

# BoT-Drive: Hierarchical Behavior and Trajectory Planning for Autonomous Driving using POMDPs

Xuanjin Jin<sup>1</sup>, Chendong Zeng<sup>1</sup>, Shengfa Zhu<sup>2</sup>, Chunxiao Liu<sup>2</sup>, Panpan Cai<sup>1\*</sup>

**Abstract**—Uncertainties in dynamic road environments pose significant challenges for behavior and trajectory planning in autonomous driving. This paper introduces BoT-Drive, a planning algorithm that addresses uncertainties at both behavior and trajectory levels within a Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) framework. BoT-Drive employs driver models to characterize unknown behavioral intentions and utilizes their model parameters to infer hidden driving styles. By also treating driver models as decision-making actions for the autonomous vehicle, BoT-Drive effectively tackles the exponential complexity inherent in POMDPs. To enhance safety and robustness, the planner further applies importance sampling to refine the driving trajectory conditioned on the planned high-level behavior. Evaluation on real-world data shows that BoT-Drive consistently outperforms both existing planning methods and learning-based methods in regular and complex urban driving scenes, demonstrating significant improvements in driving safety and reliability.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Autonomous driving (AD) represents a pivotal advancement in transportation technology, aiming to improve road safety, efficiency, and convenience by enabling vehicles to navigate without human input. A crucial aspect of AD systems is behavior and trajectory planning. This involves planning high-level actions like lane keeping, lane changing, and turning, as well as low-level driving trajectories—sequences of positions, speeds, and accelerations. These elements must be carefully planned for the autonomous vehicle (the ego-vehicle) over a future time window, considering the dynamic nature of road environments.

One of the greatest challenges in behavior and trajectory planning is handling uncertainties, particularly in complex interactions among many traffic participants. For example, the subtle actions of a nearby vehicle—such as slowly drifting toward the lane boundary—may suggest various possible intentions. These could range from preparing to change lanes or trying to create space for another vehicle, to simply exhibiting erratic driving habits. This uncertainty about the intentions and driving styles of other agents adds a significant layer of complexity to planning.

Addressing these uncertainties in real-time is often prohibited due to the computational challenge—the computational cost increases exponentially with the number of participants and the planning horizon, known as the “curse of dimensionality” and the “curse of history” [1]. Common strategies to mitigate this challenge involve simplifying the

planning process by focusing only on certain aspects of the uncertainty, either at the behavior [2]–[15] or trajectory level [16]–[22], or by employing maximum-likelihood planning approaches [23]–[27]. However, such simplifications may compromise the safety and efficiency of the ego-vehicle in complex interaction scenes.

This paper introduces BoT-Drive, a new planning algorithm grounded within a Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) framework, addressing uncertainties at both behavior and trajectory levels using hierarchical planning. The algorithm treats behavioral intentions and driving styles of external traffic participants (exo-agents) as hidden states. It represents potential driving behaviors with a set of driver models, leveraging their model parameters to characterize driving styles. This hierarchical representation allows for efficient reasoning about others’ uncertain behaviors and trajectories.

BoT-Drive further employs these driver models as high-level decision-making actions, in order to cut down the POMDP planning horizon, thus addressing the exponential complexity. This enables real-time planning in complex driving scenes, even with limited computational resources. At the low level, it generates driving trajectories by simulating the outcomes of these driver models, evaluating decisions at both levels to determine the optimal driving behavior and trajectory under uncertainty. Subsequently, we employ a trajectory optimization step to further refine the driving trajectory. The refinement step resamples scenarios from an importance sampling distribution that ensures coverage of events with high impact on safety and efficiency, thereby improving the robustness of the driving trajectory.

Our experiments show that BoT-Drive effectively enables safe and robust long-term planning under uncertainty in diverse urban environments. Evaluations using the interactive setting of nuPlan demonstrate that BoT-Drive achieves state-of-the-art performance compared to learning-based methods trained on the same dataset, without requiring any training data. Further analyses on another real-world dataset emphasizing long-term interactions show that BoT-Drive significantly enhances driving safety and efficiency over existing planning algorithms, attributed to its hierarchical and long-term reasoning and the application of importance sampling.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Uncertainty Modeling for Driving Behaviors

To plan behaviors and trajectories for a robot car, a prerequisite is to predict the behaviors of other agents and characterize the uncertainty in it. This requires motion

\* Corresponding Author.

<sup>1</sup> X. Jin, C. Zeng and P. Cai are with Qingyuan Research Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China.

<sup>2</sup> S. Zhu and C. Liu are with SenseTime, Shanghai 200240, China.




Fig. 1: Driving in a complex scene. The ego-vehicle (green) (a) passes through stopped vehicles; (b) perceives a merging vehicle (orange); (c) decelerates to make space; (d) changes lane to avoid collision; (e) follows leading vehicle. The blue line shows the planned trajectory.

prediction models that can deliver distributional outputs to capture potential behavioral modes, typically categorized into learning-based models and model-based inference methods.

