keywords used for each associated term.

Term	Relevant keywords
Automated vehicle	(Autonomous OR automated OR driverless OR driver-less OR self-driving OR selfdriving) AND (car OR vehicle); (Autonomous OR automated) driving
Socially compliant driving	(Social OR social-aware OR socially compliant OR human-like) AND (driving OR interaction OR behaviour OR behavior OR navigation OR decision-making OR trajectory planning OR planning and control); driving AND (social compliance OR social acceptance)

Boolean operators and truncation were utilized to enhance the precision and comprehensiveness of the search. Furthermore, the employed search strings were tailored to meet the specific requirements (e.g., in length) and functionalities of each selected database. The time range was set to 2000-2024. The language of publications was limited to English. Furthermore, only the publications within the subject areas of Mathematics, Psychology, Physics, Neurosciences, Computer Science, Behavioral Sciences, Social Sciences, Operations Research and Management Science, Engineering (including Transportation, Robotics, Telecommunications, Automation Control Systems, etc.), as well as Science Technology, were considered valid. Publications falling into the other domains, e.g., Art, Architecture, Demography, International Relations, Public Administration, Social Issues, etc., were excluded.

It is also important to mention that the literature search was carried out in two phases. One phase before the conceptual design and online questionnaire survey, and the second phase afterwards to capture new publications that had emerged during that time period.

### 2.1.3 Step 3: Screening and selecting studies

In this phase, the screening process commences with an initial evaluation of the titles, abstracts, and keywords of the search results to determine their alignment with the research objectives and relevance to the study topic. This preliminary assessment serves to identify potentially eligible studies for further consideration. Subsequently, the full-text articles of the identified studies undergo a thorough review to assess their eligibility. Only studies that are deemed truly pertinent to the research objectives are selected for inclusion in the scoping review.

Furthermore, to ensure the comprehensiveness of the literature coverage, a backward and forward snowballing technique was employed. This technique involves examining the reference lists of the selected papers and the papers that cite the selected papers to identify additional relevant studies that may have been missed in the initial search.

#### **2.1.4 Step 4: Charting and visualizing the studies**

In this step, the selected studies undergo abstraction and charting to capture their general characteristics, including authorship details, year of publication, source of publication, the disciplinary focus of the journal or conference, keywords, abstract content, number of citations, etc. This process enables a comprehensive overview of the literature landscape and facilitates the identification of trends, patterns, and relationships among the selected studies.

Furthermore, keyword network analysis using VOSviewer (van Eck & Waltman, 2010) and Sankey diagram visualization techniques were employed to visually represent the relationships among key terms of methodologies adopted and targeted use cases in the identified studies. Keyword network analysis provides insights into the interconnectedness of key terms and concepts within the literature, highlighting prominent themes and areas of focus. By analyzing the co-occurrence and relationships between keywords, researchers can identify clusters of related concepts and uncover overarching themes. The Sankey diagram visualization offers a graphical representation of the flow of information between different categories or variables, illustrating the distribution and relationships between various elements in the selected studies and providing a holistic view of the research landscape. By visualizing the flow of information, researchers can identify patterns, trends, and relationships that may not be immediately apparent from textual analysis alone.

By leveraging these visualization techniques, the findings of the scoping review are presented in a clear and concise manner, enabling stakeholders to easily interpret and understand the key findings and insights derived from the selected studies. Additionally, visualizing the data enhances the accessibility and communicability of the research findings, and facilitates knowledge dissemination. So that researchers can gain deeper insights into the structure and content of the literature, ultimately contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of the research field.

#### **2.1.5 Step 5: Summarizing, synthesizing, and reporting the results**

In this final step, the results of the scoping review are synthesized and mapped based on the extracted and charted data, as well as the findings from keyword network analysis and Sankey diagram visualization. The synthesized results are organized into clusters highlighting key themes, methodological approaches, application cases, study designs, models, metrics used, and broad findings identified in the selected studies. This allows for the identification of commonalities and differences among studies and provides a comprehensive overview of the literature landscape.

Furthermore, relevant research gaps were identified based on the synthesized results, highlighting areas where further investigation is needed and providing valuable insights for the development of an integrated conceptual framework that addresses key challenges and opportunities in the development of SCAVs.

## **2.2 Scoping literature review results**

### **2.2.1 Selection of pertinent studies**

The literature search through the four selected academic databases and under the aforementioned search process originally returned 1542 records, i.e., there were 432 records (361 published documents and 71 preprints) by Scopus, 258 records by Web of Science (publications and preprints together), 634 records by IEEE Xplore (including early access articles), and 218 records by TRID. Additionally, 11 studies that were identified during the screening process through snowballing were also added, so that in total, 1553 studies were qualified for the screening process.

These records were exported as comma-separated values (CSV) files and processed using Pandas Python Data Analysis Library to merge and group the records and remove the duplicates. Together with the manual examination of the titles, a total of 1327 valid unique records proceeded to the preliminary checking process. Then based on the title and abstract, 209 studies were identified to be either directly relevant to, or capable of, providing valuable insights into automated driving interactions with HDVs in mixed traffic, among which four are review or survey papers (Benrachou et al., 2022; Crosato, Tian, et

al., 2023; W. Wang et al., 2022; T. Zhang et al., 2023), and one is about cognitive architecture design and perspectives (Xie et al., 2020). Following a detailed examination regarding their full text, 68 were finally screened out due to their potential to contribute significantly to the understanding and development of socially compliant automated driving in mixed traffic. Thus, the 68 studies were ultimately selected for in-depth review. **Figure 1** illustrates the selection process of pertinent studies under the PRISMA pipeline. A full list of the 209 studies is provided in Supplementary Attachment 1 at: <https://lnkd.in/gpceU6gQ>.




Figure 1. Pertinent studies selection process flow diagram.

### 2.2.2 Charting, visualizing, summarizing, synthesizing, and reporting the results

Firstly, to visualize the key terms, methods, and concepts related to socially compliant driving and the development of SCAVs, the relevant publications identified by the Web of Science search engine were visualized using the keyword network plot by VOSviewer shown in **Figure 2**. Please note this study selected Web of Science as the sole database for visualization due to VOSviewer's limitations and the practical challenges associated with integrating multiple databases. Using the Web of Science database effectively captured the primary information and relationships between key terms and concepts, making it a suitable choice for constructing the keyword network visualization. The size of the nodes and thickness of the links depict the scale of the publications in the corresponding areas of the keyword, and the different color depicts the clusters.




Figure 2. Keyword network visualization by VOSviewer.

The analysis shows that *decision making* appears to be the most frequent keyword, followed by terms like *agent*, *policy*, *dataset*, *robotics*, *human driver*, *robots*, *safety*, and *efficiency*, among others. From the visualizations, one can also identify the commonly adopted methods and terms, such as *deep learning*, *neural networks*, *game theory*, *model predictive control*, and *optimization*. These results provide valuable global insights for understanding the target domain of socially compliant driving.

To design SCAVs, methodologies identified in the reviewed literature can be broadly grouped into learning-based and model/utility-based approaches. In practice, learning-based and model-based approaches often complement each other to achieve more robust and adaptable performance. Specifically, the detailed methodologies can be roughly classified into five key sub-categories:

#### (1) Imitation Learning of Social Driving Behaviors from Human Drivers

This approach focuses on replicating the social driving behaviors of human drivers through imitation learning techniques, such as behavior cloning (Linguang Wang et al., 2023a, 2023b; Z. Zhu & Zhao, 2023), inverse reinforcement learning (IRL) (Geng et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2019), and generative adversarial imitation learning, e.g., in (Da & Hua, 2023). The AV learns to mimic human-like decision-making and driving patterns by observing and imitating from either expert demonstrations or processed empirical real-world driving data. This method can work in an end-to-end pipeline but is not necessary. Representative works in this direction include (Da & Hua, 2023; Sun et al., 2019; Z. Wang et al., 2021; C. Xu et al., 2023).

#### (2) Reinforcement Learning Combined with Utility-based Models

In this approach, reinforcement learning (RL) is employed to infer the underlying utility (also referred to as *reward* in many studies) functions that govern social driving behaviors from observed human (expert) demonstrations or empirical driving data. The utility functions quantify social factors such as deterministic courtesy (Sun et al., 2018), and the magnitude of the concern people have for others relative to themselves, e.g., through Social Value Orientation (Liebrand & McClintock, 1988; Murphy & Ackermann, 2014; Schwarting et al., 2019). This method enables AVs to learn and adapt the

relevant social factors influencing human decision-making to achieve socially compliant behavior (Buckman et al., 2019; Larsson et al., 2021; Nan et al., 2024; Schwarting et al., 2019; Letian Wang et al., 2021; Xue et al., 2023; Yoon & Ayalew, 2019).

### *(3) Model-Based Generation of Human-Like Behaviors*

This category encompasses approaches that leverage mathematical models to replicate human driving behaviors and/or inform socially aware decision-making. Techniques within this category, such as game theory, social force models, driving risk field models, and potential field models, simulate the complex interaction dynamics between AVs and other road users, including HDVs, pedestrians, and cyclists. Game theory, in particular, provides a framework for strategic decision-making by modeling interactions as a series of cooperative or competitive scenarios where AVs make decisions based on anticipated responses from surrounding agents (Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Lv, et al., 2022; Shu et al., 2023). Other models, like the social force model, e.g., in (Chen et al., 2024; Reddy et al., 2021; Yoon & Ayalew, 2019), driving risk field model, e.g., in (Geng et al., 2023; Kolekar et al., 2020; J. Wang et al., 2023), and potential field model, e.g., in (Bhatt et al., 2022; Yan et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2024), capture the forces, risks, and potential outcomes of interactions in mixed-traffic environments, allowing for a more nuanced emulation of human-like behaviors. These model-based approaches are valuable for predicting and generating socially compliant driving behaviors by considering both explicit rules and inferred human tendencies. Notable contributions in this area include, e.g., (Bhatt et al., 2022; Ferrer & Sanfeliu, 2014; Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Lv, Huang, Xing, et al., 2020; Kolekar et al., 2020; A. Li et al., 2023; J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; Shu et al., 2023; J. Wang et al., 2023).

It can be noted that, usually, these models can be integrated with learning-based approaches (especially RL) to enhance their adaptability and responsiveness in real-time applications, as seen in works like (J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; Xiao Wang et al., 2024).

### *(4) Trajectory Prediction through Integration of Social Factors with Machine Learning for Encouraging Socially-compliant Behaviors*

This sub-category focuses on the use of machine learning (ML) models, integrated with **social factors**, to predict trajectories that reflect socially compliant behavior. Unlike categories (1) and (2), which generally deliver driving control actions, the approaches here rely on deep learning (DL) using deep neural networks (DNNs) or IRL aided by social factor models to analyze and learn from large datasets and forecast the socially compliant trajectories of surrounding HDVs, pedestrians, and/or other road users. By accurately predicting these trajectories, the ego AV can then adjust its actions to achieve corresponding socially compliant driving behavior, thus ensuring smoother and safer interactions in mixed-traffic scenarios (Geng et al., 2023; Vemula et al., 2018; Yoon & Ayalew, 2019). The prediction can then be used for RL control (Valiente et al., 2024) to leverage prediction and social awareness in RL decision-making, to improve safety and efficiency.

