

Closed-Loop Supervised Fine-Tuning of Tokenized Traffic Models

Zhejun Zhang¹ Peter Karkus¹ Maximilian Igl¹
 Wenhao Ding¹ Yuxiao Chen¹ Boris Ivanovic¹ Marco Pavone^{1,2}
¹NVIDIA Research ²Stanford University

{zhejunz, pkarkus, migl, wenhaod, yuxiaoc, bivanovic, mpavone}@nvidia.com

pavone@stanford.edu

Abstract

Traffic simulation aims to learn a policy for traffic agents that, when unrolled in closed-loop, faithfully recovers the joint distribution of trajectories observed in the real world. Inspired by large language models, tokenized multi-agent policies have recently become the state-of-the-art in traffic simulation. However, they are typically trained through open-loop behavior cloning, and thus suffer from covariate shift when executed in closed-loop during simulation. In this work, we present *Closest Among Top-K (CAT-K) rollouts*, a simple yet effective closed-loop fine-tuning strategy to mitigate covariate shift. CAT-K fine-tuning only requires existing trajectory data, without reinforcement learning or generative adversarial imitation. Concretely, CAT-K fine-tuning enables a small 7M-parameter tokenized traffic simulation policy to outperform a 102M-parameter model from the same model family, achieving the top spot on the Waymo Sim Agent Challenge leaderboard at the time of submission. The code is available at <https://github.com/NVlabs/catk>.

1. Introduction

Traffic modeling is a cornerstone of autonomous driving simulation and evaluation, typically formulated as learning a multi-agent policy that imitates the behavior of traffic participants in the real world. Given a set of historical agent trajectories and scene context (map, traffic light states, etc.), the policy generates actions for all simulated agents. The task gives rise to an imitation learning (IL) problem, with two key challenges: *multimodality* and *covariate shift*.

Traffic agent behavior is highly multimodal, and faithfully recovering accurate behavior distributions is a key challenge in the field. Inspired by large language models [2, 29], recent works introduce next-token-prediction (NTP) models where the policy reduces to a classifier over a discrete set of trajectory tokens, which makes it easier to represent highly-multimodal distributions. Accordingly,




Figure 1. **Closest Among Top-K (CAT-K) rollouts.** The key idea of our approach is to unroll the policy during fine-tuning in a way that visited states remain close to the GT. At each time step, CAT-K first takes the top-K most likely action tokens according to the policy, then chooses the one leading to the state closest to the GT. As a result, CAT-K rollouts follow the mode of the GT (e.g., turning left), while random or top-K rollouts can lead to large deviations (e.g., going straight or right). Since the policy is essentially trained to minimize the distance between the rollout states and the GT states, the GT-based supervision remains effective for CAT-K rollouts, but not for random or top-K rollouts.

the Waymo Open Sim Agent Challenge (WOSAC) leaderboard [19] is heavily populated by tokenized traffic models [9, 31, 39, 43].

Covariate shift is a well-known challenge of IL arising from the gap between open-loop training and closed-loop deployment. When a model is trained on a fixed dataset of expert demonstrations, it can face a distribution mismatch between the states seen during training and those encountered during deployment, as small errors compound and lead to unseen states where the policy performs poorly. A classic approach to tackle this problem is DAgger [23, 25, 35], which unrolls the policy and queries an expert to generate new demonstrations, but querying experts is not readily available for traffic simulation. Prior work has proposed closed-loop training using hand-crafted recovery controllers [1] or reinforcement learning [18, 21, 33]. However, it is inherently difficult to design rewards with high behavioral realism or recovery controllers robust to divergent modes. Consequently, such approaches are not currently competitive on WOSAC realism metrics.

Contributions: We introduce Closest Among Top-K (CAT-K) rollouts, a simple yet highly efficient fine-tuning strategy to address the open-loop to closed-loop gap. The key idea, illustrated in Fig. 1, is to unroll the multimodal policy during training in a way that the policy-visited states remain close to the ground-truth (GT) demonstration. CAT-K achieves this by first finding the K most likely modes of the policy and then choosing the mode closest to the GT. At inference time, actions are sampled from the policy according to the predicted likelihoods. During training, however, random sampling would lead to large deviations from the demonstrations, making them invalid and degrading the final policy performance. Our CAT-K rollout strategy balances being on-policy and staying close to GT demonstrations, such that they remain a valid supervision signal.

Experiments on the Waymo Open Motion Dataset (WOMD) demonstrate the efficacy of CAT-K. Notably, fine-tuning the SMART-7M [31] next-token-prediction traffic model enables it to outperform the 14x larger State-of-The-Art (SoTA) SMART-102M from the same model family, achieving the #1 spot on the public WOSAC leaderboard at the time of submission. To further demonstrate the potential of employing CAT-K fine-tuning for different tasks and policy representations, we apply it to an ego motion planning task using a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) policy, yielding significant gains in closed-loop behavior, reducing collisions by 25.7% and off-road driving by 33.9%.

2. Related work

2.1. Traffic simulation

Prior work explored various architectures for traffic simulation models, including conditional variational autoencoders [13, 28, 32], transformers [6, 20, 27, 42], and diffusion models [11, 15, 17, 24, 40, 41]. However, long-term stability is an important challenge for these models due to covariate shift when transitioning from open-loop training to closed-loop deployment. Various architectures have been proposed to mitigate covariate shift. BITS [32] and Symphony [12] introduce hierarchy, with high-level intent and low-level behavior prediction. TrafficBots [36, 38] formulates simulation as a world model, incorporating configurable behaviors through destination and personality parameters. Most diffusion models use guiding to generate rule-abiding behavior; however, diffusion models often struggle with computational efficiency and long horizons.

The latest advances in traffic simulation come from NTP models, which predict the next action as a token, such as Trajenglish [22], GUMP [9], KiGRAS [39], MotionLM [26], and SMART [31]. Notably, SMART is the current state-of-the-art method on the WOSAC leaderboard. In addition to strong scalability and flexibility, NTP models also show better closed-loop stability than regression-based models,

thanks to their discrete action space. Nonetheless, achieving generalization and reducing compounding errors continue to be a challenge.

2.2. Data augmentation for behavior cloning

Data augmentation is a simple yet effective way to improve the generalizability of traffic simulation models. ChauffeurNet [1] showed that carefully perturbing the vehicle trajectory and designing a recovery trajectory could alleviate the covariate shift suffered by behavior cloning (BC). However, this technique is difficult to apply to traffic simulation with complicated scenarios, including pedestrians and cyclists; and adding handcrafted recovery trajectories may negatively impact behavioral realism. Recently, NTP works such as Trajenglish [22] and SMART [31] have explored similar ideas by using noisy tokenization to perturb trajectories during training, but their data-augmentation did not lead to significant improvements in performance. Our method is related to Trajenglish’s noisy tokenization, but importantly, instead of blindly sampling tokens close to the GT without considering the policy, our CAT-K rollout selects the token from the most likely K tokens predicted by the policy that is closest to the GT.

2.3. Closed-loop fine-tuning

As mentioned above, covariate shift is a major challenge faced by traffic simulation models, since most of them are trained in open-loop and evaluated in closed-loop. Even with data augmentation, the issue is not fully resolved as the augmented noisy data does not reflect the compounded error during closed-loop rollout. Therefore, some existing works explored the use of closed-loop fine-tuning.