Learning-based models leverage deep neural networks to derive distributional predictions of driving trajectories from data. Techniques include using multiple recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [28], conditional variational auto-encoders (CVAEs) [4], [29], [30], generative adversarial networks (GANs) [31]–[33], and, more recently, graph neural networks (GNNs) [34] and Transformers [35]. Despite high accuracy in datasets, these methods often require substantial computation, limiting their applicability in real-time planning.

In contrast, model-based inference offers a computationally efficient approach by relying on lightweight motion models, such as linear dynamics [36]–[38] or predefined maneuvers [39], [40], and uses inference techniques like hidden Markov models (HMMs) [39], [41]–[43] or dynamic Bayesian networks (DBNs) [37], [38], [40], [44] to evaluate the probabilities of different models. In this work, we extend the model-based inference framework to characterize uncertainties in both high-level behaviors and low-level trajectories. This is achieved by building a hierarchical filter upon a set of long-term driver models and their model parameters, corresponding to different behavioral intentions and driving styles respectively.

### B. Behavior and Trajectory Planning under Uncertainty

Safe and robust autonomous driving requires hedging against uncertainties at both behavior and trajectory levels. High-level uncertainties involve predicting others’ routes, maneuvers, or interaction decisions, while low-level uncertainties correspond to variations in acceleration, steering, etc. However, optimally tackling both levels of uncertainty leads to intractable computational complexity, thus, it requires simplification to achieve real-time performance.

A straightforward simplification is planning under the maximum-likelihood behaviors and trajectories of others. This approach is commonly implemented using Monte-Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) [23]–[27]. Although efficient to execute, it may pose risks in scenes involving low-probability events, such as sudden lane changes.

To handle uncertainty at the trajectory level, existing works often leverage improved motion planners, which project uncertain predictions into static or dynamic probabilistic

occupancy maps [19], [22] and utilize classical planning algorithms such as A\* [16], RRT\* [17], and numerical trajectory optimization [18]–[22] to determine optimal trajectories. However, these methods often use a decoupled planning approach where trajectories are planned based on a fixed behavior determined by a high-level (often rule-based) planner. This restrains the synergy between the behavior strategy and the driving trajectory in the face of uncertainties, prohibiting smarter behaviors like changing lanes to avoid an unpredictable driver.

To address uncertainty at the behavior level, multi-policy decision-making (MPDM) generates a set of candidate policies [2], [3] or action sequences [4]–[6] for the ego-vehicle, evaluates each against sampled behaviors of other agents, and selects the policy with the best expected performance. Despite its efficiency, it plans in an open-loop manner, i.e., it never updates the belief of others’ behaviors during look-ahead planning, thus ignoring the benefits of future information. This can bring overly conservative policies and prohibit information gathering actions, e.g., shifting slightly towards the target lane when unsure about whether others would yield.

To perform closed-loop planning under uncertainty, past works formulate the driving problem as POMDPs, treating the unknown behaviors of others as hidden states, then apply POMDP solvers such as QMDP [15], POMCP [8]–[11], DESPOT [13], [14], and ABT [12] to compute the ego-vehicle’s behavior policy conditioned on future observations. Some of these works perform short-term planning by searching over primitive actions, such as longitudinal accelerations and lateral velocities [7]–[9], [11]–[14], while others consider high-level behaviors such as lane keeping and changing for long-term planning [10], [15]. However, existing POMDP methods are typically limited to specific scenes, such as multi-lane roads. Moreover, they only address behavior-level uncertainty and neglect trajectory-level uncertainty for computational simplicity. This is insufficient given that different drivers with the same intention may exhibit vastly different trajectories—e.g., an aggressive driver might cut into a lane abruptly, while a conservative driver would do so more cautiously. In this work, we extend the POMDP approach to tackle urban environments and achieve state-of-the-art results on a large-scale benchmark, nuPlan [45]. We also use a hierarchical POMDP framework to




Fig. 2: Overview of BoT-Drive, with four key steps to driving effectively in complex and uncertain urban environments: (a) the driver models used for predicting driving behaviors, including lane / lane connector following ( $LF$ ) and lane changing to the left or right ( $LC-L / LC-R$ ). (b) the multi-model inference for updating beliefs about the driver model  $m$ , reflecting behavioral intention, and the model parameter  $\theta$ , reflecting driving style, of exo-agents. (c) the belief tree search planner for determining the ego-vehicle’s optimal policy over high-level behaviors. (d) the trajectory optimization with importance sampling for refining the ego-vehicle’s driving trajectory under uncertainty.

address uncertainty at both behavior and trajectory levels simultaneously.

