Suicidal Pedestrian: Generation of Safety-Critical Scenarios for Autonomous Vehicles

Yuhang Yang¹, Kalle Kujanpää², Amin Babadi³, Joni Pajarinen¹, and Alexander Ilin²

Abstract— Developing reliable autonomous driving algorithms poses challenges in testing, particularly when it comes to safety-critical traffic scenarios involving pedestrians. An open question is how to simulate rare events, not necessarily found in autonomous driving datasets or scripted simulations, but which can occur in testing, and, in the end may lead to severe pedestrian related accidents. This paper presents a method for designing a suicidal pedestrian agent within the CARLA simulator, enabling the automatic generation of traffic scenarios for testing safety of autonomous vehicles (AVs) in dangerous situations with pedestrians. The pedestrian is modeled as a reinforcement learning (RL) agent with two custom reward functions that allow the agent to either arbitrarily or with high velocity to collide with the AV. Instead of significantly constraining the initial locations and the pedestrian behavior, we allow the pedestrian and autonomous car to be placed anywhere in the environment and the pedestrian to roam freely to generate diverse scenarios. To assess the performance of the suicidal pedestrian and the target vehicle during testing, we propose three collision-oriented evaluation metrics. Experimental results involving two state-of-the-art autonomous driving algorithms trained end-to-end with imitation learning from sensor data demonstrate the effectiveness of the suicidal pedestrian in identifying decision errors made by autonomous vehicles controlled by the algorithms.

I. INTRODUCTION

Autonomous driving (AD) is a captivating field of research that holds great potential for enhancing household mobility, optimizing traffic efficiency, and ensuring safety. In recent years, AD has gained considerable attention, and remarkable advancements have been made. Two approaches have emerged: modular driving systems that design and train each sub-module separately according to its functions [1], [2], and end-to-end models that directly perform decisions based on raw sensor inputs [3], [4]. However, despite these advancements, deploying AD on a large scale remains a significant challenge. A crucial reason for this is the difficulty, danger, and time-consuming nature of testing and validating autonomous vehicles (AVs), particularly in scenarios involving pedestrian safety.

Several datasets [5]–[7] have been provided for AV testing. However, most of these manually collected data contain few safety-critical scenarios, rendering a severe overestimation of

Fig. 1: Overview of the proposed suicidal pedestrian traffic scenario. The autonomous vehicle (AV) is controlled by an autonomous driving (AD) algorithm, which takes inputs from various sensors, producing low-level control commands to drive the vehicle safely. The pedestrian, modeled as a reinforcement learning (RL) agent, observes the location and velocity of the vehicle, and tries to hit the car with an adversarial policy learned from reward feedback.

the safety performance of the testing vehicle. Other popular practices for AV testing focus on generating traffic scenarios [8]–[10]. While these practices enrich the range of test scenarios and expedite the validation process, they are often limited to specific scenes, such as highways or intersections, and do not adequately consider pedestrian interactions.

In this paper, we propose a method for automatically generating pedestrian-related, safety-critical traffic scenarios specifically for AV testing. By optimizing the pedestrian's behavior in the scene, we guide the pedestrian to exhibit suicidal actions with the intention of colliding with the moving car, thereby forcing the vehicle to take emergency actions. To achieve this, we formulate the suicidal pedestrian as a reinforcement learning (RL) agent and train it using a modelfree RL algorithm. Additionally, to enable the pedestrian to adapt to various scenes, we design an observation space based on pedestrian characteristics and impose constraints on the initial distance between the test vehicle and the pedestrian. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our approach in generating suicidal pedestrian-based scenarios, we conduct extensive experiments in different environments, employing diverse driving policies.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- 1) Proposing a method for generating pedestrian-related safety-critical traffic scenarios dedicated to AV testing.
- 2) Designing a suicidal pedestrian as an RL agent that aims to collide with the AV under test and training the agent using a model-free RL algorithm.
- 3) Generalizing the suicidal pedestrian to test various driving policies in different environments after training

The work is supported by FCAI (Finnish Center for Artificial Intelligence)

¹Yuhang Yang and Joni Pajarinen are with the Department of Electrical Engineering and Automation, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland. yuhang.yang@aalto.fi; joni.pajarinen@aalto.fi

 2 Kalle Kujanpää and Alexander Ilin are with the Department of Computer Science, Aalto University, Espoo, Finland. kalle.kujanpaa@aalto.fi; alexander.ilin@aalto.fi

³Amin Babadi is with Bugbear Entertainment Oy. Helsinki, Finland. Work done while at Aalto University. amin.babadi@bugbear.fi

it against a specific driving agent in limited situations.