As a classic remedy for the covariate shift, DAGger has been applied to end-to-end driving [34], yet its application in traffic simulation is limited, as it requires interactive demonstrations from human drivers.

One popular approach is to apply reinforcement learning (RL). Lu et al. [18] proposed to combine IL with RL and showed that RL improves the robustness of IL policy, especially in metrics that rely heavily on consecutive decision-making, such as collision avoidance. Yet, it also exposes RL’s weakness in improving realism as it is difficult to handcraft a reward that promotes realism. The follow-up work of Peng et al. [21] learns a joint traffic model capable of rolling out the entire scenario by itself, eliminating the need for an external simulator. The reward/loss are typically handcrafted, and can be distilled from explicit traffic rules [33]. With human preference data, RL from human feedback (RLHF) has also been applied to traffic model training for better user alignment [4, 10]. Finally, Symphony [12] adds a Generative Adversarial Imitation Learning (GAIL) loss to encourage the rollout states to stay in distribution; however, the well-known issue of training stability and dis-

criminator overfitting remains a challenge.

3. Background

3.1. Problem formulation

A multi-agent traffic simulation policy can be typically formulated as $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{a}_t | \mathbf{h}_t, \mathcal{M})$, where θ denotes the trainable model parameters, $\mathbf{h}_t = \mathbf{s}_{t-H:t}$ is the state history of length H , \mathcal{M} is the context, including for example high-definition (HD) maps and traffic light states, t is the current time step, $\mathbf{a}_t = [a_t^1, \dots, a_t^N]$ and $\mathbf{s}_t = [s_t^1, \dots, s_t^N]$ are respectively the actions and states of N agents at the current time step. The dimensions of actions a and states s are respectively denoted as D_a and D_s , i.e., $a \in \mathbb{R}^{D_a}$ and $s \in \mathbb{R}^{D_s}$. From the current states and actions at step t , the next states are computed using the per-agent forward dynamics $\mathbf{s}_{t+1} = f(\mathbf{s}_t, \mathbf{a}_t) = [f(s_t^i, a_t^i)]_{i=1}^N$. We assume that $f(s_t^i, a_t^i)$ is deterministic, and can be queried during training, which is the case for traffic simulation. Extensions to stochastic dynamics would be possible in future work.

We define a rollout of T steps starting at $t = 0$ as a sequence of states $\mathbf{s}_{0:T} = [\mathbf{s}_0, \dots, \mathbf{s}_T]$, while the GT trajectories of all agents are denoted as $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{0:T}$. For training the policy, we are given a dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{0:T}^j, \mathcal{M}^j\}_{j=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|}$ of such real-world trajectories that we want to emulate with their corresponding contexts.

3.2. Next Token Prediction (NTP) policies

NTP policies, such as SMART [31] and Trajenglish [22], are parameterized as a probability distribution over a vocabulary of action tokens denoted as $V = \{x_c \mid c = 1, 2, \dots, |V|\}$, where $|V|$ is the size of the vocabulary, $x_c \in \mathbb{R}^{D_a}$ are template actions and $c \in \mathbb{N}$ is the token index. Hence, an autoregressive NTP policy for traffic simulation can equivalently be written as an agent-factorized categorical distribution at each timestep t , i.e.,

$$\pi_\theta(\mathbf{c}_t | \mathbf{h}_t, \mathcal{M}) = \prod_{i=1}^N \pi_\theta(c_t^i | \mathbf{h}_t, \mathcal{M}) = \prod_{i=1}^N \text{Cat}(c_t^i),$$

where $\text{Cat}(c_t^i)$ is the categorical distribution over the action token index for agent i (and not to be confused with our method CAT-K). Given the sampled output $\mathbf{c}_t = [c_t^1, \dots, c_t^N]$, the actions $\mathbf{a}_t = [x_{c_t^1}, \dots, x_{c_t^N}]$ are obtained using the token vocabulary V .

4. Method

Two key challenges in learning a policy from real-world trajectories are the *multimodal* nature of the trajectory distribution and the problem of *covariate shift* when policies are trained open-loop, resulting in a distribution mismatch between expert states seen during training and states visited during policy deployment.

Algorithm 1 CAT-K fine-tuning

```

1: Input: Policy  $\pi_\theta$ , action token vocabulary  $V$ , dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ 
2: Pre-train  $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{c}_t | \hat{\mathbf{h}}_t, \mathcal{M})$  with BC until convergence
3: repeat ▷ Closed-loop supervised fine-tuning
4:   Sample a traffic scenario  $\{\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{0:T}, \mathcal{M}\}$ 
5:   Init rollout state  $\mathbf{s}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{s}}_0$  ▷ CAT-K Rollout
6:   for  $t$  in  $[0, \dots, T - 1]$  do ▷  $T$  steps
7:     for  $i$  in  $[1, \dots, N]$  do ▷  $N$  agents
8:       Get action index for rollout  $c_t^i$  (Eq. 1)
9:       Get next rollout state  $s_{t+1}^i$  (Eq. 3)
10:      Compute target  $\hat{c}_t^i$  (Eq. 4)
11:    end for
12:  end for
13:  Update  $\theta$  by minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_\theta(\mathbf{s}_{0:T}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{1:T}, \mathcal{M})$  (Eq. 5)
14: until convergence

```

Covariate shift can be overcome by training closed-loop, i.e., by training on trajectories sampled from the learned policy. However, this requires the generation of expert actions (or other notions of optimality) to be used as training targets along those trajectories [25]. Querying a human expert is infeasible at scale, RL-based methods require hard-to-define rewards, and methods such as GAIL [7] are prone to mode collapse. As a consequence, none of these approaches can produce state-of-the-art traffic models and are not represented among the leading policies in the WOSAC challenge.

An alternative strategy for generating “expert” actions is to construct recovery actions that bring the agent back to the available GT trajectory. However, this is complicated by the multimodal nature of the data, as the available GT trajectory might not be a valid recovery target for the generated trajectory. For example, as shown in Fig. 1, the GT trajectory $\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{0:T}$ turns left at the intersection, while the sampled trajectory $\mathbf{s}_{0:T} \sim \pi_\theta$ might go straight or turn right. Consequently, while some SoTA traffic models [22, 31] augment the training data with recovery actions to reduce the covariate shift, they do so only from states that were reached by injecting small amounts of noise into the GT trajectory. This does not guarantee that the GT trajectory remains a valid recovery target, but it *completely ignores the learned policy* and the state distribution induced by it.

Instead, our method, *Closest Among Top-K* (CAT-K) rollout, informs the sampling process by the learned policy, but biases it towards the GT trajectory to guarantee the validity of the recovery actions. While simple to implement, it shows large boosts in performance in experiments.

4.1. Closest among top-K (CAT-K) rollout

To facilitate the formulation, we define a top^K operator:

$$\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K\} = \underset{c \in \{1, \dots, |V|\}}{\text{top}^K} (\text{Cat}(c)),$$




Figure 2. **Schematic comparison of CAT-K rollout, top-K sampling, and data augmentation techniques of Trajeglisch and SMART.** In this example, the token vocabulary has a size of 5. We rollout three steps from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$. For CAT-K rollout and top-K sampling, the top-K is w.r.t the probabilities p of tokens predicted by the policy. For the data augmentations used by Trajeglisch and SMART, the policy is unavailable, and the top-K selection is based on the negative distances between tokens and GT.

where $\text{Cat} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the probability density of a categorical distribution on the vocabulary index, and $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K\}$ are the K most probable indices. The top^K operator can be considered as a variation of the arg max operator that returns multiple indices, with top^1 equivalent to arg max.