### III. OVERVIEW

In this paper, we introduce a hierarchical planner designed to address uncertainties at both behavior and trajectory levels. Our approach centers on a Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) framework, treating the potential behavioral intentions and driving styles of other traffic participants as hidden states, while high-level behaviors of the ego-vehicle are considered as actions. The framework represents main driving behaviors using a set of driver models (Fig. 2a). Behavioral intentions of exo-agents are modeled using these driver models, and driving styles are captured using their model parameters. These models form the basis of a multi-model inference method that dynamically tracks beliefs over exo-agents’ behaviors through Bayesian inference (Fig. 2b). Conditioned on the current belief, a belief tree search algorithm plans the ego-vehicle’s optimal policy, estimating the potential consequences of future actions and the influence of observed information (Fig. 2c). Following the planned behavior, we employ importance sampling to obtain representative scenarios, generating robust low-level trajectories for the ego-vehicle. These trajectories undergo a cross-scenario evaluation to select the most effective one for execution (Fig. 2d).

Our focus is on urban driving scenes, emphasizing two key driving behaviors: lane / lane connector following and lane changing. Although the algorithm is tailored for these scenes, it is general and can be applied to various driving contexts with appropriate driver models.

### IV. UNCERTAINTY MODELING USING DRIVER MODELS

In this section, we present details on the driver models and the methodology for multi-model inference, which is essential for effectively tracking the belief over behavioral intentions and driving styles within our POMDP framework.

#### A. Driver Models

We define two key driver behaviors for urban driving: lane / lane connector following ( $LF$ ) and lane changing

( $LC$ ), each using a distinct model. The  $LF$  model guides the vehicle along the lane center or through lane connectors at junctions, while the  $LC$  model employs the MOBIL model [46] to perform lane changes, considering available space and minimal impact on following vehicles. Both models generate trajectories by employing the pure pursuit algorithm [47] for lateral control and the Intelligent Driver Model (IDM) [48] for longitudinal control. In  $LF$ , driving style is reflected by the IDM’s desired speed, with higher values indicating greater aggressiveness, while in  $LC$ , it is characterized by the pure pursuit controller’s look-ahead distance, with larger values denoting more caution.

#### B. Multi-Model Inference

To effectively track the beliefs over behavioral intentions and driving styles, we construct a dynamic Bayesian network (DBN) (Fig. 3), incorporating the aforementioned driver models and their parameters.

1) *DBN Structure*: The DBN framework comprises several key random variables:

- $x$ : physical states of all agents, including position, speed, linear acceleration, heading direction, yaw rate, etc.
- $m$ : behavioral intention (driver model) of exo-agents, assumed to be static and independent.
- $\theta$ : driving style (model parameters) of exo-agents, also static and independent.
- $o$ : observations reflecting agents’ physical states with inherent noise.

The DBN also includes critical conditional distributions:

- $p(x_t|x_{t-1}, m, \theta)$ : the transition model of physical states, following  $x_t = G(x_{t-1}, m, \theta)$  where  $G$  denotes forward simulation using the assumed driver models in  $m$  and model parameters in  $\theta$ .
- $p(o_t|x_t)$ : the observation model assuming Gaussian distribution around actual physical states  $x_t$ .

2) *Hierarchical Filtering*: For belief tracking, we apply hierarchical filtering in two stages:




Fig. 3: The dynamic Bayesian network for tracking the belief over others’ behavioral intentions and driving styles. The arrows (green) represent the process of updating the belief. (a) The belief over behavioral intention  $m$ . (b) The belief over physical states  $x_t$  and driving styles  $\theta$ .

*Low-Level Particle Filter:* For each hypothesis of behavioral intention  $m$ , we run a particle filter [49] on the DBN with fixed  $m$ . This filter maintains a particle belief (Fig. 3b) over physical states  $x_t$  and driving styles  $\theta$ , using the transition function  $x_t = G(x_{t-1}, m, \theta)$  and observation model  $p(o_t|x_t)$ .

*High-Level Histogram Filter:* To update the belief over behavioral intentions  $m$ , we utilize exact inference via a histogram filter (Fig. 3a). This involves calculating the belief  $b_t(m)$  using Bayes’ rule, integrating observation likelihoods over the low-level particle belief. Concretely, applying Bayes’ rule on the DBN gives:

$$b_t(m) = \eta p(o_t|m) b_{t-1}(m) \quad (1)$$

where  $\eta$  is the normalization constant, and:

$$\begin{aligned} p(o_t|m) &= \sum_{x_t, x_{t-1}, \theta} p(o_t|x_t) p(x_t|x_{t-1}, \theta, m) p(x_{t-1}, \theta|m) \\ &= \sum_{x_{t-1}, \theta} p(o_t|G(x_{t-1}, m, \theta)) p(x_{t-1}, \theta|m). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The last line of Eq. (2) indicates computing the high-level observation likelihood  $p(o_t|m)$  by integrating low-level likelihoods  $p(o_t|G(x_{t-1}, m, \theta))$  over the particle belief  $p(x_{t-1}, \theta|m)$ .

This multi-model inference method allows for precise tracking of exo-agents’ intentions and styles, enhancing the POMDP planner’s decision-making in complex driving scenes.