### *(5) Optimization-Based Tuning of Social Driving Parameters*

This approach leverages optimization techniques to fine-tune the parameters of driving models to achieve desired social objectives, such as individualistic, altruistic, or pro-social driving behavior. By adjusting and optimizing these parameters, the models aim to balance trade-offs between safety, efficiency, and comfort while considering the benefits of the ego AV versus surrounding vehicles or other road participants in mixed-traffic environments. Representative studies in this category include, e.g., (Larsson et al., 2021).

These aforementioned methodologies collectively represent the current state of research in socially compliant driving behavior for AVs. They highlight the multidisciplinary nature of the field, which combines elements of artificial intelligence (AI) (e.g., ML, DL, RL), physics, human factors, control theory, social psychology, and transportation engineering. The integration of multidisciplinary knowledge is crucial for developing AVs capable of safely and efficiently interacting with HDVs and other road users in complex traffic environments. It is important to note that the different approaches categorized are not mutually exclusive: in practice, they can be utilized in combination to enhance the robustness and reliability of AV behavior. A detailed illustration of the models, terms, and methods adopted by the studies is provided in **Table 2** and **Figure 3**.



Table 2. Clustering of methods identified in the papers reviewed.

(A) Machine Learning based methods

Methods and Terms Adopted		Related Publications	
Machine Learning (DL, RL)	Deep Learning	CNN	(Ding et al., 2022; Hirose et al., 2024; Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Qin et al., 2021; Valiente et al., 2024)
		GAN	(Da & Hua, 2023; Gupta et al., 2018; Kothari & Alahi, 2023; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Z. Wang et al., 2021)
		LSTM	(Alahi et al., 2016; W. J. Chang et al., 2023; Da & Hua, 2023; Ding et al., 2022; Gupta et al., 2018; Z. Huang, Liu, et al., 2023; Kothari et al., 2021; Kothari & Alahi, 2023; Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Vemula et al., 2018; Xueyang Wang et al., 2024; Z. Wang et al., 2021)
		MLP	(W. J. Chang et al., 2023; Da & Hua, 2023; Z. Huang, Liu, et al., 2023; Kothari & Alahi, 2023; Xue et al., 2023; Z. Zhu & Zhao, 2023)
		Transformer	(Geng et al., 2023; B. Huang & Sun, 2023; Z. Huang, Liu, et al., 2023; Xiao Wang et al., 2024)
		Attention Module	(Kothari & Alahi, 2023; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Qin et al., 2021; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Vemula et al., 2018; Z. Wang et al., 2021; Xue et al., 2023)
		Graph Attention Network	(Xueyang Wang et al., 2024)
		Autoencoder	(J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Valiente et al., 2024; Zong et al., 2023)
		GRU	(J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Zong et al., 2023)
		Social Pooling Layer	(Alahi et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2018)
	Reinforcement Learning	Actor-Critic	(Crosato et al., 2021; Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; L. Liu et al., 2020; Toghi et al., 2021a; Tong et al., 2024; Xue et al., 2023; Zong et al., 2023)
		Deep Q-learning	(Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; Lu et al., 2022; Nan et al., 2024; Taghavifar & Mohammadzadeh, 2024; Toghi et al., 2021b, 2022; Valiente et al., 2024)
		IRL	(Geng et al., 2023; Z. Huang, Liu, et al., 2023; Nan et al., 2024; Schwarting et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2018, 2019; C. Xu et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024)
		PPO	(Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024)
		Coordinated Policy Optimization	(Peng et al., 2021)

(B) Game theory, field-based models, and social psychological factor related methods

Methods and Terms Adopted		Related Publications
Game Theory	Stackelberg Game	(Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Huang, et al., 2022b; Hang, Lv, Huang, Cai, et al., 2020; C. Li et al., 2022; Schwarting et al., 2019; Letian Wang et al., 2021; Zhao et al., 2024)
	Nash-equilibrium based Game	(Galati et al., 2022; Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Huang, et al., 2022b; J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; M. Liu et al., 2024; Shu et al., 2023; J. Wang et al., 2023)
	POSG	(Toghi et al., 2021b, 2022; Valiente et al., 2024; Xue et al., 2023)
	Coalitional Game	(Hang, Huang, et al., 2022a; Hang, Lv, et al., 2022)
	Potential Game	(M. Liu et al., 2024)
Social Psychological Factor	SVO	(Buckman et al., 2019; Crosato et al., 2021; Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; Peng et al., 2021; Schwarting et al., 2019; Taghavifar & Mohammadzadeh, 2024; Toghi et al., 2021a, 2021b, 2022; Tong et al., 2024; Valiente et al., 2024; Xue et al., 2023; L. Zhang et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024)
	Courtesy	(W. J. Chang et al., 2023; C. Li et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2018; Letian Wang et al., 2021)
	Coordination Tendency	(J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024)
	Social Preference	(Lu et al., 2022)
	Social Cohesion	(Landolfi & Dragan, 2018)
	Social Anchor	(Kothari et al., 2021)
Field-based Models	Potential Field	(Bhatt et al., 2022; Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Huang, et al., 2022a, 2022b; Hang, Lv, Huang, Cai, et al., 2020; Reddy et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2024)
	Risk Field	(Geng et al., 2023; Kolekar et al., 2020; J. Wang et al., 2023; Xiao Wang et al., 2024; L. Zhang et al., 2023)

## (C) Other models and methods

Methods and Terms Adopted	Related Publications
Model Predictive Control	(Bhatt et al., 2022; Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Huang, et al., 2022a; Hang, Lv, Huang, Cai, et al., 2020; Landolfi & Dragan, 2018; Larsson et al., 2021; Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2018, 2019; J. Wang et al., 2023; Letian Wang et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2022; Yoon & Ayalew, 2019; L. Zhang et al., 2023)
Markov Decision Process	(Crosato et al., 2021; Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; Da & Hua, 2023; Ding et al., 2022; Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2021; Song et al., 2016; Zong et al., 2023)
Expert Demonstration	(Da & Hua, 2023; Z. Huang, Liu, et al., 2023; Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; Nan et al., 2024; Qin et al., 2021; Z. Zhu & Zhao, 2023)
Social Force Model	(Chen et al., 2024; Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; Ferrer & Sanfeliu, 2014; Reddy et al., 2021; Yoon & Ayalew, 2019)
Addressing Uncertainties	(Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; Kolekar et al., 2020; Sun et al., 2019; Letian Wang et al., 2021)
Bayesian Inference	(C. Li et al., 2022; J. Wang et al., 2023; Letian Wang et al., 2021)
Behavior Cloning	(Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a, 2023b)
Monte-Carlo Sampling	(Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a, 2023b)
Monte Carlo Tree Search	(C. Li et al., 2022)
Finite State Machine	(B. Wang et al., 2024)
Reasoning Graph	(D. Zhou et al., 2022)
Non-Convex Mixed-Integer Nonlinear Program	(Larsson et al., 2021)
Discrete Choice Model	(Kothari et al., 2021)
Minimizing Counterfactual Perturbation	(Hirose et al., 2024)
Particle Filtering	(C. Xu et al., 2023)
Gaussian Process	(Valiente et al., 2024)
Genetic Algorithm	(J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024)

From **Table 2**, it is noticed that the majority of studies adopt **machine learning** approaches, and more specifically, **deep learning** (e.g., Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN), Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) neural networks, Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU), Transformer), and **deep reinforcement learning** (e.g., IRL, Deep Q-learning, and Actor-Critic methods). Typically, driving decision-making is modeled as the Markov Decision Process (MDP), e.g., in (Crosato et al., 2021; Da & Hua, 2023; Ding et al., 2022; Hang et al., 2021; Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Zong et al., 2023), or as the partially observable Markov decision process (POMDP), e.g., in (Ding et al., 2022; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2021) to account for uncertainties. Additionally, a substantial number of studies employ game theory (e.g., Stackelberg game, coalitional game, potential game, and Partially Observable Stochastic Game (POSG)) to effectively model complex interactions between agents (e.g., AVs and HDVs), while a significant portion also utilizes model predictive control (MPC) to refine and smooth control outputs following decision-making. In the realm of social preferences, a variety of social psychological terms—such as courtesy, coordination tendency, and Social Value Orientation (SVO)—are used to encapsulate concepts related to social preferences. The targeting research objectives and tasks typically fall into three primary categories: behavior generation, trajectory prediction, as well as interactive decision-making and control. Further, multiple-agent modeling is incorporated in some studies to simulate complex, interactive driving environments involving multiple road participants, e.g., in (Da & Hua, 2023; Peng et al., 2021; Toghi et al., 2021a,

2021b, 2022; Xue et al., 2023). These observations align with insights from the keyword network visualization in **Figure 2** and are illustrated further in **Figure 3**.

Furthermore, while some interdisciplinary initiatives have been introduced, the majority of research continues to focus on combining approaches from computer science, physics, mathematics, transportation, and vehicular engineering. Although initial efforts to incorporate social psychology are emerging, they primarily center around concepts like Social Value Orientation (SVO), coordination tendencies, and courtesy, which share common themes. Greater attention and the development of more advanced models grounded in social psychology and other relevant interdisciplinary fields are essential to deepen the understanding of human-AV interactions (Brown Et Al., 2023; Vinkhuyzen & Cefkin, 2016). Specifically, incorporating culturally sensitive social behaviors into AV decision-making to develop customized AVs for diverse cultural backgrounds remains a crucial area for further investigation (Dong et al., 2024).

**Table 3** groups the reviewed papers based on simulation, data-driven, and empirical field testing approaches. From **Table 3** and **Figure 3**, it is revealed that more than half of the studies employed simulations to train, test, and verify their solutions. The commonly adopted simulation platforms and software tools include [Highway-env](#) (Leurent, 2018), [SMARTS](#) (M. Zhou et al., 2020), [CARLA](#) (Dosovitskiy et al., 2017), [MetaDrive](#) (Q. Li et al., 2023), [PTV VISSIM](#), [SUMO](#) (Lopez et al., 2018), [Universe simulator](#) (D. Zhang, 2023), and [Robot Operation System \(ROS\)](#). Additionally, more than half of the studies incorporated empirical datasets collected from real-world environments to enhance model validation. Typical frequently used datasets include the Next Generation Simulation (NGSIM) dataset (U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, 2016), Waymo Open Motion dataset (Ettinger et al., 2021), INTERACTION dataset (Zhan et al., 2019), highD dataset (Krajewski et al., 2018), exiD dataset (Moers et al., 2022), inD dataset (Bock et al., 2020), rounD dataset (Krajewski et al., 2020), SinD dataset (Y. Xu et al., 2022), Argoverse Motion dataset (M. F. Chang et al., 2019), and Argoverse 2 Motion dataset (Wilson et al., 2023). Additional datasets, including the ETH (Pellegrini et al., 2009), UCY (Lerner et al., 2007), TrajNet++ (Kothari et al., 2022), PANDA (Xueyang Wang et al., 2020), Stanford Drone (Robicquet et al., 2016), and HuRoN (Hirose et al., 2024) datasets, are employed for scenarios and applications related to social robot navigation and human trajectory prediction.

Furthermore, as clearly illustrated in **Table 4** and **Figure 4**, regarding driving maneuvers, the majority of studies focus on ones that require both longitudinal and lateral control. Various maneuvers, e.g., driving through unsignalized intersections, performing unprotected left turns, lane changing, on-ramp merging, and overtaking, have been studied. The inherent complexity and dynamic nature of these scenarios, where both directional and speed-related aspects of control must be simultaneously managed, make them particularly well-suited for studying and examining social interactions between AVs and HDVs. Such scenarios provide robust "environments" for developing and validating socially compliant driving behaviors, as they compel AVs to navigate nuanced interactions, accommodate unpredictable human behaviors, convey their intentions, and adapt their decisions to align with various human social driving patterns. Interestingly, within the reviewed publications, only two studies specifically delve into maneuvers involving only longitudinal control, i.e., car-following. This may stem from the fact that longitudinal maneuvers are often already embedded within the broader, more complex scenarios mentioned above, there is no need to specifically only target longitudinal maneuvers.