At time step t , the policy $\pi_\theta(c_t | \mathbf{h}_t, \mathcal{M})$ outputs independent categorical distributions over the token vocabulary for each agent. Our method, CAT-K rollout, deterministically rolls out the policy by selecting, at each time step and for each agent, the one action among the top-K likeliest according to π_θ that brings the agent closest to the GT next state. Using a distance metric $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ on the states, this is formally expressed as follows:

$$c_t^i = \arg \min_{c \in \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K\}} d(f(s_t^i, x_c), \hat{s}_{t+1}^i), \quad (1)$$

$$\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K\} = \text{top}^K_{c_i \in \{1, \dots, |V|\}} [\pi(c_i^i | \mathbf{h}_t, \mathcal{M})], \quad (2)$$

where c_t^i is the action token indices of agent i at step t for the CAT-K rollout, and $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K\}$ are the top-K likeliest token index according to the policy. Given c_t^i , the next state is obtained using the vocabulary V and the dynamics as:

$$s_{t+1}^i = f(s_t^i, x_{c_t^i}). \quad (3)$$

These rollout states will be used as the input \mathbf{h} to the policy at the next time step. By doing this sequentially from $t = 0$ to $t = T - 1$ and repeating for all N agents, we obtain the CAT-K rollout trajectories $s_{0:T}$.

4.2. Closed-loop supervised fine-tuning

Given the CAT-K rollout trajectory $s_{0:T}$, we can construct the recovery action indices \hat{c}_t from the GT trajectories $\hat{s}_{0:T}$ by finding the action token that brings each agent closest to its original trajectory:

$$\hat{c}_t^i = \arg \min_{c \in \{1, \dots, |V|\}} d(f(s_t^i, x_c), \hat{s}_{t+1}^i). \quad (4)$$

Given these indices \hat{c}_t , the NTP policy is trained using the cross-entropy loss

$$\mathcal{L}_\theta = -\frac{1}{NT} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} \log \pi_\theta(\hat{c}_t^i | \mathbf{h}_t, \mathcal{M}). \quad (5)$$

For efficiency, we utilize a two-stage training procedure, summarized in Algorithm 1, by first pre-training with BC and subsequently fine-tuning with closed-loop rollouts generated with CAT-K.

4.3. Comparison to previous methods

In Fig. 2, we compare our method with previous data-augmentation approaches that alleviate the covariate shift for tokenized traffic policies.

Top-K sampling is a common approach used by NTP models for generating sequences *during inference* as it improves the sample quality. However, it is unsuitable for generating trajectories during training as it does not consider the distance to the GT trajectory, and hence the validity of generated recovery actions (c.f. 2b). This can be partially addressed by post-hoc filtering of trajectories that deviated too far from the GT, but the resulting method is sample-inefficient, as most rollouts will be discarded, and the necessary max-distance hyper-parameter is difficult to tune, since its optimal value varies across scenarios (e.g. high-speed vs. low-speed situations).

In contrast, CAT-K rollout (c.f. 2a) is sample efficient by choosing the closest among top-K actions at each timestep and also removes the need to tune a distance-based hyper-parameter. As we show in Table 2, our hyper-parameter K provides strong results across a large range of values and is hence much easier to tune.

Instead of sampling top-K trajectories from the policy, current SoTA methods such as Trajeglisch [22] and SMART [31] use forms of **trajectory noising** to address the issue

<i>Leaderboard, test split</i> Method	# model params	RMM ↑	RMM diff. to SMART-large	Kinematic metrics ↑	Interactive metrics ↑	Map-based metrics ↑	min ADE ↓
SMART-tiny fine-tuned w. CAT-K (ours)	7 M	0.7635	+0.0021	0.4621	0.8115	0.8741	1.3206
SMART-large [31]	102 M	0.7614	+0.0000	0.4786	0.8066	0.8648	1.3728
KiGRAS [39]	0.7 M	0.7597	-0.0014	0.4691	0.8064	0.8658	1.4384
SMART-tiny [31]	7 M	0.7591	-0.0023	0.4759	0.8039	0.8632	1.4062
FDriver-tiny	7 M	0.7584	-0.0030	0.4614	0.8069	0.8658	1.4475
SMART [31]	8 M	0.7511	-0.0103	0.4445	0.8050	0.8571	1.5447
BehaviorGPT [43]	3 M	0.7473	-0.0141	0.4333	0.7997	0.8593	1.4147
GUMP [9]	523 M	0.7431	-0.0183	0.4780	0.7887	0.8359	1.6041

Table 1. **Results on the WOSAC 2024 leaderboard [16]**. RMM stands for Realism Meta Metric, the key metric used for ranking. Note that on the public leaderboard [16] our method appears under the name “SMART-tiny-CLSFT” (Closed-Loop Supervised Fine-Tuning).

of covariate shift. All trajectory noising approaches rely on the injection of small perturbations into the tokenization of the GT trajectory, but implementations can vary from each other in details. For example, in Trajenglish, the likelihood of each noised token is a function of the resulting distance to the ground-truth trajectory, i.e. $q_t^i(c) \sim \exp(-d(f(s_t^i, x_c), \hat{s}_{t+1}^i)/\tau)$, while for SMART, tokens are sampled uniformly from those K tokens with the highest likelihood $q_t^i(c)$. Additionally, Trajenglish, similar to our methods, builds the target recovery action by finding the token that would bring the agent back to the GT trajectory (c.f. Fig. 2c), while SMART uses the next, also noised, token as target - effectively treating the noise injection as data-augmentation on the training trajectories (c.f. Fig. 2d).

However, the noisy tokenization of Trajenglish does not yield a significant improvement (see Fig. 9 in [22]). Similarly, while the trajectory perturbation of SMART enhances the performance of a zero-shot policy trained on NuPlan [3] and evaluated on WOSAC, it does not improve performance on WOSAC itself (see Table 4 in [31]). We believe this is due to the fact the state distributions generated by their sampling strategies are sub-optimal as they completely ignore what state distribution would be induced by the learned policy, hence likely oversampling irrelevant states and under-sampling states the learned policy will encounter more frequently. By incorporating the learned policy into the sampling strategy, CAT-K generates a state distribution more like the policy’s, and is hence better able to reduce the covariate shift between training and inference. While sampling from the policy does incur higher costs for data generation, these can be effectively mitigated by pursuing a two-phase training strategy with pure BC pre-training and subsequent closed-loop fine-tuning.

Lastly, note that CAT-K with $K = |V|$ is equivalent to noise-free BC, since in this case rollouts follow the GT as closely as the available token book allows. On the other hand, for $K = 1$, CAT-K is equivalent to deterministically rolling out the policy by always choosing the most likely token. Consequently, for CAT-K, the hyper-parameter K trades off following the policy (for $K = 1$) vs. following

the GT (for $K = |V|$). In Fig. 5 we show how various choices of K impact the average displacement error (ADE) between the CAT-K rollouts and the GT.