4) Experimentally demonstrating the effectiveness of our suicidal pedestrian in identifying AV decision failures through testing with two state-of-the-art AD algorithms.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Traffic Scenario Generation for Vehicle Testing

Traffic scenario generation for vehicle testing aims to construct diverse traffic situations using simulators in order to expedite and streamline the AV testing process because realworld testing can be dangerous and expensive, particularly for safety-critical scenarios.

Recently, a lot of research has been presented on traffic scenario generation [8]–[11]. In [8], an adversarial driving scenario for AV testing is proposed, which involves training an adversarial car using Bayesian optimization and modeling the unknown cumulative performance of the test agent as a Gaussian process. Another work [11] models a threeagent environment to test AVs for detecting decision errors and improve their performance through a two-step training framework. The first step involves training an adversarial vehicle to identify failures in the test cars, while the second step focuses on retraining the autonomous car based on these failure states to enhance its robustness. Furthermore, authors in [9] propose an intelligent testing environment to validate the statistical capacity boundary of AVs in an accelerated mode. By removing non-safety-critical states and reconnecting critical ones, the Markov decision process (MDP) is modified to contain only relevant information, thereby densifying the training data and reducing the time required for AV testing. However, these studies pay little attention to pedestrians, limiting their applicability.

More recent works have further studied the behavior of pedestrians. In [12], pedestrians are trained to cross roads through crosswalks when a test vehicle approaches. However, the pedestrian trajectory is pre-scripted, constraining the proposed method from being generalized to other environments. Drawing inspiration from various existing pedestrian models [13], [14], a pedestrian-placement model [15] learns to adversarially synthesize test scenarios to increase the likelihood of collisions with a test AV given a fixed driving policy and pedestrian behavior model. However, this approach was not evaluated against state-of-the-art AD algorithms.

B. Reinforcement Learning

RL algorithms guide agents to interact with the environment and to learn behaviors through a trial-and-error style without explicit human supervision. The RL problems are modeled as MDPs and the objective of RL is to maximize the rewards in the MDP by learning how to act. Specifically, for a given MDP, RL algorithms aim to learn an optimal policy $\pi^*(s)$ that maximizes the expectation of the cumulative discounted return for every state $s \in \mathcal{S}$:

$$
\max_{\pi} \mathbb{E}\bigg[\sum_{t=0}^{T} \gamma^t R_{t+1} \bigg| s\bigg],\tag{1}
$$

where T is the time horizon, γ the discount factor, and R the reward function that at each step t depends on the action a_t taken by the policy π in state s_t .

In the AD area, RL algorithms have been widely used either for developing new driving systems [16], [17] or for generating traffic scenarios [18]–[20]. We model the traffic scenario as an MDP and train our suicidal pedestrian using a model-free RL algorithm, PPO [21].

III. METHOD

Our work focuses on the generation of safety-critical traffic scenarios involving pedestrians to facilitate the testing of AVs in urban settings. As illustrated in Fig. [1,](#page-0-0) the generated scenarios contain two agents: the AV being tested and the suicidal pedestrian (Section [III-A\)](#page-1-0). The AV is controlled by some state-of-the-art driving algorithms, which take sensor observations as inputs and produce low-level commands such as steering angle and acceleration to ensure safe driving. On the other hand, the pedestrian, modeled as an RL agent and trained with a model-free RL algorithm (Section [III-B\)](#page-2-0), observes the location and motion of the AV and attempts to collide with the car, thereby causing the AV failure. Generating the training scenarios involving the pedestrian and the target vehicle is a non-trivial process. If the pedestrian and vehicle are too close to each other, causing a collision can be very easy, and if they are far away or move in opposite directions, it is very difficult. To address this issue, we constrain the set of initial states (Section [III-B\)](#page-2-0).

A. Walking as a Markov Decision Process

One of the central challenges addressed in this paper is formulating the testing scenario as a Markov decision process (MDP). Given that the testing AV is already well-trained with fixed driving policies, our focus lies on modeling the pedestrian. Consequently, it becomes crucial to precisely define the state space S , action space A , and reward function R for the pedestrian. The state transition dynamics are implicitly determined by the simulator once the aforementioned three elements are established.