From **Table 4** and **Figure 4**, it is also important to note that some studies focus primarily on social robot navigation and human trajectory forecasting for related applications, with 12 studies included in the review. While AVs can be considered a type of robot, and the insights from social robot navigation research could be beneficial for developing socially compliant driving, there are notable differences between human/pedestrian-robot interactions and the interactions between HDVs and AVs. These differences stem from the distinct speeds, operational environments, and interaction dynamics between the two scenarios. Social robot navigation often occurs at lower speeds and in more controlled environments, which facilitates the use of field test experiments to observe and refine socially aware behaviors. Insights gained from such experiments could serve as a foundation for adaptation to the more




Figure 3. The identified methods adopted in each study.

Note: A single paper may involve multiple methods (e.g., both Deep Learning and Reinforcement Learning), and may utilize multiple models within the same method category (e.g., both LSTM and CNN within the Deep Learning category).

Table 3. Grouping of reviewed papers based on simulation, data-driven, and empirical field testing approaches.

Methods Adopted	Tools, Platforms, or Dataset	Related Publications
Simulation and simulator-related	Highway-env	(J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Toghi et al., 2021a, 2021b, 2022; Tong et al., 2024; Valiente et al., 2024; L. Zhang et al., 2023)
	SMARTS	(Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; Xiao Wang et al., 2024)
	CARLA	(Bhatt et al., 2022; Lu et al., 2022; Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Z. Zhu & Zhao, 2023)
	MetaDrive	(Peng et al., 2021)
	Python-based	(Crosato et al., 2021; Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; Da & Hua, 2023; L. Liu et al., 2020; Z. Wang et al., 2021)
	Python-Matlab	(Zhao et al., 2024)
	Matlab-Simulink	(Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Huang, et al., 2022a; Hang, Lv, et al., 2022; Hang, Lv, Huang, Cai, et al., 2020)
	Prescan	(Song et al., 2016)
	CarSim	(Chen et al., 2024)
	Matlab/Simulink-CarSim	(Yan et al., 2022)
	Prescan-MATLAB/Simulink-CarSim	(J. Wang et al., 2023)
	Robot Operation System (ROS)	(Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Letian Wang et al., 2021)
	SUMO-ROS	(Zong et al., 2023)
	PTV VISSIM	(Larsson et al., 2021)
	Julia	(Sun et al., 2018)
	MobileSim	(Reddy et al., 2021)
	Universe Simulator	(Xue et al., 2023)
	Fixed based Driving Simulator	(Kolekar et al., 2020)
	Human-in-the-loop driver simulator	(J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; C. Xu et al., 2023)
	Hardware-in-the-loop simulator	(Hang, Huang, et al., 2022b)
Self-built upon datasets	(Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a)	
<i>Not specified</i>	(Buckman et al., 2019; Ferrer & Sanfeliu, 2014; Landolfi & Dragan, 2018; Schwarting et al., 2019; Shu et al., 2023; Sun et al., 2019; Taghavifar & Mohammadzadeh, 2024; B. Wang et al., 2024; D. Zhou et al., 2022)	

Table 3. Continued.

Methods Adopted	Tools, Platforms, or Dataset	Related Publications	
Involving empirical data	Next Generation Simulation (NGSIM) Dataset	(Chen et al., 2024; Hang et al., 2021; M. Liu et al., 2024; Nan et al., 2024; Schwarting et al., 2019; Sun et al., 2018; J. Wang et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024)	
	Waymo Open Motion Dataset	(W. J. Chang et al., 2023; Z. Huang, Liu, et al., 2023)	
	INTERACTION Dataset	(B. Huang & Sun, 2023; C. Li et al., 2022; Shu et al., 2023; Tong et al., 2024; Letian Wang et al., 2021; Lingguang Wang et al., 2023b)	
	highD Dataset	(Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a; C. Xu et al., 2023)	
	exiD Dataset	(Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a)	
	inD Dataset	(Geng et al., 2023; Lingguang Wang et al., 2023b)	
	round Dataset	(Lingguang Wang et al., 2023b)	
	SinD Dataset	(J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024)	
	Argoverse Motion Dataset	(Ding et al., 2022)	
	Argoverse2 Motion Dataset	(J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024)	
	Beijing Jianguomen Flyover Area Dataset	(Z. Wang et al., 2021)	
	Data collected by wheelchair testbed	(Qin et al., 2021)	
	Data collected over 60 hours of driving from 10 drivers at 6 intersections	(Z. Zhu & Zhao, 2023)	
	Datasets related to social robot navigation/human trajectory prediction	PANDA	(Xueyang Wang et al., 2024)
		ETH	(Alahi et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2018; Kothari & Alahi, 2023; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Vemula et al., 2018; Xueyang Wang et al., 2024)
		UCY	(Alahi et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2018; Kothari & Alahi, 2023; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Vemula et al., 2018; Xueyang Wang et al., 2024)
TrajNet ++		(Kothari et al., 2021; Kothari & Alahi, 2023)	
Stanford Drone Dataset		(Sadeghian et al., 2019)	
HuRoN		(Hirose et al., 2024)	
Involving controlled field test	(Ding et al., 2022; Ferrer & Sanfeliu, 2014; Hirose et al., 2024; L. Liu et al., 2020; Oliveira et al., 2019; Reddy et al., 2021)		
Involving survey questionnaire	(Galati et al., 2022)		
Involving user study	(Landolfi & Dragan, 2018)		




Figure 4. The identified involved maneuvers in each study.

Note: A single paper may involve multiple maneuvers, thus the total number of maneuvers can exceed the total number of reviewed papers (68).



Table 4. Clustering of manoeuvres and applications identified in the reviewed papers.

Use Cases		Related Publications
Intersection	Unsignalized intersection <sup>a</sup>	(Buckman et al., 2019; Geng et al., 2023; Hang, Huang, et al., 2022a; J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; M. Liu et al., 2024; Peng et al., 2021; Song et al., 2016; Valiente et al., 2024; Xia et al., 2022; Z. Zhu & Zhao, 2023; Zong et al., 2023)
	Unprotected left turn <sup>a</sup>	(Hang, Huang, et al., 2022b; Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; J. Liu, Qi, et al., 2024; J. Liu, Zhou, et al., 2024; Schwarting et al., 2019; Shu et al., 2023; Xiao Wang et al., 2024; D. Zhou et al., 2022; Zong et al., 2023)
	Roundabout	(Z. Huang, Wu, et al., 2023; C. Li et al., 2022; Peng et al., 2021; Valiente et al., 2024; Letian Wang et al., 2021; L. Zhang et al., 2023)
	T-junction	(Oliveira et al., 2019; Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Tong et al., 2024)
Lane change	Highway driving	(Hang, Lv, Huang, Cai, et al., 2020; Larsson et al., 2021; Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a; C. Xu et al., 2023; Zhao et al., 2024)
	Urban driving	(W. J. Chang et al., 2023; Z. Wang et al., 2021)
	Two-lane road with large curvature	(Yan et al., 2022)
	<i>Not specific</i>	(Chen et al., 2024)
Merge	On-ramp merging	On-ramp merging: (Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Lv, et al., 2022; M. Liu et al., 2024; Nan et al., 2024; Schwarting et al., 2019; Toghi et al., 2021b, 2021a, 2022; Valiente et al., 2024; Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a; Xue et al., 2023)
	Intersection merging	(Xiao Wang et al., 2024)
Overtaking	Urban driving	(Lu et al., 2022; Zong et al., 2023)
	Highway driving	(Hang et al., 2021; Hang, Lv, Huang, Cai, et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2024)
	<i>Not specific</i>	(Xiao Wang et al., 2024)
Highway exit	(Landolfi & Dragan, 2018; Toghi et al., 2022; Valiente et al., 2024; Lingguang Wang et al., 2023a)	
Interact with pedestrian/ Pedestrian collision avoidance	(Bhatt et al., 2022; Crosato et al., 2021; Crosato, Shum, et al., 2023; Pérez-Dattari et al., 2022; Sun et al., 2019; Taghavifar & Mohammadzadeh, 2024)	
Road cruising	(Xiao Wang et al., 2024)	
Platoon	(B. Wang et al., 2024)	
Bottleneck	(Peng et al., 2021; Xue et al., 2023)	
Tollgate	(Peng et al., 2021)	
Parking lot	(Peng et al., 2021)	
Nudging parked cars on urban streets	(Bhatt et al., 2022)	
Social occlusion inference	(B. Huang & Sun, 2023)	
Oncoming traffic	(Kolekar et al., 2020; M. Liu et al., 2024)	
Reacts to stalled car	(Landolfi & Dragan, 2018)	
Reacts to speeding	(Landolfi & Dragan, 2018)	
Reacts to ambulance	(Landolfi & Dragan, 2018)	
Car-following	(Kolekar et al., 2020; Larsson et al., 2021)	

<sup>a</sup> *Unsignalized intersection*: Here “unsignalized intersection” may include “unprotected left turn” or can be other scenarios (e.g., right-turning and going straight at unsignalized intersections), while the row of “unprotected left turn” is specifically about unprotected left turning through unsignalized intersections.

Table 4. Continued.

Use Cases	Related Publications
Social robot navigating	(Da & Hua, 2023; Ferrer & Sanfeliu, 2014; Galati et al., 2022; Hirose et al., 2024; L. Liu et al., 2020; Reddy et al., 2021)
Human trajectory forecasting	(Alahi et al., 2016; Gupta et al., 2018; Kothari et al., 2021; Kothari & Alahi, 2023; Sadeghian et al., 2019; Vemula et al., 2018; Xueyang Wang et al., 2024)
Social reactions, feedbacks, and trust in AVs	(Joo & Kim, 2023; Oliveira et al., 2019; Othman, 2021; Schneble & Shaw, 2021)

complex and high-speed interactions involved in AV driving. This study highlights some typical works related to pedestrian trajectory prediction and social robots navigating around humans but does not aim to provide a comprehensive review of these domains. For further information, readers are encouraged to refer to (Singamaneni et al., 2024).

Lastly, some papers delve into the public's social perception, acceptance, and trust of AV technology, e.g., (Joo & Kim, 2023; Oliveira et al., 2019; Othman, 2021; Schneble & Shaw, 2021), recognizing these aspects as critical for the broader adoption and integration of AVs into society. In particular, Joo and Kim (2023) conducted an online study to explore the influence of perceived collision algorithm types, i.e., selfish (prioritizing passenger safety) versus utilitarian (minimizing total damage by saving more lives, regardless of passenger status), and role of social approval of these algorithms on individuals' attitudes toward AVs. The study revealed a striking mismatch between societal and individual preferences. Participants rated utilitarian algorithms as more ethical and beneficial to society, aligning with broader social values. However, they expressed greater trust in, and a stronger personal preference for, selfish algorithms. Respondents were more willing to use and even pay a premium for AVs equipped with selfish algorithms, highlighting a significant divergence between ethical ideals and personal safety priorities. This discrepancy underscores the complexity of fostering public trust and acceptance of AV technology and suggests that designing and deploying SCAVs to balance societal ethics with individual user preferences is a crucial challenge for manufacturers and policymakers.