## V. HIERARCHICAL BEHAVIOR AND TRAJECTORY PLANNING USING POMDP

In this section, we present the formulation of our Partially Observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) and illustrate the BoT-Drive algorithm for hierarchical behavior and trajectory planning, developed upon the POMDP formulation.

### A. POMDP Model

The specifics of the POMDP model are as follows.

1) *State and Observation Spaces:* The state representation,  $x$ , and observation representation,  $o$ , in our POMDP model are consistent with those defined in the Dynamic Bayesian Network (DBN) as discussed in Section IV.

2) *Action Space:* The action space,  $A$ , for the ego-vehicle contains a set of high-level driving behaviors. They include lane / lane connector following (*LF*), lane changing to the left (*LC-L*), and lane changing to the right (*LC-R*), each underpinned by a specific driver model. Actions are dynamically filtered based on the current physical state of the ego-vehicle to exclude illegal or unreasonable maneuvers. For example, *LC-L* is deemed illegal if the ego-vehicle is already in the leftmost lane.

3) *State Transition and Observation Models:* The state transition and observation models in the POMDP mirror those in Section IV. State transitions are determined by forward simulating the assumed driver models and parameters for all agents, including the ego-vehicle, while the observation model remains consistent with the DBN.

4) *Reward Function:* The reward function in the POMDP model is designed to holistically capture the key aspects of autonomous driving performance:

- *Safety:* Measured by a cubic collision penalty that increases with driving speed.
- *Efficiency:* Measured by a linear penalty based on the deviation from the desired speed.
- *Task Completion:* Measured by an exponentially growing penalty as the vehicle deviates from its goal lane.
- *Smoothness:* Measured by a constant penalty assigned to each lane change action.

### B. Belief Tree Search Planner

In this section, we present the belief tree search planner in BoT-Drive for computing the optimal behavior policy (Fig. 2(c)). This planner is developed upon DESPOT [53], a popular POMDP solver, extended to integrate high-level behavior planning with low-level trajectory optimization.

The planner begins by sampling a diverse set of driving scenarios. Each scenario captures a unique combination of the physical state  $x$ , behavioral intention  $m$ , and driving style  $\theta$  of all exo-agents interacting with the ego-vehicle, collectively forming the initial belief. Rooted in this belief, the planner constructs a belief tree that recursively branches over all feasible high-level actions available to the ego-vehicle and the potential observations it might encounter. For each action and a given scenario, the planner simulates the corresponding behavior of the ego-vehicle and rolls out the driver models of all relevant agents. These forward simulations are conducted with discrete time steps (0.2 seconds) and over fixed durations (2 seconds for *LF* and 4 seconds for *LC*). After action branching, the tree further branches with observations. The planner streamlines the branching process by considering only the final observation from each simulation. The belief tree is iteratively built following the DESPOT heuristics, using a maximum look-ahead horizon of 9 seconds. The planner replans at a fixed rate, e.g., 10Hz.

TABLE I  
COMPARISON WITH LEARNING-BASED MODELS

Methods	Val14					Test14-hard				
	Overall Score $\uparrow$	Coll.R. $\downarrow$	Prog. $\uparrow$	Comf. $\uparrow$	Area Com. $\uparrow$	Overall Score $\uparrow$	Coll.R. $\downarrow$	Prog. $\uparrow$	Comf. $\uparrow$	Area Com. $\uparrow$
	(-)	(%)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(-)	(%)	(-)	(-)	(-)
GC-PGP [50]	54.51	15.56	57.99	91.68	87.21	42.86	18.75	47.37	<b>89.34</b>	86.76
PlanCNN <sup>1</sup> [51]	72.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IDM [48]	77.33	11.27	85.20	93.11	93.02	62.26	17.28	69.60	87.87	84.19
PDM [52]	92.11	2.15	90.21	<b>94.81</b>	99.46	76.07	4.78	75.09	84.19	95.22
BoT-Drive (Ours)	<b>92.57</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>90.52</b>	93.38	<b>100.00</b>	<b>81.32</b>	<b>4.41</b>	<b>80.34</b>	86.76	<b>97.06</b>

The outcome of this planning process is an optimal policy tree, specifying the best action for every potential future observation. From this tree, an optimal sequence of actions is extracted: the first action is the immediate optimal action under the current belief, and subsequent actions are chosen following the most likely observation path in the policy tree.

Leveraging the guaranteed near-optimality of DESPOT search [53], the proposed planner enables optimal hedging against uncertainty in dynamic and interactive driving environments.