1) State Space: The state input for our suicidal pedestrian agent captures how the agent perceives the environment. Since the pedestrian can successfully collide with the car by knowing the vehicle's position and velocity information, a finite-dimensional vector containing this information suffices for our collision-seeking suicidal pedestrian. Additionally, we consider how to represent the position and velocity. It can either be directly represented in world coordinates or in a relative form by describing it in the pedestrian coordinate system via coordinate transformation. In this paper, we adopt the relative representation due to its rotation and translation invariance, which enhances the generalization capability of our suicidal pedestrian.

Therefore, we use the following state space:

$$
s = [\alpha, d, \beta, v] \tag{2}
$$

where α is the angle of direction and d the distance to the target vehicle from the pedestrian, β is the relative direction

TABLE I: The PPO hyperparameters

Parameter	Value
No. total training steps	70000
No. epochs when optimizing the surrogate loss	10
No. env. steps to run per update	150
Batch size	64
Learning rate for actor and critic networks	3×10
Discount factor	0.98
λ for Generalized Advantage Estimate (GAE)	0.95
Objective clipping value	0.2
Value loss coefficient	0.5
Entropy regularization coefficient	0.01

in which the target vehicle is moving and v is the relative scalar speed.

2) Action Space: The action of our suicidal pedestrian is determined by the forward direction angle and the scalar velocity. The forward direction angle, ranging from $[-\pi, \pi]$, specifies what direction the pedestrian will walk toward, while the scalar velocity ranging from $[0, 3.5]$ in m/s describes how fast the pedestrian is. Notably, since the input state is represented in the pedestrian coordinate, the output action is also represented in this coordinate. However, both the pedestrian agent and the AV move in the environment defined in the world coordinate. Therefore, the pedestrian action, especially for its forward direction angle, must be transformed back to the world coordinates.

3) Reward Functions: The reward function plays an essential role in training the pedestrian policy. We have considered two types of rewards:

• Reward R_1 which aims to maximize the collision rate without considering the velocity of the vehicle:

$$
R_1 = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if hit the vehicle} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
$$

• Reward R_2 which encourages the pedestrian to generate the most hazardous collisions by encouraging collisions when the vehicle is driving at high speeds:

 $R_2 =$ $\sqrt{ }$ \int \mathcal{L} $\max(3, 1.5v_c)$, if hit the front of vehicle $max(1, 0.5v_c)$, if hit other parts of vehicle 0, otherwise

where v_c is the velocity of the vehicle when the collision happens. The shaped reward forms a natural curriculum and helps learn complex and unpredictable behaviors, such as exploiting occluded areas, required to fool the AD algorithms into dangerous frontal collisions.

B. Policy Optimization

We use a continuous-action model-free RL algorithm Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) [21] to train the suicidal pedestrian. We estimate the advantage function with GAE [22], and use the hyperparameters described in Table [I.](#page-2-1)

At the beginning of each episode, we spawn the pedestrian close to the vehicle within a sector area from $-60°$ to 60◦ based on the forward direction of the vehicle, with the distance varying from 7m to 30m. This creates a task of

a suitable difficulty level. When the distance is lower, it is easier to hit the vehicle. On the other hand, a larger distance allows the pedestrian to learn more complex behaviors, thus enhancing the diversity of the generated traffic scenarios.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

The experiments aim to demonstrate the effectiveness of our designed suicidal pedestrian used for generating safetycritical traffic scenarios for AV testing. To this end, we first train our suicidal pedestrian against one simple but effective rule-based AV. Later we evaluate the trained pedestrian in different environments to verify its ability to create collisions. Finally, we test two state-of-the-art AD algorithms with our trained suicidal pedestrian, exposing their decision errors when dealing with pedestrian-related traffic scenarios.

A. Experimental Setup

We use CARLA [23] open-source urban driving simulator to train and validate the designed suicidal pedestrian, as well as evaluate some state-of-the-art AD algorithms. We use Town 1 and Town 2 provided by CARLA to build our training and test environments. These towns contain T-intersections and two-lane roads. We chose these towns because T-intersections can provide more complex traffic scenarios and two-lane roads are the main road structure in residential areas where pedestrians are more likely to appear. We train our suicidal pedestrian against the default CARLA AV (behavior agent) with the two different reward functions, R_1 and R_2 , and perform three training runs.