### 3. Conceptual Framework Design

#### 3.1 Expert Interview

Building on the findings from the summarized literature review, an informal interview was conducted with ten experts representing diverse scientific and consultancy positions across research institutes, consulting firms, original equipment manufacturer (OEM) companies, and government sectors. The purpose of the interview was to gather expert perspectives through open-ended discussions on the current limitations of AVs, to further identify existing research gaps, and to understand their expectations for the development of SCAVs.

To facilitate insightful and meaningful discussions, the preliminary findings from the literature review were shared with the experts prior to the discussion. This ensured that the conversations were well-informed. The discussions were open-ended, allowing participants to elaborate on their views on the current limitations of AVs and provide in-depth observations on the challenges and opportunities in this field. The questions discussed include:

- *Do you have confidence in automated vehicles, particularly in mixed-traffic conditions?*
- *What are the current limitations and critical pain points of automated vehicles?*
- *Which scenarios do you perceive as particularly challenging for automated vehicles, and what scenarios, maneuvers, or use cases would you like automated vehicles to address soon?*
- *What are your expectations for the short-term and long-term development of automated vehicles?*
- *What key efforts are necessary to drive the development and public acceptance of automated vehicles?*

Key insights derived from these expert interviews are summarized as follows:

Regarding the current practice and limitations of SCAVs, several critical shortcomings in the current generation of AVs were identified:

- **Excessive Conservatism:** Most current AVs often adopt overly defensive driving strategies, which may significantly compromise traffic efficiency.
- **Inability to Interpret Implicit Communications:** Most current AVs struggle to decode subtle signals to understand the implicit “communications” from human drivers, such as waving hands or a deceleration that implies yielding right of way.
- **Challenges in Adapting to Various Driving Styles:** Most current AVs are unable to effectively adapt to the various driving styles, especially aggressive or assertive driving behaviors exhibited by surrounding HDVs.
- **Limited Scenario Anticipation:** Unlike human drivers, current AVs lack robust capabilities to foresee, anticipate, and prepare for dynamic future scenarios.
- **Cultural and Normative Inflexibility:** Current AVs are not yet designed to adapt their driving behaviors and styles to account for varying norms and driving cultures across different countries.

Regarding the research gaps and expectations, together with the literature review findings, the highlighted critical gaps and outlined priorities for advancing SCAVs are as follows:

- **Integration of Sensing, Planning and Control:** Few studies connect AVs’ sensing capabilities, particularly considering sensor inaccuracies, to trajectory planning and control. Given the importance of this in real-world deployment, it warrants more in-depth exploration.
- **Cultural and Normative Adaptation:** As limited research and development have incorporated cultural differences, driving norms, and implicit cues into automated driving models, this area deserves more attention.
- **Development of AV Communication Pipelines:** There is a pressing need for AVs to express their intentions to other road users using e.g., external human-machine interfaces (eHMI) such as color-changing surfaces, signal lights, or LED panels on AVs.
- **AV-Human Mutual Behavioral Adaptation:** The long-term and short-term adaptation of human drivers’ behavior when interacting with AVs and the corresponding adjustments AVs should make in response to those adaptations are seldom accounted for in the current development of AV driving models.
- **Network-wide and Societal Benefits:** Few studies have considered the broader implications for overall network efficiency and societal benefits (e.g., total emissions across road networks) when deploying different AV driving strategies, styles, and behaviors.
- **Interdisciplinary efforts:** Most research combines approaches from computer science, physics, mathematics, and engineering. Emerging efforts involving social psychology focus on adding concepts like SVO, coordination tendencies, and courtesy. More advanced frameworks incorporating social psychology and other interdisciplinary fields are needed to deepen the understanding of human-AV interactions.

These insights were the basis for the conceptual framework in the following *Section 3.2* to guide future research and development efforts in this area.

### 3.2 Proposed Conceptual Framework

Incorporating insights from the scoping review and addressing the identified gaps and research expectations from both the literature review and the expert interview, a conceptual framework, as illustrated in **Figure 5**, is proposed to guide future research and development on SCAVs.

Overall, this framework follows the standard modular design for developing AVs, which includes sensing and perception modules, decision-making modules, planning modules, and control action modules. The differences and added values of the proposed conceptual framework are as follows:




Figure 5. The proposed conceptual framework for developing socially-compliant AVs.

- Socially-Compliant Decision-Making Module:** The traditional decision-making module is enhanced and transformed into the proposed socially-compliant decision-making module. This modification integrates social components (including culture, norms, and cues), which may influence implicit interactions, and consideration for various driving styles (e.g., aggressive, cautious, pro-social). The integration and embedding of these elements will help to address the aforementioned limitations of *Cultural and Normative Inflexibility* and *Challenges in Adapting to Various Driving Styles*. Furthermore, the module incorporates mechanisms for bidirectional behavioral adaptation, enabling AVs to respond to human drivers' behavioral cues and adjust their responses accordingly, which will be illustrated later.
- Safety Constraint Module:** This module continuously monitors and enforces safety constraints to ensure that AVs operate within predefined safety boundaries. Although the socially compliant

decision-making module should already incorporate safety metrics, the dedicated safety constraint module serves as a critical safeguard, ensuring that all actions taken by the AV are within the safety limits, thereby preventing undesirable outcomes. The planning module in this framework encompasses both high-level path planning and behavior planning (e.g., lane changes, merging) as well as low-level motion planning (e.g., longitudinal and angular velocity, acceleration), all of which must adhere to the safety constraints outlined by this module.

- c) **Trade-off between Ego and Network-Level Benefits:** A fundamental challenge (which is currently missing) in AV development is balancing the individual benefits of the ego vehicle (such as safety, comfort, and efficiency) with the broader benefits to the road network and other road users. The proposed framework emphasizes the necessity of managing this trade-off, acknowledging that optimal performance for individual vehicles should not come at the expense of the overall network efficiency or societal benefits. It is suggested that this trade-off should be managed dynamically, on a case-by-case basis, to ensure a balanced approach that maximizes both individual and collective outcomes (i.e., a more holistic, systems-level perspective). This requires close collaboration between AV developers, road operators, and regulatory authorities to align objectives and responsibilities. By managing the trade-off adaptively, this module will help meet the aforementioned expectation regarding *Network-wide and Societal Benefits*.
- d) **Bidirectional Behavioral Adaptation Module:** A key novel contribution of the proposed framework is the introduction of a bidirectional behavioral adaptation module. This module addresses the phenomenon where human drivers adapt their behavior in response to the presence and actions of AVs in mixed traffic. For instance, drivers may exploit the defensive behavior of AVs by engaging in more aggressive driving when interacting with them. To mitigate this, the AVs must adapt their behaviors in return, effectively responding to changes in human driving patterns and fostering a more balanced and cooperative interaction. The module is designed to facilitate a dynamic, iterative process of mutual adaptation, wherein both AVs and human drivers adjust their actions to optimize safety, traffic flow, and overall road network efficiency in mixed traffic conditions. For successful real-world deployment, it is essential that the bidirectional behavioral adaptation module undergoes continuous updates, both in the short-term and long-term, to account for evolving traffic conditions and varied human driving behaviors. This ensures that the module remains responsive to a wide array of scenarios, thereby supporting the integration of AVs into diverse traffic contexts. This module will help to alleviate the aforementioned limitations of *Excessive Conservatism* and *Challenges in Adapting to Various Driving Styles* and help to meet the expectations of *AV-Human Mutual Behavioral Adaptation*.
- e) **Spatial-Temporal Memory Module:** The spatial-temporal memory module is designed to facilitate the long- and short-term updating of knowledge and driving rules, as well as to enhance the awareness of ongoing behavioral adaptations. This module enables AVs to incorporate historical interaction data and adapt their decision-making strategies over time. By maintaining a dynamic memory of past interactions, AVs can continuously refine their understanding of human-AV dynamics, ensuring that driving strategies incorporate lessons learned from prior experiences. This module is essential for the effective integration and implementation of bidirectional behavioral adaptation within the broader AV decision-making framework.

Explanations regarding the other remaining limitations, gaps, and expectations are presented in *Section 3.1*:

The limitation of *Limited Scenario Anticipation* will be tackled by the sensing and perception module and the eHMI which connect the sensing and perception module to the element of *Implicit Interactions* in the socially compliant decision-making module (shown in blue texts and dashed arrows in **Figure 5**). Furthermore, an advanced and powerful sensor and perception module that is accurate, robust, and capable of handling sensing failure and uncertainties is vital for filling the gap of *Integration of Sensing and Planning & Control*. It is important to note that the development of advanced sensing and perception techniques remains a broader area of study and falls outside the scope of this research.

The *Inability to Interpret Implicit Communications* can be alleviated through the proposed eHMI which allows AVs to convey their intentions more effectively. The eHMI will also help with the

expectations regarding the *Development of AV Communication Pipelines* helping AVs and other road users to communicate and interact.

While vehicle connectivity, including vehicle-to-vehicle (V2V), vehicle-to-infrastructure (V2I), and vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communication with pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users, is essential for addressing some of these limitations and research gaps, it is important to clarify that these aspects lie beyond the scope of this study. Connectivity is recognized as a crucial element in the broader ecosystem of autonomous driving, meriting its own dedicated line of research. Limited by space, this study could not delve deeply into this area.

#### **4. Online Questionnaire Survey**

To evaluate and verify the proposed framework for developing SCAVs, an online questionnaire-based survey was conducted. The survey was disseminated via targeted email distribution lists, including those of relevant expert groups such as the [Universities' Transport Study Group \(UTSG\)](#) and the [TRAIL Research School](#). Additionally, the survey was actively promoted during key academic conferences, including the [IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference \(ITSC\)](#) and the [IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium \(IV\)](#). The participants were asked to answer a sequence of questions including multiple-choice questions, rank-order scale questions, rating scale questions, and open-ended questions. The questions are presented in seven subsections. The online survey takes approximately 15 minutes to fill. The survey can be accessed at <https://lnkd.in/evg6Dn9W>. To promote experts' and professionals' participation in the survey, it was mentioned that every successful and qualified response would result in a 5-euro donation to the United Nations Road Safety Fund (<https://roadsafetyfund.un.org/>). The survey questionnaire is provided in full for reference in Supplementary Attachment 2 at: <https://lnkd.in/gpceU6gQ>.

##### **4.1 Respondents profile**

A total of 99 responses were collected from experts across various nations and continents. 9 responses were excluded from the analysis due to contradictions in the answers or because the respondents self-identified as lacking confidence in their responses. Thus, 90 responses from experts were included in the final analysis. These experts represent a diverse range of roles in professional services, including researchers from universities, research institutes, and industry companies; developers from original equipment manufacturers (OEMs); policymakers; consultants; technicians; and professional drivers.

**Figure 6** illustrates the distribution of respondents' profiles. The remaining 90 respondents were from 29 countries and across 6 continents. They all claimed to be familiar with the concept and technology of automated vehicles, and more than half (54 out of the 90) of them are working in a field directly related to automated vehicles. Among them, 35 respondents are involved in developing AVs, 8 are engaged in testing automated driving functions with 3 of them are qualified safety/test drivers, and 1 is researching human factors related to AVs.

In terms of professional roles, 49 respondents are researchers, 18 are consultants, 7 are policymakers, and 2 are developers or technicians at OEMs. Notably, one respondent claimed to be an associate editor for a relevant journal, one claimed to be responsible for the implementation of vehicle regulations by public authorities, and another one worked on the national strategy for the deployment of AVs. Furthermore, 86 out of the 90 respondents hold a driving license, with 6 claiming to have a professional driving qualification. These findings underscore the diverse expertise and perspectives that the respondents bring to the survey, enhancing the credibility of the survey results.