### C. Trajectory Optimization with Importance Sampling

This trajectory optimization complements the belief tree search planner by performing detailed analysis at the trajectory level. Scenarios are resampled using importance sampling, focusing on key driving events. Candidate trajectories are generated for each scenario and cross-evaluated across all scenarios as follows,

$$E[V(\tau(\phi))] = \frac{1}{n_{\text{IS}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{IS}}} \prod_{j=1}^N \frac{p(m_{i,j})}{q(m_{i,j})} V_i(\tau(\phi)), \quad (3)$$

$$\tau(\phi)^* = \arg \max E[V(\tau(\phi))],$$

where  $n_{\text{IS}}$  is the number of sampled scenarios,  $N$  is the number of exo-agents,  $\phi$  is a sampled scenario,  $\tau(\phi)$  is a candidate trajectory generated under scenario  $\phi$ . The expected trajectory value  $V(\tau(\phi))$  is computed using the reward model as detailed in Section V-A.4), with importance weights  $\frac{p(m_{i,j})}{q(m_{i,j})}$  correcting for bias. The trajectory that maximizes the expected value is selected, ensuring safe and efficient maneuvers under uncertainty.

## VI. EXPERIMENTS

Our experiments compare BoT-Drive with both learning-based models and model-based planning using real-world driving data. Results show that BoT-Drive successfully generalizes to diverse urban environments and effectively enhances driving safety in complex scenes and task completion in long-term interactions. While BoT-Drive is completely training-free, it achieves state-of-the-art performance in the interactive setting of nuPlan, compared to learning-based models. On another dataset focused on long-term interactions, BoT-Drive achieves zero collisions and full task completion compared to existing planning algorithms. Ablation

<sup>1</sup>PlanCNN [51] did not release the trained model. Thus, the results are retrieved from the PDM paper [52].

studies highlight the crucial roles of hierarchical POMDP planning and importance sampling in trajectory optimization.

### A. Comparison with Learning-Based Models

In this section, we compare BoT-Drive with existing learning-based methods, focusing on the driving performance in diverse urban environments. We evaluate methods on nuPlan [45], a large-scale real-world autonomous driving dataset, using the *Val14* set selected by [52] with 1,118 regular scenes and the *Test14-hard* set selected by [51] with 272 complex scenes. Each scene lasts for 15 seconds. Evaluations are conducted in the interactive setting, leveraging closed-loop simulation of the traffic flow. We apply the official metrics from nuPlan, including collision rate (Coll. R), progress towards the goal (Prog.), passenger comfort (Comf.), and drivable area compliance (Area Com.).

We compare BoT-Drive with state-of-the-art learning models, including PDM [52], the winner of the 2023 nuPlan planning competition, which integrates IDM [48] for longitudinal control with a learned module for lateral offset adjustment, and baselines highlighted in that paper, such as GC-PGP [50], which encodes observations as graphs to predict probable trajectories; PlanCNN [51], which uses a CNN to encode observations and employs a transformer-based model for future trajectory planning; and IDM [48].

Results in Table I show that BoT-Drive outperforms all learning-based models, achieving the highest overall score. It achieves the lowest collision rate of 0.81% in *Val14* and 4.41% in *Test14-hard*, the highest progress and area compliance in both sets, while maintaining a similar level of comfort. The performance gap becomes more significant on complex cases in *Test14-hard*. Notably, after excluding collisions caused by non-reactive pedestrians, the collision rate further decreases to 0.0% and 1.47% in regular and complex cases, respectively. Note that, unlike learning-based methods that rely heavily on the specific dataset, BoT-Drive delivers state-of-the-art performance without requiring any training data.

### B. Comparison with Model-Based Planning

In this section, we compare BoT-Drive with model-based planning methods. To emphasize the driving performance in long-term interactions, we now use a different dataset containing 100 real-world traffic scenes, each with significantly longer episodes of 40 seconds, collected by autonomous



TABLE II  
COMPARISON WITH MODEL-BASED PLANNING

Methods		Reward $\uparrow$	Coll.R. $\downarrow$	MGR $\downarrow$	TTG $\downarrow$	Comfort $\uparrow$
		-	(%)	(%)	(s)	-
w/o unc	Decoupled	-0.90	1.70	0.00	42.74	0.96
	ML-MCTS	-0.88	2.00	0.00	42.75	0.98
	Ours	<b>-0.77</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>41.44</b>	<b>0.98</b>
w/ unc	Traj. Opt.	-2.43	10.00	0.90	<b>36.46</b>	0.92
	MPDM	-0.94	1.90	0.00	42.37	0.94
	POMDP	-0.89	1.80	0.10	41.36	0.95
	Ours	<b>-0.77</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	41.44	<b>0.98</b>

vehicles in Shanghai. Evaluation metrics include the overall performance, denoted by the cumulative reward; safety, denoted by the collision rate (Coll.R.); task completion, denoted by the miss-goal rate (MGR); efficiency, denoted by the time to goal (TTG); and a comfort score.

We compare BoT-Drive with existing planning algorithms, including Decoupled, which employs IDM to follow an A\*-searched path, and ML-MCTS [23]–[27], which uses Monte Carlo Tree Search (MCTS) to optimize the ego-vehicle’s behavior based on the maximum-likelihood scenario. Traj. Opt. [20], [21] implements trajectory optimization under uncertainty. MPDM [2]–[6] uses multi-policy decision-making to handle open-loop behavior planning under uncertainty. POMDP [8]–[10] performs closed-loop behavior planning under uncertainty.