5. Experiments

To show the broad relevance of CAT-K fine-tuning, we evaluate its performance on two different tasks using two different types of policy architecture, namely a *traffic simulation* task using a NTP policy and an *ego-motion planning* task using a policy parameterized as GMM. We base both tasks on the widely used WOMB [5] and follow the simulation setup proposed in WOSAC [19], namely providing 1 second of history and generating rollouts of 8 seconds length.

5.1. Traffic Simulation

Metrics. In the traffic simulation task, we follow the WOSAC evaluation protocol: for each scenario, we generate 32 simulated rollouts *for all agents in the scene*, at 10Hz, and evaluate how well their distribution matches that of the human demonstrations in the data. This distributional matching is evaluated along three dimensions, namely kinematics (e.g., velocities and accelerations), interactions (e.g., collisions), and map alignment (e.g., off-road). All three are summarized as weighted averages in the “Realism Meta-Metric” (RMM), the key performance indicator of the WOSAC leaderboard. For more details please see [19]. We also report the minADE (minimum average displacement error), which is not used in the RMM, but widely applied for motion prediction and policy evaluation.

Policy. We use SMART [31] as policy architecture, as it provides a strong baseline (topping the WOSAC leaderboard) and its implementation is open-sourced. Specifically, we use the SMART-tiny (7M) model with the associated configuration provided, as well as the provided pre-trained action-token vocabulary. These tokens correspond to a re-planning frequency of 2Hz and are upsampled to 10Hz for evaluation. SMART uses a transformer architecture [30] with query-centric representations [37, 42] to encode map polylines and agent trajectories. For BC pre-training, the trajectory perturbation on road polylines and




Figure 3. Influence of K_{infer} for inference-time top-K sampling.




Figure 4. On server vs. local evaluation of SMART-tiny.

agent trajectories is disabled, as they are found to deteriorate performance, except for zero-shot generalization to new datasets (see [31], table 4). The model is trained on $8 \times$ A100 80GB GPUs with batch size 80. We use BC to pre-train the model for 64 epochs, each taking 1.7 hour, then continue with closed-loop supervised fine-tuning with CAT-32 for 10 epochs, each taking 2.6 hours. During fine-tuning, the parameters of the map encoder are frozen.

5.2. Ego-motion planning

Metrics. Unlike traffic simulation, in ego-motion planning only the ego vehicle is controlled and evaluated. Furthermore, the optimal policy is not one that perfectly matches the ground truth trajectory *distribution*, but which minimizes planning metrics, such as collision rate, off-road rate, and ADE. For completeness, we also report the WOSAC Realism Meta-Metric, applied only to the ego trajectories, and the minADE over 32 sampled rollouts. With the exception of minADE, and in contrast to the traffic simulation task, the rollouts for evaluation are sampled deterministically, by choosing the mode of the policy at each timestep.

Policy. To show that our fine-tuning approach can be applied to a more general class of policies beyond NTP, we parameterized the output of the ego policy as GMM. Specifically, we replace the final layer of the SMART network with two heads, a classification head that predicts the mixture densities and a regression head that predicts the means of the Gaussian distributions with fixed standard deviations (similar to, e.g., [14]). Specifically, the GMM predicts 16 modes, each representing a 3-dimensional Gaussian distribution over the changes in x- and y-position and yaw heading. In contrast to the SMART traffic simulation policy that uses cross-entropy loss on all agents, the GMM-based ego policy is trained using negative log-likelihood loss and only




Figure 5. ADE between CAT-K rollouts and GT trajectories.

predicts actions for the ego-vehicle. When applying CAT-K rollout or top-K sampling to the GMM, we select the K most-likely modes of the GMM, and within each mode deterministically use the mean of the Gaussian. Also note that the ego policy operates in a mid-to-end manner, taking tracking results and HD maps as inputs, rather than in a fully end-to-end fashion that maps raw sensor observations to actions.

5.3. Results

5.3.1. WOSAC leaderboard for traffic simulation

In Table 1 we compare our approach with other traffic simulation policies on the WOSAC leaderboard. Notably, all the top-ranking methods on the leaderboard are NTP policies trained via BC. Our SMART-tiny model using CAT-K fine-tuning outperforms the previous SoTA, SMART-large with 102M parameters, by a significant margin of $+0.0021$; and improves on SMART-tiny by $+0.0044$. As the first to perform closed-loop fine-tuning on the leaderboard, our approach sets a new SoTA. Our method improves all metrics except for the kinematic metrics, possibly due to limitations in the action token vocabulary.

For fine-tuning, we chose CAT-32 after preliminary hyper-parameter explorations, a choice that was later confirmed to perform well in our ablation studies (see Tab. 2), though CAT-K improved performance for a wide range of values of K . We also found that choosing a sufficiently high K_{infer} for top-K sampling during inference is important for a high RMM value [9] and we chose $K_{infer} = 48$ for our leaderboard submission based on local validation results (see Fig. 3). Note that in all of our experiments, we fixed the inference time sampling temperature to 1.0 and did not use additional top-p sampling (nucleus sampling), though we expect that tuning these hyper-parameters can lead to additional performance gains.

To make sure that the observed performance gains with CAT-K are not due to improved hyper-parameter tuning, we also conduct a large-scale hyper-parameter grid-search for the baseline method SMART-tiny, including training for more epochs, adjusting the learning rate and learning rate scheduler, trying various data-augmentation and data pre-processing strategies, and using inference-time sampling

<i>Local val. split</i> Method	Criterion of top ^K	K for top ^K	Sampled from	Next target	RMM ↑	Kinematic metrics ↑	Interactive metrics ↑	Map-based metrics ↑	min ADE ↓
BC pre-training	-	-	-	GT	0.7581	0.4512	0.8076	0.8697	1.3152
BC fine-tuning	-	-	-	GT	0.7590	0.4514	0.8096	0.8700	1.3039
Trajenglish’s noisy tokenization	neg. dist.	5 [†]	neg. dist. [†]	GT [†]	0.7562	0.4469	0.8074	0.8673	1.3459
	neg. dist.	5 [†]	uniform	GT [†]	0.7554	0.4467	0.8069	0.8655	1.3404
	neg. dist.	32	neg. dist. [†]	GT [†]	0.7401	0.4174	0.7985	0.8493	1.6669
SMART’s trajectory perturbation	neg. dist.	5 [†]	uniform [†]	RO [†]	0.7556	0.4440	0.8082	0.8661	1.3177
	neg. dist.	5 [†]	neg. dist.	RO [†]	0.7560	0.4469	0.8069	0.8673	1.3514
	neg. dist.	32	uniform [†]	RO [†]	0.7314	0.4158	0.7949	0.8300	1.5380
Top-5	prob	5	prob	GT	0.6478	0.3313	0.6847	0.7528	1.8802
Top-5 + distance filter	prob	5	prob	GT	0.6860	0.3356	0.7466	0.8083	1.7627
Top-5 + distance based sampling	prob	5	neg. dist.	GT	0.7058	0.3536	0.7579	0.8400	1.5848
Deterministic rollout	-	-	max-prob	GT	0.6361	0.3291	0.6845	0.7492	1.8695
CAT-5	prob	-	closest	GT	0.7423	0.4251	0.7917	0.8601	1.4677
CAT-16	prob	-	closest	GT	0.7604	0.4592	0.8082	0.8709	1.3372
CAT-32 (leaderboard)	prob	-	closest	GT	0.7616	0.4583	0.8105	0.8720	1.3105
CAT-40	prob	-	closest	GT	0.7617	0.4567	0.8101	0.8738	1.2998
CAT-64	prob	-	closest	GT	0.7602	0.4552	0.8098	0.8707	1.3028