Figure 6. The distribution of respondents' profiles: (a) residence countries, (b) familiarity with AV.

#### 4.2 Benefits of SCAVs and willingness to purchase or use

Regarding the benefits of SCAVs, participants were asked to rate to what extent they think SCAVs will influence overall traffic safety and efficiency. The rating is based on a 7-point Likert scale with “-3” meaning *strongly worsen*; “0” standing for *neutral/no influence*; and “3” indicating *strongly improve*. As demonstrated in **Figure 7**, the majority of respondents believe that SCAVs contribute positively to both overall traffic safety and efficiency. The average rating for the potential improvement in safety is 1.04, while the average rating for efficiency is 0.54. These figures indicate that, on average, respondents perceive SCAVs as having a greater potential to enhance safety than to improve efficiency, but both are seen as contributing positively.

Correspondingly, when participants were asked about their willingness to purchase SCAVs when considering a vehicle purchase or their willingness to use them for on-demand mobility services during

their travels, the majority responded positively, as shown in **Figure 8** and **Figure 9**. Specifically, 72 respondents indicated that they would like to buy a SCAV, while only 8 stated that they would never consider purchasing one, even if such AVs were cheaper.

Furthermore, acknowledging the suitability of SCAVs for shared on-demand travel services, 77 respondents expressed a willingness to use them for trips, while only 4 indicated that they would not use SCAVs, even if they were more affordable.

Notably, some participants emphasized that they prioritize functionality and performance over price, expressing a preference for public transport options that meet their specific needs; thus, they were categorized in the group of “Other”.




Figure 7. The rating distribution on to what extent the participants think SCAVs will influence overall traffic safety (light blue) and efficiency (orange).




Figure 8. The distribution of willingness to buy one socially compliant automated vehicle.






Figure 9. The distribution of willingness to use socially compliant automated vehicles for trips.


### 4.3 Development of SCAVs

#### 4.3.1 Rating and ranking of the identified key technical capabilities


In the context of developing SCAVs, experts' opinions on the importance of various technical aspects required for AVs to exhibit socially compliant behaviors were assessed. Corresponding to the developed conceptual framework (Figure 5), respondents were asked to rate 9 key technical capabilities on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 represented "Least Needed" and 7 represented "Strongly Needed." The evaluated technical aspects were:

- **Anticipation Capability:** The ability to anticipate the intended actions of other road users;
- **eHMI Communication Capability:** The ability to convey intended actions effectively through external Human-Machine Interaction (eHMI);
- **Social and Cultural Alignment:** The ability to adapt to different local cultures, social norms, and cues;
- **User Acceptance:** The ability to take consideration of acceptance levels among drivers, passengers, and nearby road users;
- **Driving Style Adaptation:** The ability to adjust to varying driving styles of surrounding human drivers, such as aggressive or defensive, and pro-social or egoistic;
- **Bi-directional Behavioral Adaptation:** The ability to enable mutual adaptation between AVs and human drivers over time;
- **Multi-objective Optimization:** The ability to balance multiple goals such as safety, efficiency, energy consumption, and environmental impact;
- **Trade-off Management:** The ability to maintain trade-offs between the AV's benefits and those of surrounding traffic participants, between the ego AV's benefits and benefits at the network (regional) level;
- **Spatial-temporal Memory Buffer Integration:** Incorporating spatial-temporal memory buffers (short, medium, and long-term) to continually refine driving strategies.

As shown in Figure 10, respondents rated the extent to which they believe these properties should be integrated into SCAVs. All 9 key technical capabilities were rated as significant, with average ratings exceeding 4.8, which supports and verifies the elements proposed in the conceptual framework (Figure 5). Their ratings did not vary too much, with **Anticipation Capability** receiving the highest average rating (6.29), followed by the capabilities of **Multi-objective Optimization** (5.76) and **Trade-off Management** (5.61).



(a)



(b)

Figure 10. Ratings on 9 key technical capabilities regarding their importance for developing SCAVs: (a) detailed rating distributions for each capability, (b) boxplot of the rating scales for each capability.

As demonstrated in **Figure 11**, respondents were also asked to rank the top 3 most important aspects among 6 selected capabilities in the medium-term development (coming 1-3 years) supposing there are limited resources for developing SCAVs. The ranking results indicated that **Anticipation Capability** ranked first, followed by **Multi-objective Optimization**, which is consistent with the results shown in **Figure 10**.

Furthermore, as illustrated in **Figure 12**, respondents were asked to rank the top 2 most important aspects among 4 selected capabilities for long-term development (in the coming 5-10 years or longer), again assuming limited resources for developing SCAVs. The results revealed that **Bi-directional Behavioral Adaptation** ranked first, followed by **Spatial-temporal Memory Buffer Integration**, which is reasonable and aligns well with the proposed conceptual framework in **Figure 5**.

These ratings and rankings yield critical insights into which technical features are deemed essential and urgent for enabling AVs to navigate complex social interactions effectively. Such data-driven insights will be invaluable in guiding the prioritization and future technical development of SCAVs.




Figure 11. Ranking results for 6 selected technical capabilities regarding their priorities for developing socially compliant AVs in the medium term.




Figure 12. Ranking results for 4 selected technical capabilities regarding their priorities for developing socially compliant AVs in the long term.


#### 4.3.2 Rating the possibility of mathematically modeling the identified key technical capabilities

Regarding the implementation of the identified key technical capabilities, the respondents were asked to rate the possibility and feasibility of mathematically modeling the six identified key technical capabilities of *Social and Cultural Alignment*, *Driving Style Adaptation*, *Bi-directional Behavioral Adaptation*, *Multi-objective Optimization*, *Trade-off Management*, and *Spatial-temporal Memory Buffer Integration*. Ratings were provided on a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 represented “Not Possible” and 7 represented “Highly Possible”. The results are depicted in **Figure 13**.


All the examined 6 key technical capabilities were found to be feasible for mathematical modeling. *Multi-objective Optimization* was rated and deemed as the most feasible, followed by *Trade-off Management*, which is expected given that both of them could be modeled as typical optimization problems. In contrast, *Social and Cultural Alignment* was identified as the most challenging and least feasible for mathematical modeling, followed by *Bi-directional Behavioral Adaptation* and *Spatial-temporal Memory Buffer Integration*, which is also reasonable. This aligns with earlier recommendations for interdisciplinary cooperation, particularly drawing on knowledge and insights from social psychological domains alongside advancements in computer science.

#### 4.3.3 Suggestions from the respondents

Respondents were invited to share suggestions and insights through open-ended questions such as “What else would you expect for the Socially Compliant Automated Vehicles?” and “Do you have any further comments for better development of Socially Compliant Automated Vehicles?” A range of thoughtful responses was collected, which, after in-depth analysis, have been summarized, further upgraded, and polished as follows:



(a)



(b)

Figure 13. Ratings on the feasibility of mathematically modeling the 6 identified key technical capabilities for developing socially compliant automated vehicles (AVs): (a) detailed rating distributions for each selected capability, (b) boxplot of the rating scales for each capability.

The development of SCAVs must prioritize **safety and trust** as core principles. Safety should remain paramount across all stages of development, and building trust between humans and SCAVs requires transparency, effective trust modeling, and clear communication of the vehicle's decision-making processes and intentions to its users and other road participants. Respondents emphasized the need for ML models to be trained using curated, unbiased datasets that reflect socially responsible driving behaviors rather than exceptional cases like those of professional drivers (e.g., F1 pilots). Additionally, initial deployment should focus on less complex environments, such as highways and provincial roads, before progressing to urban settings, where social compliance becomes more intricate and essential.

**Infrastructure upgrades** are also vital to support the successful deployment of SCAVs. This includes the development of dedicated AV lanes, vehicle-to-everything (V2X) communication networks, and robust systems with reliable backup mechanisms to prevent failures in smart traffic management systems. Respondents also highlighted the importance of balanced policy frameworks that encourage shared

mobility solutions, such as controlled fleets of robotaxis, over private ownership of AVs. Collaboration among OEMs, regulators, and other stakeholders is deemed critical for fostering open communication, pooling knowledge, and advancing technical priorities strategically.

An **interdisciplinary and culturally sensitive approach** is required to reflect the diversity of societal needs in SCAV behaviors. Human factors must be central to design, ensuring that AVs can adapt to the social norms and behaviors of both drivers and other road users, such as cyclists and pedestrians, who are often overlooked. SCAVs should strike a balance between idealized performance and relatable, realistic behaviors that align with the imperfect nature of human driving.

Ultimately, the success of SCAVs hinges on the careful **prioritization of technical and social efforts**, given the significant time and resources required for development. Transparent AI systems, robust infrastructure, and a focus on public acceptance and trustworthiness will be pivotal in ensuring SCAVs' seamless integration into society. These vehicles must not only navigate the immediate social and cultural contexts of their operation but also anticipate the long-term challenges of mixed-traffic environments and future scenarios dominated by automation. With thoughtful design and strategic planning, SCAVs can deliver safe, reliable, and socially aligned mobility solutions that meet the evolving needs of diverse communities.

Furthermore, as the deployment of AVs becomes increasingly widespread, a growing body of **empirical evidence** on real-world AV behavior is emerging. This provides a valuable opportunity to investigate not only how AVs interact with human-driven vehicles but also how they respond to each other. Understanding interactions both within the same brand and between different brands of AVs is an area that remains underexplored but is critical for fostering interoperability, social compliance, and collaborative traffic systems. Such studies could reveal how variations in algorithms, decision-making priorities, and communication protocols influence the dynamics of AV interactions. By fostering cross-brand standardization and promoting cooperative driving behaviors among AVs, the industry can take a significant step toward realizing the vision of a harmonized, intelligent transportation system that benefits all road users. Expanding research in this direction would further support the development of SCAVs that are not only socially compliant but also capable of thriving in increasingly complex and automated traffic environments.

## 5. Conclusion, Limitation, and Future Research

This study represents the first comprehensive scoping review of the current state of the art in the development of socially compliant automated vehicles (SCAVs), systematically identifying key concepts, methodological approaches, and research gaps in the field. Through a rigorous review of existing literature and expert interviews, this study has elucidated critical pain points and research gaps while outlining vital research expectations essential for advancing SCAV development. Building on these insights, this study proposed a novel conceptual framework designed to address the multifaceted and interdisciplinary challenges of SCAVs in mixed-traffic environments. The framework outlines the key capability elements necessary for SCAVs and incorporates crucial considerations across technical, social, and cultural dimensions, effectively bridging theoretical insights with practical applications to achieve socially compliant automation.

To validate the conceptual framework, an online questionnaire-based survey was conducted, confirming the relevance of the framework's key elements and technical capabilities. Among these, **Anticipation Capability** emerged as the most significant and urgent requirement for mid-term implementation (1–3 years), reflecting its importance in enabling SCAVs to predict and adapt to dynamic road scenarios, especially regarding the interaction with HDVs. For long-term development (5–10 years or more), **Bi-directional Behavioral Adaptation**—the ability to dynamically and mutually interact with and learn from other road users—and **Spatial-Temporal Memory Buffer Integration** were identified as the most critical priorities. These findings offer actionable insights for research and development (R&D) in both academia and industry, serving as a strategic roadmap for integrating social compliance into automated driving systems. They highlight research priorities and guide the creation of SCAVs that align with societal expectations. For researchers, the proposed conceptual framework identifies focus areas and

key elements to be studied. For the industry, it provides actionable insights into developing and embedding social compliance in AV systems, enabling scalable and context-sensitive deployment. The developed framework can also foster collaboration among academia, industry, and policymakers, ensuring technical innovation aligns with societal needs and regulatory standards, accelerating the path toward SCAV and further towards safe and socially inclusive automated mobility solutions.