We set the episode length to 600 timesteps and run the simulator at a speed of 20 timesteps per second. This means each episode lasts 30s unless the suicidal pedestrian collides with the vehicle. Moreover, considering the speed difference, each control command for the pedestrian is repeated for 20 timesteps, equal of 1s of simulation. At the same time, we update the command for AV every timestep to avoid accidents caused by delayed controls.

We use the OpenAI Gym [24] framework to wrap up our designed suicidal pedestrian. We train the pedestrian with the PPO [21] implementation from stable-baselines 3[25].

We evaluate the performance using the following metrics:

- *Collision rate*: an overall performance metric which specifies how often the pedestrian can result in a collision with the target vehicle.
- *Moving collision rate*: collision rate when the target vehicle is moving.
- *Front collision rate*: collision rate with the front part of the target vehicle.

B. Training Against the CARLA AV Agent

Fig. [2](#page-3-0) shows that training of the pedestrian policy converges after 70000 steps when trained using both rewards R_1 and R_2 . The value of the mean episode length indicates that using R_2 results in a policy that is more aggressive in searching for and hitting the vehicle.

Table [II](#page-3-1) shows the performance of our suicidal pedestrian. One can see that both reward functions perform well in

Fig. 2: Average rewards (left) and average episode lengths (right) during training of the suicidal pedestrian using R_1 (green) and R_2 (blue). The solid line represents the mean return, and the light-colored area represents the standard deviation. All plots are smoothed by the moving average over 9 data points.

TABLE II: Performance of the suicidal pedestrian against the CARLA AV agent. The best results from the point of view of the suicidal pedestrian are shown in bold.

		Train town (Town 2)		Test town (Town 1)		
Reward	Collision rate	Front collision rate	Moving collision rate	Collision rate	Front collision rate	Moving collision rate
R_1	0.84 ± 0.05	$0.77 + 0.04$	$0.42 + 0.09$	$0.79 + 0.00$	$0.73 + 0.05$	$0.43 + 0.04$
R2	0.90 ± 0.03	0.82 ± 0.05	$0.55 + 0.01$	0.86 ± 0.02	$0.80 + 0.04$	$0.54 + 0.05$

Fig. 3: Typical behaviors of the pedestrian trained with R_2 . Red arrows represent the pedestrian direction. Top row: The pedestrian directly hits the vehicle from the central front, as the car fails to predict the pedestrian's movement. Bottom row: The pedestrian crashes into the car from the side.

guiding the pedestrian to hit the target AV. R_2 generally yields better performance than R_1 . Note that more than half of all collisions happen when the AV does not stop in time, which corresponds to more hazardous scenarios. As for the collision areas, the front part of the vehicle receives almost 80% of collisions. We can also see that the pedestrian agent generalizes well to a new town. The performance of both reward functions declines only slightly, by approximately 5%, when the suicidal pedestrian is deployed to a previously unknown environment.

Note that the collision rate does not reach 100% and we see two reasons for that. First, the pedestrian uses a coordinate-based state and it may be blocked by environmental objects that are not included in the state. Second, sometimes the pedestrian fails to predict the future trajectory of the AV. In Fig. [3,](#page-3-2) we visualize some typical behaviors of the suicidal pedestrian.

C. Testing SOTA AD Algorithms with the Suicidal Pedestrian

We test two state-of-the-art AD algorithms with our suicidal pedestrian, LAV [26] that plans using predicted future trajectories for all traffic participants, and InterFuser [27] that has a safety controller relying on a predicted object density map to avoid collisions. Note that the pedestrian was trained against the CARLA behavior agent, and it is evaluated with LAV and InterFuser without any adaptations.

Table [III](#page-4-0) describes the performance of LAV and InterFuser against the suicidal pedestrian. The results show that the pedestrian can generate collisions both with LAV and InterFuser, showing potential weaknesses of these two driving algorithms. InterFuser has a much lower moving collision rate than LAV and CARLA, which suggests most crashes of InterFuser are not severe, while LAV is more likely to cause hazardous consequences when a collision happens.

We visualize some failures of LAV and InterFuser when

TABLE III: Evaluation results of two state-of-the-art AD algorithms using the suicidal pedestrian trained with reward R_2 . The best results from the point of view of the driving policy are shown in bold.