Table 2. **Ablation study on WOSAC 2% validation split.** We compare different ways to fine-tune the same base mode (BC pre-training). “Sampled from” indicates how the action is sampled during fine-tuning, either based on the distance to the GT (“neg. dist”, “uniform”, “closest”) or based on the model outputs (“prob”, “max-prob”). Here dist. is the abbreviation of distance. RO stands for rollout, i.e., the next target action is computed based on the rollout, not the GT state. † indicates original hyper-parameter choices of baseline algorithms.

using top-K with various values for K_{infer} . This allowed us to push its performance to 0.7606 RMM on the test split (not shown in Tab. 1), but still falling significantly short of the performance of our CAT-K fine-tuning method (0.7635 RMM). Note that even comparing against this improved baseline, our method improves the performance more (by +0.0029) than scaling up the model size by a factor of 14 to 102M parameters (+0.0023).

Qualitatively, our method can generate diverse and realistic behavior over long periods of time. As shown in Fig. 6, our method can handle the subtle interactions between traffic participants in a dense parking lot, which is arguably a more challenging scenario than intersections and highways for traffic simulation. Moreover, the behavior remains realistic at the end of the required simulation time of 8 seconds. Additional examples are in the supplementary video.

5.3.2. Ablation studies on WOSAC

In Table 2 we provide a thorough ablation study. Due to the high cost of evaluation we use 2% of the validation split (880 out of 44097 scenarios). To verify the fidelity of this evaluation setting, we compare results with those on the full validation set in Fig. 4. We observe consistent differences indicating that our evaluation setting is reasonable.

We begin with a SMART-tiny model trained with BC for 64 epochs (BC pre-training, row 1). All other models fine-tune the BC pre-training model for 5 epochs. During inference, we use top-K sampling with $K_{\text{infer}} = 40$ for all methods (the best K_{infer} for SMART-tiny according to Fig. 3).

In Table 2, CAT-K fine-tuning is the only method that significantly outperforms the BC pre-training model. Further fine-tuning with BC (row 2), using Trajenglish’s noisy tokenization (rows 3-5), or SMART’s trajectory perturbation (rows 6-8) remain on par with the original model or even reduce its performance. Closed-loop fine-tuning with top-K rollouts instead of CAT-K rollouts during training significantly reduces performance (rows 9-12), even when rollouts close to the GT are selected for training by either filtering them based on the distance to the GT or sampling among them from a distance-dependent distribution. The observation that data-augmentation and fine-tuning with top-K sampling cannot improve the RMM, are consistent with findings in prior works [18, 21, 22, 31], as well as with the WOSAC leaderboard. Comparisons with different values of K for top-K sampling, as well as other hyper-parameters, are provided in the appendix.

Next, we ablate the value of K used for CAT-K rollout during fine-tuning (rows 13-17). Results indicate that the performance improvement is robust to the choice of K after a reasonable minimum value.

As discussed in Sec. 4.3, the hyper-parameter K in CAT-K determines how closely the policy follows the GT trajectory, in a way that is more robust than a distance based threshold, for which the optimal value varies strongly based on the situation (vehicle speed, proximity to other cars, etc.). To give more insight into how K impacts rollouts, in Fig. 5, we inspect the average ADE between rollouts and

Method (<i>Local val. split</i>)	Collision rate ↓	Off-road rate ↓	RMM ↑	ADE ↓	minADE ³² ↓
BC pre-training	0.0568	0.0053	0.8108	1.3623	1.3537
BC fine-tuning	0.0599	0.0058	0.8105	1.3520	1.3509
Deterministic rollout	0.0433	0.0138	0.8081	1.1799	0.7962
CAT-3	0.0422	0.0035	0.8169	1.3096	0.6912

Table 3. **Performance of ego policies on WOSAC with local evaluation on 2% validation split.** All models are fine-tuned for 5 epochs based on the BC pre-training model, which is trained for 32 epochs. We use deterministic rollout during inference and compute all metrics, except for the minADE³². For minADE³², we generate 32 rollouts by using top-3 sampling with a temperature of 1.0 to first sample the categorical distribution over the mixtures, then selecting the mean of the sampled Gaussian mixture.




Figure 6. **Simulation results on WOSAC.** Our fine-tuned policy generates interesting and diverse behaviors rarely seen in prior works. Each row represents a different rollout of our model in the same scene. The transparent boxes show the GT agents in the dataset, while the solid boxes show the agents generated by our model. We highlight the agents within the red, green, and orange rectangles, across time steps and rollouts. The red rectangle shows different interactive negotiations emerging between a pedestrian and two vehicles. The green rectangle shows an initially parked vehicle, that leaves (row 1) or stays parked (row 2, 3). The orange rectangle shows a vehicle waiting (row 1) in front of a speed bump (visualized as two light-blue lines), proceeding (row 2), or entering a parking space (row 3).

GT trajectories over training epochs, for different K values. As expected, as $K \rightarrow |V|$, the ADE decreases towards the level of quantization error, induced by tokenization with a finite vocabulary size (dashed line). With more fine-tuning epochs the average ADE slightly reduces, highlighting how CAT-K fine-tuning improves the policy to follow all behavior modes more closely.

5.3.3. Fine-tuning a GMM-based ego policy

Besides NTP traffic simulation policies, CAT-K fine-tuning can also improve the performance of a GMM-style ego policy with continuous action space. In Table. 3 we compare our approach with fine-tuning using deterministic rollouts, as well as with continued BC. Our CAT-3 fine-tuning improves all metrics except for ADE, where deterministic rollout performs better. This is expected, as deterministic rollout aligns all modes towards the GT, resulting in mode averaging. While this reduces ADE, it negatively impacts other metrics. Additionally, fine-tuning with CAT-K rollout helps overcome the limitation of GMM trained with negative log-likelihood loss, which struggles to capture multimodality as effectively as NTP policies trained with cross-entropy loss. This is supported by the significant drop in minADE after

the fine-tuning.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce CAT-K rollouts, a closed-loop supervised fine-tuning technique for IL problems with highly multimodal demonstrations, such as traffic simulation. The CAT-K rollout approximately finds the rollout closest to the GT among likely rollouts of a policy, ensuring adherence to the policy while maintaining GT as a reliable reference for supervised learning. As the first method using closed-loop fine-tuning, it achieves the top spot on the WOSAC leaderboard.

In the future, we aim to incorporate modern sampling techniques to CAT-K rollouts, such as top-p (nucleus) sampling [8]. We also plan to explore applications of CAT-K fine-tuning to a broader range of policy classes, such as diffusion policies; as well as other multimodal IL tasks, such as motion generation for animation, robot navigation and manipulation, etc. Importantly, our results show that closed-loop supervised fine-tuning is a promising area of future research for policies trained open-loop, such as the widely used NTP policies.