Results in Table II show that BoT-Drive surpasses all baselines in the overall reward, achieving a collision rate of zero, and meeting all navigation goals across all tests, while also maintaining high efficiency and comfort. Compared to Decoupled and ML-MCTS, which do not account for uncertainty, BoT-Drive’s ability to optimally hedge against uncertainties has completely eliminated collisions by allowing the ego-vehicle to proactively predict and avoid potential hazards. Compared to Traj. Opt., MPDM, and POMDP, which also account for uncertainty, the enhanced performance of BoT-Drive is attributed to its hierarchical planning structure that synergistically integrates behavior policy with trajectory planning. Particularly, BoT-Drive overcomes the frequent collisions and goal-reaching failures of Traj. Opt. by utilizing interactive simulations to generate adaptable trajectories that ensure both safety and task completion. BoT-Drive advances MPDM and POMDP, which focus on abstract behavior policies, by simultaneously incorporating the stochastic nature of low-level trajectory planning. This two-level consideration is crucial for achieving a zero collision rate. Additionally, BoT-Drive augments comfort over Traj. Opt. and MPDM by effectively reasoning about future information and its impact on decisions, thus avoiding abrupt or inconsistent maneuvers.

### C. Ablation Study

We conduct an ablation study to assess key components of our algorithm by testing three variations: W/O-Unc., which uses only a single maximum-likelihood scenario for planning; W/O-IS, which omits importance sampling and directly

TABLE III  
ABLATION STUDY RESULTS

Methods	Reward $\uparrow$	Coll.R. $\downarrow$	MGR $\downarrow$	TTG $\downarrow$	Comfort $\uparrow$
	(-)	(%)	(%)	(s)	(-)
W/O-Unc.	-0.88	2.00	0.00	42.75	0.98
W/O-IS	-0.79	1.00	0.10	<b>41.39</b>	0.98
H=4s	-0.81	0.00	1.10	43.09	0.98
H=9s (Full)	<b>-0.77</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	41.44	<b>0.98</b>

samples from the original belief for trajectory optimization; and H=4s, which reduces the planning horizon from 9s to 4s.

Table III shows the results. Comparison with W/O-Unc. and W/O-IS confirms that both POMDP planning and importance sampling contribute to driving safety, evidenced by the reduction of the collision rate from 2% in W/O-Unc. and 1% in W/O-IS to 0% in BoT-Drive. Comparison with H=4s shows the benefit of long-term planning in ensuring task completion, evidenced by the reduction of the miss-goal rate from 1.1% in H=4s to 0% in BoT-Drive.

### D. Visualization of Planning Results

Our planning results in Fig. 1 illustrate BoT-Drive’s ability to handle uncertainty and perform long-term planning for safe and efficient driving. In (a), the ego-vehicle navigates through a complex junction, carefully interacting with surrounding vehicles. In (b), long-term planning enables the ego-vehicle to perceive the orange vehicle from a distance and anticipate a potential collision due to it intruding into the ego-vehicle’s lane, thus, the ego-vehicle decelerates in a timely manner. In (c), the belief tracker detects a significant increase in the probability of the risky intrusion, prompting the ego-vehicle to change lane, thus avoiding collision. In (d), while performing the lane change, the ego-vehicle continues to decelerate to ensure a safe following distance. In (e), the ego-vehicle has completed the lane change, and continues to follow the leading vehicle.

## VII. CONCLUSION

In this study, BoT-Drive addresses the challenge of behavior and trajectory planning in complex urban autonomous driving, focusing on tackling uncertainties. We have proposed a hierarchical POMDP planning framework, capable of handling uncertainties in both behavioral intentions and driving styles of other agents. By doing so, it can dynamically track others’ uncertain behaviors, and generate the optimal policy and the corresponding trajectory to achieve safe and efficient driving. Evaluations in real-world datasets demonstrate significant improvements in both safety and robustness.