By providing a structured and interdisciplinary approach, this study contributes to the foundation of socially aware and ethically aligned AV technologies, laying the groundwork for safe, reliable, and socially compliant automated mobility solutions.

Despite its meaningful contributions, this study has several limitations that provide opportunities for further research. First, in the scoping review, as aforementioned, the scoping review did not analyze or summarize in detail the experiments, model performance, and results from the reviewed studies. Furthermore, the study did not thoroughly investigate scenarios involving multi-vehicle interactions, particularly among multiple AVs. As AV penetration rates increase, understanding these interactions will become critical. Future reviews could address these gaps to provide a more comprehensive assessment of current research in this field.

Second, while the study emphasized the importance of anticipation capability, it did not extensively address its relationship with perception, particularly perception under uncertainty. This critical aspect which includes managing ambiguous or incomplete information in real-world scenarios, represents a highly complex research domain that warrants dedicated research attention. Developing robust perception systems that can handle uncertainties will significantly enhance SCAVs' ability to navigate and interact socially in diverse and unpredictable environments. Similarly, connectivity, though recognized as an essential enabler, was not explored in depth. Future work could delve into the integration and benefits of vehicle-to-everything (V2X) technologies to support seamless communication between AVs, infrastructure, and road users for SCAV development.

Third, the study did not extensively examine interactions between AVs and vulnerable road users, such as cyclists and pedestrians. These interactions are crucial for ensuring SCAVs can operate safely and effectively in complex urban environments, where unpredictable behavior from such road users often creates additional challenges. Addressing this limitation will not only enhance SCAVs' ability to anticipate and respond to the movements of vulnerable road users but also foster greater public trust and acceptance of AV technologies. Such efforts will help make SCAVs more inclusive and adaptable to diverse road user types, ultimately contributing to safer and more equitable urban mobility systems.

Moreover, the geographic concentration of respondents, primarily from European countries, introduces potential cultural and contextual biases into the study. Social compliance in driving behaviors is influenced by regional norms, regulations, and infrastructure designs, and thus, the findings may not fully capture global perspectives. Expanding future surveys to include more diverse respondents from diverse cultural, regional, and geographic contexts would provide a more comprehensive understanding of SCAV expectations and requirements worldwide.

Finally, this study does not address the broader systemic challenges of integrating SCAVs into existing infrastructure and ecosystems. Factors such as regulatory alignment, public acceptance, and economic feasibility remain critical to the successful deployment of SCAVs and must be explored further. In particular, balancing the needs of private and shared ownership models, addressing the environmental impact of SCAVs, and mitigating potential socioeconomic disparities should form part of future interdisciplinary research efforts.

In conclusion, while this study provides a valuable foundation for SCAV development, it highlights the complexity and interdisciplinary nature of the challenges ahead. By addressing the identified limitations and advancing research in these critical areas, future efforts can build on the insights and framework presented here to create SCAV systems that are not only technically advanced but also socially responsible and globally inclusive.

### **Credit Authorship Contribution Statement**

**Yongqi Dong:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing, Data curation, Formal analysis, Visualization, Validation. **Bart van Arem:** Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Supervision, Resources. **Haneen Farah:** Conceptualization, Writing – review & editing, Validation, Supervision, Resources, Project administration, Funding acquisition.

### **Declaration of Competing Interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### **Acknowledgments**

This work was supported by the Applied and Technical Sciences (TTW), a subdomain of the Dutch Institute for Scientific Research (NWO) through the Project Safe and Efficient Operation of Automated and Human-Driven Vehicles in Mixed Traffic (SAMEN) under Contract 17187.

### **Data Availability**

Data will be made available on request.

## References

- Alahi, A., Goel, K., Ramanathan, V., Robicquet, A., Fei-Fei, L., & Savarese, S. (2016). Social LSTM: Human trajectory prediction in crowded spaces. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2016.110>
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology: Theory and Practice*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Benrachou, D. E., Glaser, S., Elhenawy, M., & Rakotonirainy, A. (2022). Use of Social Interaction and Intention to Improve Motion Prediction Within Automated Vehicle Framework: A Review. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(12), 22807–22837. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3207347>
- Bhatt, N. P., Khajepour, A., & Hashemi, E. (2022). MPC-PF: Social Interaction Aware Trajectory Prediction of Dynamic Objects for Autonomous Driving Using Potential Fields. *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, i, 9837–9844. <https://doi.org/10.1109/iros47612.2022.9981046>
- Bock, J., Krajewski, R., Moers, T., Runde, S., Vater, L., & Eckstein, L. (2020). The inD Dataset: A Drone Dataset of Naturalistic Road User Trajectories at German Intersections. *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IV47402.2020.9304839>
- Brown, B., Broth, M., & Vinkhuyzen, E. (2023). The Halting problem: Video analysis of self-driving cars in traffic. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3544548.3581045>
- Buckman, N., Pierson, A., Schwarting, W., Karaman, S., & Rus, D. (2019). Sharing is Caring: Socially-Compliant Autonomous Intersection Negotiation. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS40897.2019.8967997>
- Chang, M. F., Lambert, J., Sangkloy, P., Singh, J., Bak, S., Hartnett, A., Wang, D., Carr, P., Lucey, S., Ramanan, D., & Hays, J. (2019). Argoverse: 3D tracking and forecasting with rich maps. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019.00895>
- Chang, W. J., Tang, C., Li, C., Hu, Y., Tomizuka, M., & Zhan, W. (2023). Editing Driver Character: Socially-Controllable Behavior Generation for Interactive Traffic Simulation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 8(9), 5432–5439. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LRA.2023.3291897>
- Chen, X., Zhang, W., Bai, H., Xu, C., Ding, H., & Huang, W. (2024). Two-Dimensional Following Lane-Changing (2DF-LC): A Framework for Dynamic Decision-Making and Rapid Behavior Planning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 9(1), 427–445. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2023.3324305>
- Crosato, L., Shum, H. P. H., Ho, E. S. L., & Wei, C. (2023). Interaction-Aware Decision-Making for Automated Vehicles Using Social Value Orientation. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 8(2), 1339–1349. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2022.3189836>
- Crosato, L., Tian, K., Shum, H. P. H., Ho, E. S. L., Wang, Y., & Wei, C. (2023). Social Interaction-Aware Dynamical Models and Decision-Making for Autonomous Vehicles. *Advanced Intelligent Systems*, 2300575. <https://doi.org/10.1002/aisy.202300575>
- Crosato, L., Wei, C., Ho, E. S. L., & Shum, H. P. H. (2021). Human-centric Autonomous Driving in an AV-Pedestrian Interactive Environment Using SVO. *Proceedings of the 2021 IEEE International Conference on Human-Machine Systems, ICHMS 2021*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICHMS53169.2021.9582640>
- Da, L., & Hua, W. (2023). CrowdGAIL: A spatiotemporal aware method for agent navigation. *Electronic Research Archive*, 31(2), 1134–1146. <https://doi.org/10.3934/era.2023057>
- Ding, W., Zhang, L., Chen, J., & Shen, S. (2022). EPSILON: An Efficient Planning System for Automated Vehicles in Highly Interactive Environments. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 38(2), 1118–1138. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TRO.2021.3104254>
- Dong, Y., Liu, C., Wang, Y., & Fu, Z. (2024). *Towards Understanding Worldwide Cross-cultural Differences in Implicit Driving Cues: Review, Comparative Analysis, and Research Roadmap*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.01119>



- Dosovitskiy, A., Ros, G., Codevilla, F., Lopez, A., & Koltun, V. (2017). *CARLA: An Open Urban Driving Simulator*. *CoRL*, 1–16. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.03938>
- Du, Y., Chen, J., Zhao, C., Liu, C., Liao, F., & Chan, C. Y. (2022). Comfortable and energy-efficient speed control of autonomous vehicles on rough pavements using deep reinforcement learning. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 134(December 2021), 103489. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2021.103489>
- ElSamadisy, O., Shi, T., Smirnov, I., & Abdulhai, B. (2024). Safe, Efficient, and Comfortable Reinforcement-Learning-Based Car-Following for AVs with an Analytic Safety Guarantee and Dynamic Target Speed. *Transportation Research Record*, 2678(1), 643–661. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981231171899>
- Ettinger, S., Cheng, S., Caine, B., Liu, C., Zhao, H., Pradhan, S., Chai, Y., Sapp, B., Qi, C., Zhou, Y., Yang, Z., Chouard, A., Sun, P., Ngiam, J., Vasudevan, V., McCauley, A., Shlens, J., & Anguelov, D. (2021). Large Scale Interactive Motion Forecasting for Autonomous Driving: The WAYMO OPEN MOTION DATASET. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV48922.2021.00957>
- Fagnant, D. J., & Kockelman, K. (2015). Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: Opportunities, barriers and policy recommendations. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2015.04.003>
- Farah, H., Postigo, I., Reddy, N., Dong, Y., Rydergren, C., Raju, N., & Olstam, J. (2022). Modeling Automated Driving in Microscopic Traffic Simulations for Traffic Performance Evaluations: Aspects to Consider and State of the Practice. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1109/tits.2022.3200176>
- Ferrer, G., & Sanfeliu, A. (2014). Proactive kinodynamic planning using the Extended Social Force Model and human motion prediction in urban environments. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems, Iros*, 1730–1735. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2014.6942788>
- Fraedrich, E., Beiker, S., & Lenz, B. (2015). Transition pathways to fully automated driving and its implications for the sociotechnical system of automobility. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40309-015-0067-8>
- Galati, G., Primatesta, S., Grammatico, S., Macrì, S., & Rizzo, A. (2022). Game theoretical trajectory planning enhances social acceptability of robots by humans. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-25438-1>
- Geng, M., Cai, Z., Zhu, Y., Chen, X., & Lee, D. H. (2023). Multimodal Vehicular Trajectory Prediction With Inverse Reinforcement Learning and Risk Aversion at Urban Unsignalized Intersections. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(11), 12227–12240. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2023.3285891>
- Greenblatt, J. B., & Shaheen, S. (2015). Automated Vehicles, On-Demand Mobility, and Environmental Impacts. *Current Sustainable/Renewable Energy Reports*, 2(3), 74–81. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40518-015-0038-5>
- Gupta, A., Johnson, J., Fei-Fei, L., Savarese, S., & Alahi, A. (2018). Social GAN: Socially Acceptable Trajectories with Generative Adversarial Networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2255–2264. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2018.00240>
- Hang, P., Huang, C., Hu, Z., & Lv, C. (2022a). Decision Making for Connected Automated Vehicles at Urban Intersections Considering Social and Individual Benefits. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(11), 22549–22562. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3209607>
- Hang, P., Huang, C., Hu, Z., & Lv, C. (2022b). Driving Conflict Resolution of Autonomous Vehicles at Unsignalized Intersections: A Differential Game Approach. *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, 27(6), 5136–5146. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TMECH.2022.3174273>
- Hang, P., Lv, C., Huang, C., Cai, J., Hu, Z., & Xing, Y. (2020). An Integrated Framework of Decision Making and Motion Planning for Autonomous Vehicles Considering Social Behaviors. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 69(12), 14458–14469. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2020.3040398>
- Hang, P., Lv, C., Huang, C., Xing, Y., & Hu, Z. (2022). Cooperative Decision Making of Connected Automated Vehicles at Multi-Lane Merging Zone: A Coalitional Game Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(4), 3829–3841.