References

- [1] Mayank Bansal, Alex Krizhevsky, and Abhijit Ogale. Chauffeurnet: Learning to drive by imitating the best and synthesizing the worst. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.03079*, 2018. 1, 2
- [2] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, pages 1877–1901. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. 1
- [3] Holger Caesar, Juraj Kabzan, Kok Seang Tan, Whye Kit Fong, Eric M. Wolff, Alex H. Lang, Luke Fletcher, Oscar Beijbom, and Sammy Omari. NuPlan: A closed-loop ml-based planning benchmark for autonomous vehicles. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) ADP3 Workshop*, 2021. 5
- [4] Yulong Cao, Boris Ivanovic, Chaowei Xiao, and Marco Pavone. Reinforcement learning with human feedback for realistic traffic simulation. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 14428–14434. IEEE, 2024. 2
- [5] Scott Ettinger, Shuyang Cheng, Benjamin Caine, Chenxi Liu, Hang Zhao, Sabeek Pradhan, Yuning Chai, Ben Sapp, Charles R Qi, Yin Zhou, et al. Large scale interactive motion forecasting for autonomous driving: The waymo open motion dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9710–9719, 2021. 5
- [6] Roger Girgis, Florian Golemo, Felipe Codevilla, Martin Weiss, Jim Aldon D’Souza, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Felix Heide, and Christopher Pal. Latent variable sequential set transformers for joint multi-agent motion prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.00563*, 2021. 2
- [7] Jonathan Ho and Stefano Ermon. Generative adversarial imitation learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016. 3
- [8] Ari Holtzman, Jan Buys, Li Du, Maxwell Forbes, and Yejin Choi. The curious case of neural text degeneration. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020. 8
- [9] Yihan Hu, Siqi Chai, Zhening Yang, Jingyu Qian, Kun Li, Wenxin Shao, Haichao Zhang, Wei Xu, and Qiang Liu. Solving motion planning tasks with a scalable generative model. In *European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, 2025. 1, 2, 5, 6
- [10] Zhiyu Huang, Xinshuo Weng, Maximilian Igl, Yuxiao Chen, Yulong Cao, Boris Ivanovic, Marco Pavone, and Chen Lv. Gen-drive: Enhancing diffusion generative driving policies with reward modeling and reinforcement learning fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.05582*, 2024. 2
- [11] Zhiyu Huang, Zixu Zhang, Ameya Vaidya, Yuxiao Chen, Chen Lv, and Jaime Fernández Fisac. Versatile scene-consistent traffic scenario generation as optimization with diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02524*, 2024. 2
- [12] Maximilian Igl, Daewoo Kim, Alex Kuefler, Paul Mougín, Punit Shah, Kyriacos Shiarlis, Dragomir Anguelov, Mark Palatucci, Brandyn White, and Shimon Whiteson. Symphony: Learning realistic and diverse agents for autonomous driving simulation. In *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2445–2451. IEEE, 2022. 2
- [13] Maximilian Igl, Punit Shah, Paul Mougín, Sirish Srinivasan, Tarun Gupta, Brandyn White, Kyriacos Shiarlis, and Shimon Whiteson. Hierarchical imitation learning for stochastic environments. In *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 1697–1704. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [14] Boris Ivanovic and Marco Pavone. The trajectron: Probabilistic multi-agent trajectory modeling with dynamic spatiotemporal graphs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 2375–2384, 2019. 6
- [15] Chiyu Jiang, Andre Cornman, Cheolho Park, Benjamin Sapp, Yin Zhou, Dragomir Anguelov, et al. Motiondiffuser: Controllable multi-agent motion prediction using diffusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9644–9653, 2023. 2
- [16] Waymo LLC. Waymo open sim agent challenge (wosac) 2024 leaderboard. <https://waymo.com/open/challenges/2024/sim-agents/>, 2024. Accessed: 2024-11-14. 5, 2
- [17] Jack Lu, Kelvin Wong, Chris Zhang, Simon Suo, and Raquel Urtasun. Scenecontrol: Diffusion for controllable traffic scene generation. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 16908–16914. IEEE, 2024. 2
- [18] Yiren Lu, Justin Fu, George Tucker, Xinlei Pan, Eli Bronstein, Rebecca Roelofs, Benjamin Sapp, Brandyn White, Aleksandra Faust, Shimon Whiteson, et al. Imitation is not enough: Robustifying imitation with reinforcement learning for challenging driving scenarios. In *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 7553–7560. IEEE, 2023. 1, 2, 7, 3
- [19] Nico Montali, John Lambert, Paul Mougín, Alex Kuefler, Nicholas Rhinehart, Michelle Li, Cole Gulino, Tristan Emrich, Zoey Yang, Shimon Whiteson, et al. The waymo open sim agents challenge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 36, 2024. 1, 5
- [20] Jiquan Ngiam, Benjamin Caine, Vijay Vasudevan, Zhengdong Zhang, Hao-Tien Lewis Chiang, Jeffrey Ling, Rebecca Roelofs, Alex Bewley, Chenxi Liu, Ashish Venugopal, et al. Scene transformer: A unified architecture for predicting multiple agent trajectories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08417*, 2021. 2
- [21] Zhenghao Peng, Wenjie Luo, Yiren Lu, Tianyi Shen, Cole Gulino, Ari Seff, and Justin Fu. Improving agent behaviors with rl fine-tuning for autonomous driving. In *European*

- Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 165–181. Springer, 2025. 1, 2, 7
- [22] Jonah Philion, Xue Bin Peng, and Sanja Fidler. TrajEglish: Traffic modeling as next-token prediction. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
- [23] Aditya Prakash, Aseem Behl, Eshed Ohn-Bar, Kashyap Chitta, and Andreas Geiger. Exploring data aggregation in policy learning for vision-based urban autonomous driving. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 11763–11773, 2020. 1
- [24] Ethan Pronovost, Meghana Reddy Ganesina, Noureldin Hendy, Zeyu Wang, Andres Morales, Kai Wang, and Nick Roy. Scenario diffusion: Controllable driving scenario generation with diffusion. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:68873–68894, 2023. 2
- [25] Stéphane Ross, Geoffrey Gordon, and Drew Bagnell. A reduction of imitation learning and structured prediction to no-regret online learning. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, pages 627–635. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011. 1, 3
- [26] Ari Seff, Brian Cera, Dian Chen, Mason Ng, Aurick Zhou, Nigamaa Nayakanti, Khaled S Refaat, Rami Al-Rfou, and Benjamin Sapp. Motionlm: Multi-agent motion forecasting as language modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8579–8590, 2023. 2
- [27] Shaoshuai Shi, Li Jiang, Dengxin Dai, and Bernt Schiele. Mtr++: Multi-agent motion prediction with symmetric scene modeling and guided intention querying. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024. 2
- [28] Simon Suo, Sebastian Regalado, Sergio Casas, and Raquel Urtasun. TrafficSim: Learning to simulate realistic multi-agent behaviors. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 10400–10409, 2021. 2
- [29] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 1
- [30] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017. 5
- [31] Wei Wu, Xiaoxin Feng, Ziyang Gao, and Yuheng Kan. Smart: Scalable multi-agent real-time simulation via next-token prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
- [32] Danfei Xu, Yuxiao Chen, Boris Ivanovic, and Marco Pavone. Bits: Bi-level imitation for traffic simulation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2929–2936. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [33] Chris Zhang, James Tu, Lunjun Zhang, Kelvin Wong, Simon Suo, and Raquel Urtasun. Learning realistic traffic agents in closed-loop. In *Conference on Robot Learning (CoRL)*, 2023. 1, 2, 3
- [34] Jiakai Zhang and Kyunghyun Cho. Query-efficient imitation learning for end-to-end autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06450*, 2016. 2
- [35] Zhejun Zhang, Alexander Liniger, Dengxin Dai, Fisher Yu, and Luc Van Gool. End-to-end urban driving by imitating a reinforcement learning coach. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021. 1
- [36] Zhejun Zhang, Alexander Liniger, Dengxin Dai, Fisher Yu, and Luc Van Gool. Trafficbots: Towards world models for autonomous driving simulation and motion prediction. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 1522–1529. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [37] Zhejun Zhang, Alexander Liniger, Christos Sakaridis, Fisher Yu, and Luc V Gool. Real-time motion prediction via heterogeneous polyline transformer with relative pose encoding. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. 5
- [38] Zhejun Zhang, Christos Sakaridis, and Luc Van Gool. Trafficbots v1. 5: Traffic simulation via conditional vaes and transformers with relative pose encoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.10898*, 2024. 2
- [39] Jianbo Zhao, Jiaheng Zhuang, Qibin Zhou, Taiyu Ban, Ziyao Xu, Hangning Zhou, Junhe Wang, Guoan Wang, Zhiheng Li, and Bin Li. Kigras: Kinematic-driven generative model for realistic agent simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.12940*, 2024. 1, 2, 5
- [40] Ziyuan Zhong, Davis Rempe, Yuxiao Chen, Boris Ivanovic, Yulong Cao, Danfei Xu, Marco Pavone, and Baishakhi Ray. Language-guided traffic simulation via scene-level diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06344*, 2023. 2
- [41] Ziyuan Zhong, Davis Rempe, Danfei Xu, Yuxiao Chen, Sushant Veer, Tong Che, Baishakhi Ray, and Marco Pavone. Guided conditional diffusion for controllable traffic simulation. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3560–3566. IEEE, 2023. 2
- [42] Zikang Zhou, Jianping Wang, Yung-Hui Li, and Yu-Kai Huang. Query-centric trajectory prediction. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17863–17873, 2023. 2, 5
- [43] Zikang Zhou, Haibo Hu, Xinhong Chen, Jianping Wang, Nan Guan, Kui Wu, Yung-Hui Li, Yu-Kai Huang, and Chun Jason Xue. Behaviorgpt: Smart agent simulation for autonomous driving with next-patch prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.17372*, 2024. 1, 5, 2

Closed-Loop Supervised Fine-Tuning of Tokenized Traffic Models

Supplementary Material

7. Supplementary videos

We provide the following videos as part of the supplementary material. All videos are carefully edited and thoroughly annotated, offering additional qualitative results to support our paper. Please note that all videos are without sound.

- `tldr_highlights.mp4`: The most interesting behaviors generated by our model. If you are short on time, we recommend watching this video.
- `parking_lot.mp4`: The busy parking lot scenario shown in the main paper.
- `ped_cyc.mp4`: Interesting behaviors for pedestrians and cyclists.
- `lane_changing.mp4`: Lane-changing scenario involving interactions between multiple agents.
- `bc_compounding_error.mp4`: This video provides a real-world example of covariate shift, demonstrating how the BC policy suffers from compounding errors.
- `more_behaviors.mp4`: If you have time, enjoy additional interesting behaviors generated by our model. These include exiting parking lots, making U-turns, stopping at stop signs, obeying traffic lights, near-accident scenarios, and more.

8. Full algorithm

To complement the algorithm in the main paper, we provide the detailed and complete algorithm for BC pre-training, followed by CAT-K fine-tuning, in Algorithm 2. Our BC pre-training follows Trajenglish and SMART, which are identical when no data augmentation is applied.

9. Implementation details

Our implementation is based on the open-source repository of SMART¹. We made the following changes, as we believe they may improve performance:

- Preprocessing agent trajectories using linear interpolation.
- Adding additional HD map elements, such as speed bumps.
- Setting the learning rate decay to 1% instead of to 0%.
- Resolving duplicated tokens in the action token vocabulary.
- Removing data augmentation applied to the tokenization of map polylines and agent trajectories, as it only improves performance for zero-shot transfer from NuPlan to WOSAC but significantly decreases performance when the model is both trained and validated on WOSAC [31].

¹<https://github.com/rainmaker22/SMART>

Algorithm 2 BC pre-training and CAT-K fine-tuning

```
1: Input: Policy  $\pi_\theta$ , action token vocabulary  $V$ , dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ 
2: Pre-train  $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{c}_t \mid \hat{\mathbf{h}}_t, \mathcal{M})$  with BC until convergence
3: repeat ▷ BC pre-training
4:   Sample a traffic scenario  $\{\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{0:T}, \mathcal{M}\}$ .
5:   Init rollout state  $\mathbf{s}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{s}}_0$ .
   ▷ Sequential tokenization following Trajenglish
6:   for  $t$  in  $[0, \dots, T - 1]$  do
7:     Tokenization for each agent  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ 
        $c_t^i = \arg \min_{c \in \{1, \dots, |V|\}} d(f(s_t^i, x_c) - \hat{s}_{t+1}^i)$ .
8:     Save  $\mathbf{c}_t$  as the GT labels  $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_t$ .
9:     Get next rollout state  $s_{t+1}^i$  (Eq. 3)
10:  end for
11:  Batched forward pass with causal masking
        $\pi_\theta(\mathbf{c}_{1:T} \mid \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{0:T-1}, \mathcal{M})$ .
12:  Update  $\theta$  by minimizing the cross entropy loss Eq. 5
       with GT labels  $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ .
13: until convergence
14: repeat ▷ Closed-loop supervised fine-tuning
15:   Sample a traffic scenario  $\{\hat{\mathbf{s}}_{0:T}, \mathcal{M}\}$ 
16:   Init rollout state  $\mathbf{s}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{s}}_0$  ▷ CAT-K Rollout
17:   for  $t$  in  $[0, \dots, T - 1]$  do ▷  $T$  steps
18:     for  $i$  in  $[1, \dots, N]$  do ▷  $N$  agents
19:       One step forward pass policy  $\pi$  with previous
       rollout states.
20:       Get action index for rollout  $c_t^i$  (Eq. 1)
21:       Get next rollout state  $s_{t+1}^i$  (Eq. 3)
22:       Compute target  $\hat{c}_t^i$  (Eq. 4)
23:       Save forward-pass output logits of this step
       for later training.
24:     end for
25:   end for
26:   Update  $\theta$  by minimizing  $\mathcal{L}_\theta(\mathbf{s}_{0:T}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}_{1:T}, \mathcal{M})$  (Eq. 5)
27: until convergence
```

Apart from these changes, we use the same model architecture, hyperparameters, and other settings as provided in the open-source repository. While SMART-tiny was originally trained on 32 NVIDIA TESLA V100 GPUs for 23 hours, we use 8 NVIDIA A100 GPUs for all our experiments. Our reproduced SMART-tiny model is trained for 64 hours (64 epochs) with BC. We finetune this BC baseline model with CAT-K rollout for 25 hours (10 epochs) to obtain our final model, SMART-tiny-CLSFT, which is submitted to the leaderboard. Performing inference and generating the submission file for the validation split (44,097 scenarios) together requires 3 hours, the same as for the test