	Train town (Town 2)			Test town (Town 1)		
Method	Pedestrian reward	C ollision rate	Moving collision rate	Pedestrian reward	Collision rate	Moving collision rate
CARLA behavior	$4.57 + 0.15$	$0.90 + 0.03$	$0.55 + 0.02$	$4.29 + 0.29$	$0.86 + 0.02$	$0.54 + 0.05$
LAV [26]	$3.56 + 0.26$	$0.93 + 0.02$	$0.47 + 0.04$	3.94 ± 0.26	$0.90 + 0.03$	$0.61 + 0.01$
InterFuser [27]	$3.77 + 0.38$	$0.94 + 0.02$	$0.32 + 0.06$	$3.82 + 0.16$	$0.92 + 0.02$	$0.37 + 0.02$

Fig. 4: Visualization of two collision episodes with LAV. We present three (concatenated) camera images (top), detection and motion predictions (bottom left), and predicted road geometries (bottom right) for the two episodes. Left: LAV detects the pedestrian as a vehicle. Right: LAV fails to find the pedestrian due to insufficient fusion of images.

Fig. 5: Visualization of a failure case of InterFuser in which the AV does not perform any actions to avoid collisions due to failing to predict the trajectory of the pedestrian. We present camera images (top row), detected traffic scenes at the current timestep (middle row) and predicted traffic scenes at the next two timesteps (bottom row). The yellow rectangle in the last two rows represents the ego vehicle, while white rectangles represent other detected objects. Green dots are the future trajectory of the ego vehicle.

dealing with our suicidal pedestrian to understand their weaknesses better. Fig. [4](#page-4-1) illustrates two typical errors of LAV: incorrect detection and unsuccessful detection. In incorrect detection, LAV detects the pedestrian as a vehicle, thus applying unreasonable dynamic models to the pedestrian to predict the corresponding trajectories. In unsuccessful detection, LAV fails to detect the pedestrian due to vision failure. Interestingly, both errors can happen at different stages of one episode. Fig. [5](#page-4-2) illustrates a typical failure case of InterFuser, in which the vehicle does not perform any actions to avoid collisions with the suicidal pedestrian even if the pedestrian is detected. This failure suggests that Interfuser performs well in detection, but potential improvements should be applied to its prediction and decision-making modules.

V. DISCUSSION & FUTURE WORK

This paper proposes a suicidal pedestrian model to generate safety-critical traffic scenarios for AD testing. We model the pedestrian as an RL agent and train it using a modelfree PPO algorithm. Furthermore, we perform experiments to validate its effectiveness in generating collision scenarios. Finally, testing results of two state-of-the-art AD algorithms illustrate our suicidal pedestrian can significantly help find driving algorithm decision errors.