- <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2021.3069463>
- Hang, P., Lv, C., Huang, C., Xing, Y., Hu, Z., & Cai, J. (2020). Human-like lane-change decision making for automated driving with a game theoretic approach. *2020 4th CAA International Conference on Vehicular Control and Intelligence, CVCI 2020, Cvci*, 708–713. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVCI51460.2020.9338614>
- Hang, P., Lv, C., Xing, Y., Huang, C., & Hu, Z. (2021). Human-Like Decision Making for Autonomous Driving: A Noncooperative Game Theoretic Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 22(4), 2076–2087. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2020.3036984>
- Hirose, N., Shah, D., Sridhar, A., & Levine, S. (2024). SACSoN: Scalable Autonomous Control for Social Navigation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 9(1), 49–56. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LRA.2023.3329626>
- Huang, B., & Sun, P. (2023). Social Occlusion Inference with Vectorized Representation for Autonomous Driving. *Conference Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 2634–2639. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SMC53992.2023.10394619>
- Huang, Z., Liu, H., Wu, J., & Lv, C. (2023). Conditional Predictive Behavior Planning With Inverse Reinforcement Learning for Human-Like Autonomous Driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(7), 7244–7258. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2023.3254579>
- Huang, Z., Wu, J., & Lv, C. (2023). Efficient Deep Reinforcement Learning With Imitative Expert Priors for Autonomous Driving. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 34(10), 7391–7403. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNNLS.2022.3142822>
- Jamson, H., Merat, N., Carsten, O., & Lai, F. (2011). *Fully-Automated Driving: The Road to Future Vehicles*. <https://doi.org/10.17077/drivingassessment.1370>
- Joo, Y. K., & Kim, B. (2023). Selfish but Socially Approved: The Effects of Perceived Collision Algorithms and Social Approval on Attitudes toward Autonomous Vehicles. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 39(19), 3717–3727. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2022.2102716>
- Kolekar, S., de Winter, J., & Abbink, D. (2020). Human-like driving behaviour emerges from a risk-based driver model. *Nature Communications*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18353-4>
- Kothari, P., & Alahi, A. (2023). Safety-Compliant Generative Adversarial Networks for Human Trajectory Forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(4), 4251–4261. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3233906>
- Kothari, P., Kreiss, S., & Alahi, A. (2022). Human Trajectory Forecasting in Crowds: A Deep Learning Perspective. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2021.3069362>
- Kothari, P., Sifringer, B., & Alahi, A. (2021). Interpretable social anchors for human trajectory forecasting in crowds. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 15551–15561. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR46437.2021.01530>
- Krajewski, R., Bock, J., Kloeker, L., & Eckstein, L. (2018). The highD Dataset: A Drone Dataset of Naturalistic Vehicle Trajectories on German Highways for Validation of Highly Automated Driving Systems. *IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, Proceedings, ITSC, 2018-Novem*, 2118–2125. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC.2018.8569552>
- Krajewski, R., Moers, T., Bock, J., Vater, L., & Eckstein, L. (2020). The roundD Dataset: A Drone Dataset of Road User Trajectories at Roundabouts in Germany. *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, ITSC 2020*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC45102.2020.9294728>
- Łach, Ł., & Svyetlichnyy, D. (2024). Comprehensive Review of Traffic Modeling: Towards Autonomous Vehicles. *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*, 14(18). <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14188456>
- Landolfi, N. C., & Dragan, A. D. (2018). Social Cohesion in Autonomous Driving. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 8118–8125. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2018.8593682>
- Larsson, J., Keskin, M. F., Peng, B., Kulcsár, B., & Wymeersch, H. (2021). Pro-social control of connected automated vehicles in mixed-autonomy multi-lane highway traffic. *Communications in Transportation Research*, 1(September). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.commtr.2021.100019>
- Lerner, A., Chrysanthou, Y., & Lischinski, D. (2007). Crowds by example. *Computer Graphics Forum*.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8659.2007.01089.x>

- Leurent, E. (2018). *An environment for autonomous driving decision-making*. Accessed 2024-05-09 from <https://github.com/eleurent/highway-env>
- Li, A., Yongqi, Z., Haneen, D., & Bart, F. (2023). Social-aware Planning and Control for Automated Vehicles Based on Driving Risk Field and Model Predictive Contouring Control : Driving through Roundabouts as a Case Study Main aims Social-aware DRF-SVO-MPCC implementation Summary Demo Video. *2023 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, 3297–3304. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SMC53992.2023.10394462>
- Li, C., Trinh, T., Wang, L., Liu, C., Tomizuka, M., & Zhan, W. (2022). Efficient Game-Theoretic Planning With Prediction Heuristic for Socially-Compliant Autonomous Driving. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 7(4), 10248–10255. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LRA.2022.3191241>
- Li, Q., Peng, Z., Feng, L., Zhang, Q., Xue, Z., & Zhou, B. (2023). MetaDrive: Composing Diverse Driving Scenarios for Generalizable Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2022.3190471>
- Liebrand, W. B. G., & McClintock, C. G. (1988). The ring measure of social values: A computerized procedure for assessing individual differences in information processing and social value orientation. *European Journal of Personality*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2410020304>
- Liu, J., Qi, X., Hang, P., & Sun, J. (2024). Enhancing Social Decision-Making of Autonomous Vehicles: A Mixed-Strategy Game Approach With Interaction Orientation Identification. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology, PP*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TVT.2024.3385750>
- Liu, J., Zhou, D., Hang, P., Ni, Y., & Sun, J. (2024). Towards Socially Responsive Autonomous Vehicles: A Reinforcement Learning Framework With Driving Priors and Coordination Awareness. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 9(1), 827–838. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2023.3332080>
- Liu, L., Dugas, D., Cesari, G., Siegwart, R., & Dube, R. (2020). Robot navigation in crowded environments using deep reinforcement learning. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 5671–5677. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS45743.2020.9341540>
- Liu, M., Tseng, H. E., Filev, D., Girard, A., & Kolmanovsky, I. (2024). Safe and Human-Like Autonomous Driving: A Predictor-Corrector Potential Game Approach. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 32(3), 834–848. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCST.2023.3332438>
- Lopez, P. A., Behrisch, M., Bieker-Walz, L., Erdmann, J., Flotterod, Y. P., Hilbrich, R., Lucken, L., Rummel, J., Wagner, P., & Wiebner, E. (2018). Microscopic Traffic Simulation using SUMO. *IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, Proceedings, ITSC, 2018-Novem*, 2575–2582. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC.2018.8569938>
- Lu, H., Lu, C., Yu, Y., Xiong, G., & Gong, J. (2022). Autonomous Overtaking for Intelligent Vehicles Considering Social Preference Based on Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning. *Automotive Innovation*, 5(2), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42154-022-00177-1>
- Moers, T., Vater, L., Krajewski, R., Bock, J., Zlocki, A., & Eckstein, L. (2022). The exiD Dataset: A Real-World Trajectory Dataset of Highly Interactive Highway Scenarios in Germany. *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IV51971.2022.9827305>
- Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
- Murphy, R. O., & Ackermann, K. A. (2014). Social Value Orientation: Theoretical and Measurement Issues in the Study of Social Preferences. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 18(1), 13–41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868313501745>
- Nan, J., Deng, W., Zhang, R., Wang, Y., Zhao, R., & Ding, J. (2024). Interaction-Aware Planning with Deep Inverse Reinforcement Learning for Human-Like Autonomous Driving in Merge Scenarios. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 9(1), 2714–2726. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2023.3298912>
- Oliveira, L., Proctor, K., Burns, C. G., & Birrell, S. (2019). Driving style: How should an automated vehicle behave? *Information (Switzerland)*, 10(6), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/INFO10060219>
- Orieno, O. H., Ndubuisi, N. L., Ilojiana, V. I., Bui, P. W., & Odonkor, B. (2024). The Future of Autonomous Vehicles in the U.S. Urban Landscape: a Review: Analyzing Implications for Traffic,

- Urban Planning, and the Environment. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal*, 5(1), 43–64. <https://doi.org/10.51594/estj.v5i1.721>
- Othman, K. (2021). Public acceptance and perception of autonomous vehicles: a comprehensive review. In *AI and Ethics* (Vol. 1, Issue 3). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-021-00041-8>
- Pellegrini, S., Ess, A., Schindler, K., & Van Gool, L. (2009). You'll never walk alone: Modeling social behavior for multi-target tracking. *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2009.5459260>
- Peng, Z., Li, Q., Hui, K. M., Liu, C., & Zhou, B. (2021). Learning to Simulate Self-Driven Particles System with Coordinated Policy Optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 13(NeurIPS), 10784–10797.
- Pérez-Dattari, R., Brito, B., de Groot, O., Kober, J., & Alonso-Mora, J. (2022). Visually-guided motion planning for autonomous driving from interactive demonstrations. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 116(August), 105277. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2022.105277>
- Qin, L., Huang, Z., Zhang, C., Guo, H., Ang, M., & Rus, D. (2021). Deep Imitation Learning for Autonomous Navigation in Dynamic Pedestrian Environments. *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation, 2021-May(Icra)*, 4108–4115. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA48506.2021.9561220>
- Raju, N., Schakel, W., Reddy, N., Dong, Y., & Farah, H. (2022). Car-Following Properties of a Commercial Adaptive Cruise Control System: A Pilot Field Test. In *Transportation Research Record*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03611981221077085>
- Reddy, A. K., Malviya, V., & Kala, R. (2021). Social Cues in the Autonomous Navigation of Indoor Mobile Robots. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 13(6), 1335–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-020-00721-1>
- Robicquet, A., Sadeghian, A., Alahi, A., & Savarese, S. (2016). Learning social etiquette: Human trajectory understanding in crowded scenes. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (Including Subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46484-8\\_33](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46484-8_33)
- Sadeghian, A., Kosaraju, V., Sadeghian, A., Hirose, N., Rezatofighi, H., & Savarese, S. (2019). SoPhie: An attentive GAN for predicting paths compliant to social and physical constraints. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2019-June*, 1349–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2019.00144>
- Schneble, C. O., & Shaw, D. M. (2021). Driver's views on driverless vehicles: Public perspectives on defining and using autonomous cars. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 11, 100446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2021.100446>
- Schwartz, W., Pierson, A., Alonso-Mora, J., Karaman, S., & Rus, D. (2019). Social behavior for autonomous vehicles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(50), 2492–24978. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1820676116>
- Shu, K., Mehrizi, R. V., Li, S., Pirani, M., & Khajepour, A. (2023). Human Inspired Autonomous Intersection Handling Using Game Theory. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(10), 11360–11371. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2023.3281390>
- Singamaneni, P. T., Bachiller-Burgos, P., Manso, L. J., Garrell, A., Sanfeliu, A., Spalanzani, A., & Alami, R. (2024). A survey on socially aware robot navigation: Taxonomy and future challenges. *International Journal of Robotics Research*, 0(0), 1–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02783649241230562>
- Song, W., Xiong, G., & Chen, H. (2016). Intention-Aware Autonomous Driving Decision-Making in an Uncontrolled Intersection. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2016/1025349>
- Sun, L., Zhan, W., Chan, C. Y., & Tomizuka, M. (2019). Behavior planning of autonomous cars with social perception. *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, Proceedings, 2019-June(Iv)*, 207–213. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IVS.2019.8814223>
- Sun, L., Zhan, W., Tomizuka, M., & Dragan, A. D. (2018). Courteous Autonomous Cars. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 663–670. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS.2018.8593969>
- Tafidis, P., Farah, H., Brijs, T., & Pirdavani, A. (2022). Safety implications of higher levels of automated