Future work aims to increase computational efficiency through parallelization techniques and incorporate advanced deep-learning methods to further enhance the planner’s robustness and adaptability in highly unstructured and dynamic environments.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Pineau, G. Gordon, and S. Thrun, "Anytime point-based approximations for large POMDPs," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 27, pp. 335–380, 2006.
- [2] E. Galceran, A. Cunningham, R. Eustice, and E. Olson, "Multipolicy Decision-Making for Autonomous Driving via Change-point-based Behavior Prediction," in *Robotics: Science and Systems XI*, 2015.
- [3] E. Galceran, A. G. Cunningham, R. M. Eustice, and E. Olson, "Multipolicy decision-making for autonomous driving via change-point-based behavior prediction: Theory and experiment," *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1367–1382, 2017.
- [4] E. Schmerling, K. Leung, W. Vollprecht, and M. Pavone, "Multimodal probabilistic model-based planning for human-robot interaction," in *2018 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2018, pp. 3399–3406.
- [5] L. Zhang, W. Ding, J. Chen, and S. Shen, "Efficient uncertainty-aware decision-making for automated driving using guided branching," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2020, pp. 3291–3297.
- [6] W. Ding, L. Zhang, J. Chen, and S. Shen, "Epsilon: An efficient planning system for automated vehicles in highly interactive environments," *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 1118–1138, 2021.
- [7] S. Brechtel, T. Gindele, and R. Dillmann, "Probabilistic decision-making under uncertainty for autonomous driving using continuous POMDPs," in *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, 2014, pp. 392–399.
- [8] Z. N. Sunberg, C. J. Ho, and M. J. Kochenderfer, "The value of inferring the internal state of traffic participants for autonomous freeway driving," in *American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2017, pp. 3004–3010.
- [9] Z. Sunberg and M. J. Kochenderfer, "Improving automated driving through POMDP planning with human internal states," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 11, pp. 20 073–20 083, 2022.
- [10] D. S. González, M. Garzón, J. S. Dibangoye, and C. Laugier, "Human-like decision-making for automated driving in highways," in *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, 2019, pp. 2087–2094.
- [11] C. Xia, M. Xing, and S. He, "Interactive planning for autonomous driving in intersection scenarios without traffic signs," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 24 818–24 828, 2022.
- [12] K. Shu, H. Yu, X. Chen, S. Li, L. Chen, Q. Wang, L. Li, and D. Cao, "Autonomous driving at intersections: A behavior-oriented critical-turning-point approach for decision making," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 234–244, 2021.
- [13] H. Bai, S. Cai, N. Ye, D. Hsu, and W. S. Lee, "Intention-aware online POMDP planning for autonomous driving in a crowd," in *2015 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2015, pp. 454–460.
- [14] M. H. Danesh, P. Cai, and D. Hsu, "LEADER: Learning Attention over Driving Behaviors for Planning under Uncertainty," in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 199–211.
- [15] M. Naghshtavar, A. K. Sadek, and A. J. Wiggers, "Risk-averse behavior planning for autonomous driving under uncertainty," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.01254*, 2018.
- [16] O. Speidel, J. Ruof, and K. Dietmayer, "Graph-based motion planning for automated vehicles using multi-model branching and admissible heuristics," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Autonomous Systems (ICAS)*, 2021, pp. 1–5.
- [17] F. Damerow and J. Eggert, "Risk-averse behavior planning under multiple situations with uncertainty," in *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference (ITSC)*, 2015, pp. 656–663.
- [18] W. Xu, J. Pan, J. Wei, and J. M. Dolan, "Motion planning under uncertainty for on-road autonomous driving," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2014, pp. 2507–2512.
- [19] L. Lützw, Y. Meng, A. C. Armijos, and C. Fan, "Density planner: Minimizing collision risk in motion planning with dynamic obstacles using density-based reachability," in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023, pp. 7886–7893.
- [20] W. Xu, J. Wei, J. M. Dolan, H. Zhao, and H. Zha, "A real-time motion planner with trajectory optimization for autonomous vehicles," in *2012 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2012, pp. 2061–2067.
- [21] X. Li, Z. Sun, D. Cao, Z. He, and Q. Zhu, "Real-time trajectory planning for autonomous urban driving: Framework, algorithms, and verifications," *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 740–753, 2015.
- [22] J. Zhou, B. Olofsson, and E. Frisk, "Interaction-aware motion planning for autonomous vehicles with multi-modal obstacle uncertainty predictions," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [23] N. C. Volpi, Y. Wu, and D. Ognibene, "Towards event-based MCTS for autonomous cars," in *Asia-Pacific Signal and Information Processing Association Annual Summit and Conference (APSIPA ASC)*, 2017, pp. 420–427.
- [24] C. Li, T. Trinh, L. Wang, C. Liu, M. Tomizuka, and W. Zhan, "Efficient Game-Theoretic Planning With Prediction Heuristic for Socially-Compliant Autonomous Driving," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 10 248–10 255, 2022.
- [25] C.-J. Hoel, K. Driggs-Campbell, K. Wolff, L. Laine, and M. J. Kochenderfer, "Combining planning and deep reinforcement learning in tactical decision making for autonomous driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 294–305, 2019.
- [26] D. Lenz, T. Kessler, and A. Knoll, "Tactical cooperative planning for autonomous highway driving using Monte-Carlo Tree Search," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2016, pp. 447–453.
- [27] S. V. Albrecht, C. Brewitt, J. Wilhelm, B. Gyevar, F. Eiras, M. Dobre, and S. Ramamoorthy, "Interpretable goal-based prediction and planning for autonomous driving," in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2021, pp. 1043–1049.
- [28] N. Deo and M. M. Trivedi, "Multi-modal trajectory prediction of surrounding vehicles with maneuver based lstms," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2018, pp. 1179–1184.
- [29] C. Choi, J. H. Choi, J. Li, and S. Malla, "Shared cross-modal trajectory prediction for autonomous driving," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 244–253.
- [30] B. Ivanovic, K. Leung, E. Schmerling, and M. Pavone, "Multimodal deep generative models for trajectory prediction: A conditional variational autoencoder approach," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 295–302, 2020.
- [31] A. Gupta, J. Johnson, L. Fei-Fei, S. Savarese, and A. Alahi, "Social gan: Socially acceptable trajectories with generative adversarial networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 2255–2264.
- [32] X. Li, G. Rosman, I. Gilitschenski, C.-I. Vasile, J. A. DeCastro, S. Karaman, and D. Rus, "Vehicle trajectory prediction using generative adversarial network with temporal logic syntax tree features," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 3459–3466, 2021.
- [33] A. Kawasaki and A. Seki, "Multimodal trajectory predictions for autonomous driving without a detailed prior map," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 3723–3732.
- [34] N. Deo, E. Wolff, and O. Beijbom, "Multimodal trajectory prediction conditioned on lane-graph traversals," in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 203–212.
- [35] Z. Huang, X. Mo, and C. Lv, "Multi-modal motion prediction with transformer-based neural network for autonomous driving," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2022, pp. 2605–2611.
- [36] E. A. Pool, J. F. Kooij, and D. M. Gavrila, "Using road topology to improve cyclist path prediction," in *2017 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2017, pp. 289–296.
- [37] J. F. P. Kooij, F. Flohr, E. A. I. Pool, and D. M. Gavrila, "Context-Based Path Prediction for Targets with Switching Dynamics," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 127, no. 3, pp. 239–262, 2019.
- [38] M. Roth, J. Stapel, R. Happee, and D. M. Gavrila, "Driver and pedestrian mutual awareness for path prediction and collision risk estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 896–907, 2021.
- [39] G. Xie, H. Gao, L. Qian, B. Huang, K. Li, and J. Wang, "Vehicle trajectory prediction by integrating physics-and maneuver-based approaches using interactive multiple models," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics*, vol. 65, no. 7, pp. 5999–6008, 2017.