Our work can be extended to having more pedestrians and cars in the simulations. Another direction would be to consider different goal-conditioned pedestrians to generate more varying behaviors to address the limitation of only using the suicidal pedestrian with limited behavior diversity. Moreover, we can augment our state representation with the locations of other objects, or we could use image inputs or object-based representations to replace the hand-crafted state vector, thus allowing the pedestrian to plan movements according to the surroundings, avoid obstacles, or take advantage of obstacles to surprise the drivers.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Paden, M. Čáp, S. Z. Yong, D. Yershov, and E. Frazzoli, "A survey of motion planning and control techniques for self-driving urban vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on intelligent vehicles*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 33–55, 2016.
- [2] A. Colombo and D. Del Vecchio, "Efficient algorithms for collision avoidance at intersections," in *Proceedings of the 15th ACM international conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, 2012, pp. 145–154.
- [3] A. Kendall, J. Hawke, D. Janz, P. Mazur, D. Reda, J.-M. Allen, V.- D. Lam, A. Bewley, and A. Shah, "Learning to drive in a day," in *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 8248–8254.
- [4] D. Chen, B. Zhou, V. Koltun, and P. Krähenbühl, "Learning by cheating," in *Proceedings of the Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 66–75.
- [5] A. Geiger, P. Lenz, C. Stiller, and R. Urtasun, "Vision meets robotics: The kitti dataset," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 32, no. 11, pp. 1231–1237, 2013.
- [6] P. Sun, H. Kretzschmar, X. Dotiwalla, A. Chouard, V. Patnaik, P. Tsui, J. Guo, Y. Zhou, Y. Chai, B. Caine *et al.*, "Scalability in perception for autonomous driving: Waymo open dataset," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 2446–2454.
- [7] J. Behley, M. Garbade, A. Milioto, J. Quenzel, S. Behnke, C. Stachniss, and J. Gall, "Semantickitti: A dataset for semantic scene understanding of lidar sequences," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 9297–9307.
- [8] Y. Abeysirigoonawardena, F. Shkurti, and G. Dudek, "Generating adversarial driving scenarios in high-fidelity simulators," in *Proceedings of the 2019 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 8271–8277.
- [9] S. Feng, H. Sun, X. Yan, H. Zhu, Z. Zou, S. Shen, and H. X. Liu, "Dense reinforcement learning for safety validation of autonomous vehicles," *Nature*, vol. 615, no. 7953, pp. 620–627, 2023.
- [10] M. Zhang, Y. Zhang, L. Zhang, C. Liu, and S. Khurshid, "Deeproad: Gan-based metamorphic testing and input validation framework for autonomous driving systems," in *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Automated Software Engineering*, 2018, pp. 132–142.
- [11] A. Sharif and D. Marijan, "Adversarial deep reinforcement learning for improving the robustness of multi-agent autonomous driving policies," in *Proceedings of the 2022 29th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 61–70.
- [12] D. Karunakaran, S. Worrall, and E. Nebot, "Efficient statistical validation with edge cases to evaluate highly automated vehicles," in *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE 23rd International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2020, pp. 1–8.
- [13] A. Rasouli and J. K. Tsotsos, "Autonomous vehicles that interact with pedestrians: A survey of theory and practice," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 900–918, 2020.
- [14] W. Ding, B. Chen, M. Xu, and D. Zhao, "Learning to collide: An adaptive safety-critical scenarios generating method," in *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 2243–2250.
- [15] M. Priisalu, A. Pirinen, C. Paduraru, and C. Sminchisescu, "Generating scenarios with diverse pedestrian behaviors for autonomous vehicle testing," in *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 1247–1258.
- [16] M. Toromanoff, E. Wirbel, and F. Moutarde, "End-to-end model-free reinforcement learning for urban driving using implicit affordances," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2020.
- [17] D. Chen, V. Koltun, and P. Krähenbühl, "Learning to drive from a world on rails," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021, pp. 15 590–15 599.
- [18] M. Koren, S. Alsaif, R. Lee, and M. J. Kochenderfer, "Adaptive stress testing for autonomous vehicles," in *Proceedings of the 2018 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–7.
- [19] A. Corso, P. Du, K. Driggs-Campbell, and M. J. Kochenderfer, "Adaptive stress testing with reward augmentation for autonomous vehicle validatio," in *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 163–168.
- [20] B. Chalaki, L. E. Beaver, B. Remer, K. Jang, E. Vinitsky, A. M. Bayen, and A. A. Malikopoulos, "Zero-shot autonomous vehicle policy transfer: From simulation to real-world via adversarial learning," in *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE 16th International Conference on Control & Automation (ICCA)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 35–40.
- [21] J. Schulman, F. Wolski, P. Dhariwal, A. Radford, and O. Klimov, "Proximal policy optimization algorithms," *arXiv*, 2017. [Online]. Available:<https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>
- [22] J. Schulman, P. Moritz, S. Levine, M. Jordan, and P. Abbeel, "Highdimensional continuous control using generalized advantage estimation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.02438*, 2015.
- [23] A. Dosovitskiy, G. Ros, F. Codevilla, A. Lopez, and V. Koltun, "Carla: An open urban driving simulator," in *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 1–16.
- [24] G. Brockman, V. Cheung, L. Pettersson, J. Schneider, J. Schulman, J. Tang, and W. Zaremba, "Openai gym," *arXiv*, 2016. [Online]. Available:<https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.01540>
- [25] A. Raffin, A. Hill, A. Gleave, A. Kanervisto, M. Ernestus, and N. Dormann, "Stable-baselines3: Reliable reinforcement learning implementations," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 268, pp. 1–8, 2021.
- [26] D. Chen and P. Krähenbühl, "Learning from all vehicles," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2022, pp. 17 222–17 231.
- [27] H. Shao, L. Wang, R. Chen, H. Li, and Y. Liu, "Safety-enhanced autonomous driving using interpretable sensor fusion transformer," in *Proceedings of the Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 726–737.