- vehicles: a scoping review. *Transport Reviews*, 42(2), 245–267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2021.1971794>
- Taghavifar, H., & Mohammadzadeh, A. (2024). Integrating deep reinforcement learning and social-behavioral cues: A new human-centric cyber-physical approach in automated vehicle decision-making. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09544070241230126>
- Talebpour, A., & Mahmassani, H. S. (2016). Influence of connected and autonomous vehicles on traffic flow stability and throughput. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2016.07.007>
- Toghi, B., Valiente, R., Sadigh, D., Pedarsani, R., & Fallah, Y. P. (2021a). *Altruistic Maneuver Planning for Cooperative Autonomous Vehicles Using Multi-agent Advantage Actor-Critic*. *Cvpr*, 1–8. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.05664>
- Toghi, B., Valiente, R., Sadigh, D., Pedarsani, R., & Fallah, Y. P. (2021b). Cooperative Autonomous Vehicles that Sympathize with Human Drivers. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 4517–4524. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS51168.2021.9636151>
- Toghi, B., Valiente, R., Sadigh, D., Pedarsani, R., & Fallah, Y. P. (2022). Social Coordination and Altruism in Autonomous Driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(12), 24791–24804. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3207872>
- Tong, Y., Wen, L., Cai, P., Fu, D., Mao, S., Shi, B., & Li, Y. (2024). Human-Like Decision Making at Unsignalized Intersections Using Social Value Orientation. *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Magazine*, 16(2), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MITS.2023.3342308>
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., Moher, D., Peters, M. D. J., Horsley, T., Weeks, L., Hempel, S., Akl, E. A., Chang, C., McGowan, J., Stewart, L., Hartling, L., Aldcroft, A., Wilson, M. G., Garritty, C., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and explanation. In *Annals of Internal Medicine*. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration. (2016). *Next Generation Simulation (NGSIM) Vehicle Trajectories and Supporting Data*. [Dataset]. Provided by ITS DataHub through [Data.transportation.gov](http://data.transportation.gov). Accessed 2024-05-09 from <http://doi.org/10.21949/1504477>
- Valiente, R., Razzaghpour, M., Toghi, B., Shah, G., & Fallah, Y. P. (2024). Prediction-Aware and Reinforcement Learning-Based Altruistic Cooperative Driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 25(3), 2450–2465. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2023.3323440>
- van Eck, N. J., & Waltman, L. (2010). Software survey: VOSviewer, a computer program for bibliometric mapping. *Scientometrics*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-009-0146-3>
- Vasile, L., Dinkha, N., Seitz, B., Dasch, C., & Schramm, D. (2023). Comfort and Safety in Conditional Automated Driving in Dependence on Personal Driving Behavior. *IEEE Open Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 4(June), 772–784. <https://doi.org/10.1109/OJITS.2023.3323431>
- Vemula, A., Muelling, K., & Oh, J. (2018). Social Attention: Modeling Attention in Human Crowds. *Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, 4601–4607. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICRA.2018.8460504>
- VINKHUYZEN, E., & CEFKIN, M. (2016). Developing Socially Acceptable Autonomous Vehicles. *Ethnographic Praxis in Industry Conference Proceedings*, 2016(1), 522–534. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1559-8918.2016.01108>
- Wang, B., Su, R., Huang, L., Lu, Y., & Zhao, N. (2024). Distributed Cooperative Control and Optimization of Connected Automated Vehicles Platoon Against Cut-in Behaviors of Social Drivers. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, PP, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2024.3401082>
- Wang, J., Zhang, Y., Wang, X., & Li, L. (2023). A Human-Like Lane-changing Behavior Model for Autonomous Vehicles in Mixed Traffic Flow Environment. *IET Conference Proceedings*, 2023(26), 107–112. <https://doi.org/10.1049/icp.2023.3359>
- Wang, Letian, Sun, L., Tomizuka, M., & Zhan, W. (2021). Socially-Compatible Behavior Design of Autonomous Vehicles with Verification on Real Human Data. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 6(2), 3421–3428. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LRA.2021.3061350>

- Wang, Lingguang, Fernandez, C., & Stiller, C. (2023a). High-Level Decision Making for Automated Highway Driving via Behavior Cloning. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 8(1), 923–935. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2022.3169207>
- Wang, Lingguang, Fernandez, C., & Stiller, C. (2023b). Learning Safe and Human-Like High-Level Decisions for Unsignalized Intersections From Naturalistic Human Driving Trajectories. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(11), 12477–12490. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2023.3286454>
- Wang, W., Wang, L., Zhang, C., Liu, C., & Sun, L. (2022). Social Interactions for Autonomous Driving: A Review and Perspectives. *Foundations and Trends® in Robotics*. <https://doi.org/10.1561/23000000078>
- Wang, Xiao, Tang, K., Dai, X., Xu, J., Du, Q., Ai, R., Wang, Y., & Gu, W. (2024). S4TP: Social-Suitable and Safety-Sensitive Trajectory Planning for Autonomous Vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 9(2), 3220–3231. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2023.3338483>
- Wang, Xueyang, Chen, X., Jiang, P., Lin, H., Yuan, X., Ji, M., Guo, Y., Huang, R., & Fang, L. (2024). The Group Interaction Field for Learning and Explaining Pedestrian Anticipation. *Engineering*, 34, 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eng.2023.05.020>
- Wang, Xueyang, Zhang, X., Zhu, Y., Guo, Y., Yuan, X., Xiang, L., Wang, Z., Ding, G., Brady, D., Dai, Q., & Fang, L. (2020). Panda: A gigapixel-level human-centric video dataset. *Proceedings of the IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.00333>
- Wang, Z., Gao, P., He, Z., & Zhao, L. (2021). A CGAN-based model for human-like driving decision making. *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference, WCNC, 2021-March*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WCNC49053.2021.9417336>
- Wilson, B., Qi, W., Agarwal, T., Lambert, J., Singh, J., Khandelwal, S., Pan, B., Kumar, R., Hartnett, A., Pontes, J. K., Ramanan, D., Carr, P., & Hays, J. (2023). *Argoverse 2: Next Generation Datasets for Self-Driving Perception and Forecasting*. *NeurIPS*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2301.00493>
- Xia, C., Xing, M., & He, S. (2022). Interactive Planning for Autonomous Driving in Intersection Scenarios Without Traffic Signs. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(12), 24818–24828. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3205250>
- Xie, S., Chen, S., Tomizuka, M., Zheng, N., & Wang, J. (2020). To Develop Human-like Automated Driving Strategy Based on Cognitive Construction: Appraisal and Perspective. *2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, ITSC 2020*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC45102.2020.9294591>
- Xu, C., Zhao, W., Wang, C., Cui, T., & Lv, C. (2023). Driving Behavior Modeling and Characteristic Learning for Human-like Decision-Making in Highway. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 8(2), 1994–2005. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIV.2022.3224912>
- Xu, Y., Shao, W., Li, J., Yang, K., Wang, W., Huang, H., Lv, C., & Wang, H. (2022). SIND: A Drone Dataset at Signalized Intersection in China. *IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, Proceedings, ITSC, 2022*, 2471–2478. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC55140.2022.9921959>
- Xue, J., Zhang, D., Xiong, R., Wang, Y., & Liu, E. (2023). A Two-Stage Based Social Preference Recognition in Multi-Agent Autonomous Driving System. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 5507–5513. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS55552.2023.10341803>
- Yan, Y., Wang, J., Zhang, K., Liu, Y., Liu, Y., & Yin, G. (2022). Driver’s Individual Risk Perception-Based Trajectory Planning: A Human-Like Method. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(11), 20413–20428. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2022.3190521>
- Yaqoob, I., Khan, L. U., Kazmi, S. M. A., Imran, M., Guizani, N., & Hong, C. S. (2020). Autonomous Driving Cars in Smart Cities: Recent Advances, Requirements, and Challenges. *IEEE Network*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MNET.2019.1900120>
- Yoon, D. D., & Ayalew, B. (2019). Social force aggregation control for autonomous driving with connected preview. *Proceedings of the American Control Conference, 2019-July*, 1388–1393. <https://doi.org/10.23919/acc.2019.8814725>
- Zhan, W., Sun, L., Wang, D., Shi, H., Clause, A., Naumann, M., Kummerle, J., Konigshof, H., Stiller, C., de La Fortelle, A., & Tomizuka, M. (2019). *INTERACTION Dataset: An INTERNATIONAL, Adversarial and Cooperative moTION Dataset in Interactive Driving Scenarios with Semantic Maps*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.03088>

- Zhang, D. (2023). *Universe simulator*. Accessed 2024-05-09 from <https://github.com/alibaba-damo-academy/universe>
- Zhang, L., Dong, Y., Farah, H., & Van Arem, B. (2023). Social-Aware Planning and Control for Automated Vehicles Based on Driving Risk Field and Model Predictive Contouring Control: Driving Through Roundabouts as a Case Study. *Conference Proceedings - IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man and Cybernetics*, 3297–3304. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SMC53992.2023.10394462>
- Zhang, T., Zhan, J., Shi, J., Xin, J., & Zheng, N. (2023). Human-Like Decision-Making of Autonomous Vehicles in Dynamic Traffic Scenarios. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 10(10), 1905–1917. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JAS.2023.123696>
- Zhao, C., Chu, D., Deng, Z., & Lu, L. (2024). Human-Like Decision Making for Autonomous Driving With Social Skills. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, PP, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITS.2024.3366699>
- Zhou, D., Ma, Z., Zhao, X., & Sun, J. (2022). Reasoning Graph: A Situation-aware framework for cooperating unprotected turns under mixed connected and autonomous traffic environments. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 143(July), 103815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2022.103815>
- Zhou, M., Luo, J., Vilella, J., Yang, Y., Rusu, D., Miao, J., Zhang, W., Alban, M., Fadakar, I., Chen, Z., Huang, A. C., Wen, Y., Hassanzadeh, K., Graves, D., Chen, D., Zhu, Z., Nguyen, N., Elsayed, M., Shao, K., ... Wang, J. (2020). SMARTS: Scalable Multi-Agent Reinforcement Learning Training School for Autonomous Driving. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*.
- Zhu, M., Wang, Y., Pu, Z., Hu, J., Wang, X., & Ke, R. (2020). Safe, efficient, and comfortable velocity control based on reinforcement learning for autonomous driving. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 117(Lv), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trc.2020.102662>
- Zhu, Z., & Zhao, H. (2023). Joint Imitation Learning of Behavior Decision and Control for Autonomous Intersection Navigation. *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, 1564–1571. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IROS55552.2023.10342405>
- Zong, Z., Shi, J., Wang, R., Chen, S., & Zheng, N. (2023). Human-Like Decision Making and Planning for Autonomous Driving with Reinforcement Learning. *IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems, Proceedings, ITSC, September*, 3922–3929. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ITSC57777.2023.10421908>