- [40] C. Blaiotta, "Learning generative socially aware models of pedestrian motion," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 3433–3440, 2019.
- [41] F. Kuhnt, R. Kohlhaas, T. Schamm, and J. M. Zöllner, "Towards a unified traffic situation estimation model—Street-dependent behaviour and motion models," in *2015 18th International Conference on Information Fusion (Fusion)*, 2015, pp. 1223–1229.
- [42] F. Kuhnt, J. Schulz, T. Schamm, and J. M. Zöllner, "Understanding interactions between traffic participants based on learned behaviors," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2016, pp. 1271–1278.
- [43] N. Schneider and D. M. Gavrila, "Pedestrian Path Prediction with Recursive Bayesian Filters: A Comparative Study," in *Pattern Recognition*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013, vol. 8142, pp. 174–183, series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
- [44] Y. Gu, Y. Hashimoto, L.-T. Hsu, and S. Kamijo, "Motion planning based on learning models of pedestrian and driver behaviors," in *IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2016, pp. 808–813.
- [45] H. Caesar, J. Kabzan, K. S. Tan, W. K. Fong, E. Wolff, A. Lang, L. Fletcher, O. Beijbom, and S. Omari, "NuPlan: A closed-loop ML-based planning benchmark for autonomous vehicles," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11810*, 2022.
- [46] A. Kesting, M. Treiber, and D. Helbing, "General Lane-Changing Model MOBIL for Car-Following Models," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, vol. 1999, no. 1, pp. 86–94, 2007.
- [47] R. C. Coulter, *Implementation of the pure pursuit path tracking algorithm*. Carnegie Mellon University, The Robotics Institute, 1992.
- [48] M. Treiber, A. Hennecke, and D. Helbing, "Congested traffic states in empirical observations and microscopic simulations," *Physical Review E*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 1805–1824, 2000.
- [49] P. M. Djuric, J. H. Kotecha, J. Zhang, Y. Huang, T. Ghirmai, M. F. Bugallo, and J. Miguez, "Particle filtering," *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 19–38, 2003.
- [50] M. Hallgarten, M. Stoll, and A. Zell, "From Prediction to Planning With Goal Conditioned Lane Graph Traversals," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.07753*, 2023.
- [51] K. Renz, K. Chitta, O.-B. Mercea, A. S. Koepke, Z. Akata, and A. Geiger, "PlanT: Explainable Planning Transformers via Object-Level Representations," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14222*, 2022.
- [52] D. Dauner, M. Hallgarten, A. Geiger, and K. Chitta, "Parting with misconceptions about learning-based vehicle motion planning," in *Proceedings of The 7th Conference on Robot Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, J. Tan, M. Toussaint, and K. Darvish, Eds., vol. 229. PMLR, 2023, pp. 1268–1281.
- [53] N. Ye, A. Somani, D. Hsu, and W. S. Lee, "DESPOT: Online POMDP planning with regularization," *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, vol. 58, pp. 231–266, 2017.