<i>Leaderboard, test split</i> Method	Realism meta metric↑	Linear speed likeli.↑	Linear acc. likeli.↑	Angular speed likeli.↑	Angular acc. likeli.↑	Distance to nearest object likeli.↑	Collision likeli. ↑	Time to collision likeli.↑	Distance to road edge likeli.↑	Offroad likeli. ↑	min ADE ↓
SMART-tiny-CLSFT (ours)	0.7635	0.3854	0.2970	0.5173	0.6487	0.3917	0.9700	0.8350	0.6801	0.9518	1.3206
MM-GPT (Nov. 13)	0.7628	0.3729	0.4045	0.4977	0.6232	0.3850	0.9685	0.8299	0.6705	0.9488	1.3154
MM-GPT (Nov. 11)	0.7621	0.3853	0.4181	0.5008	0.6477	0.3936	0.9578	0.8353	0.6792	0.9371	1.3383
SMART-large [31]	0.7614	0.3786	0.4134	0.4952	0.6270	0.3872	0.9632	0.8346	0.6761	0.9403	1.3728
KiGRAS [39]	0.7597	0.3704	0.3784	0.4962	0.6314	0.3867	0.9619	0.8373	0.6723	0.9431	1.4383
SMART-tiny [31]	0.7591	0.3733	0.4082	0.4945	0.6277	0.3835	0.9601	0.8338	0.6709	0.9401	1.4062
FDriver-tiny	0.7584	0.3661	0.3669	0.4876	0.6248	0.3840	0.9641	0.8366	0.6688	0.9446	1.4475
SMART [31]	0.7511	0.3646	0.4057	0.4231	0.5845	0.3769	0.9655	0.8318	0.6590	0.9363	1.5447
BehaviorGPT [43]	0.7473	0.3615	0.3365	0.4806	0.5544	0.3834	0.9537	0.8308	0.6702	0.9349	1.4147
GUMP [9]	0.7431	0.3569	0.4111	0.5089	0.6353	0.3707	0.9403	0.8276	0.6686	0.9028	1.6031
SMART-tiny (we reproduced not on the public leaderboard)	0.7607	0.3835	0.2832	0.5121	0.6361	0.3900	0.9663	0.8342	0.6778	0.9506	1.3181

Table 4. **Results on the WOSAC 2024 leaderboard [16]**, accessed right before the submission deadline, on November 15, 2024, at 7:59 AM UTC. Realism Meta Metric is the key metric used for ranking. All other metrics contribute to the realism meta metric, except for the minADE, which has no effect on the ranking. Note that on the public leaderboard [16] our method appears under the name “SMART-tiny-CLSFT” (Closed-Loop Supervised Fine-Tuning), and our reproduced SMART-tiny is not published to the public leaderboard. Here likeli. is the abbreviation of likelihood, and acc. stands for acceleration.

split (44,920 scenarios).

10. Additional experiment results

10.1. WOSAC leaderboard

In Table 4 we provide the results of all metrics for the top 10 entries on the WOSAC leaderboard², accessed right before the submission deadline (Nov 15, 2024, 07:59 AM UTC). We also provide the results of our reproduced SMART-tiny, trained via BC and used as the starting point for our fine-tuning experiments. Our method achieves the best performance across nearly all metrics. Notably, an anonymous concurrent work, MM-GPT, has recently made multiple submissions and achieved a high ranking on the leaderboard. Nevertheless, our method still outperforms the best MM-GPT model in the majority of the metrics.

The main caveat of our method is the exceptionally low linear acceleration likelihood. We believe this may be caused by the limitations of the action token vocabulary we used, as the SMART-tiny we reproduced also has a very low linear acceleration likelihood compared to the original submission of SMART-tiny on the leaderboard. We will continue to investigate this performance discrepancy between the original SMART-tiny and our reproduced SMART-tiny.

10.2. Ablation

In Table 5, we provide additional ablation studies we conducted. Our method, CAT-K fine-tuning with $K = 32$, achieves the overall best performance. Only on the map-based metrics we are slightly outperformed by “Trajenglish

top-5, sampled w/ policy prob.”, but the difference is insignificant. The “sampled w/ policy prob.” version of Trajenglish’s noisy tokenization and SMART’s trajectory perturbation is an on-policy variation of the original data augmentation, where the K closest-to-GT tokens are sampled using the probability predicted by the policy rather than using the negative distance. These on-policy versions perform better than the off-policy data augmentation, but their performance is still worse than our CAT-K fine-tuning. For top-K sampling, adding distance based filtering or distance based sampling improves the performance, but they still cannot match the performance of our method. For the original versions of Trajenglish and SMART’s data augmentation, a thorough search of the hyperparameters confirms the conclusion drawn in the Trajenglish and SMART papers: Data augmentation does not significantly improve the performance on WOSAC.

Our CAT-K rollout can be seen as a special case of top-K with distance based sampling, where a very low temperature is used in the distance based sampling, ensuring that the closest-to-GT token is selected deterministically. For example, “Top-32 + distance based sampling” with a sampling temperature $\tau \rightarrow 0$ is equivalent to CAT-32 rollout.

10.3. GMM-based ego policy

In Table 6 we present additional ablation studies for training and fine-tuning the GMM ego policy. Inspired by the training strategy used in multimodal motion prediction, we experimented with applying hard-assignment to train the BC policy, aiming to mitigate the mode-averaging problem in the GMM. Specifically, at each time step and for each agent, we train only the Gaussian mixture compo-

²<https://waymo.com/open/challenges/2024/sim-agents/>

<i>Local val. split</i> Method	Criterion of top ^K	K for top ^K	Sampled from	Next target	RMM ↑	Kinematic metrics ↑	Interactive metrics ↑	Map-based metrics ↑	min ADE ↓
BC pre-training	-	-	-	GT	0.7581	0.4512	0.8076	0.8697	1.3152
CAT-32 (submitted to leaderboard)	prob	-	closest	GT	0.7616	0.4583	0.8105	0.8720	1.3105
Trajenglish’s noisy tokenization	neg. dist.	5	neg. dist.	GT	0.7562	0.4469	0.8074	0.8673	1.3459
	neg. dist.	5	uniform	GT	0.7554	0.4467	0.8069	0.8655	1.3404
	neg. dist.	16	neg. dist.	GT	0.7486	0.4336	0.8031	0.8585	1.4811
	neg. dist.	16	uniform	GT	0.7481	0.4315	0.8033	0.8581	1.5012
	neg. dist.	32	neg. dist.	GT	0.7401	0.4174	0.7985	0.8493	1.6669
	neg. dist.	32	uniform	GT	0.7412	0.4177	0.7987	0.8521	1.6715
	neg. dist.	64	neg. dist.	GT	0.7303	0.4005	0.7906	0.8413	1.9083
	neg. dist.	64	uniform	GT	0.7295	0.3994	0.7890	0.8416	1.9307
SMART’s trajectory perturbation	neg. dist.	5	neg. dist.	RO	0.7560	0.4469	0.8069	0.8673	1.3514
	neg. dist.	5	uniform	RO	0.7553	0.4468	0.8074	0.8647	1.3566
	neg. dist.	16	neg. dist.	RO	0.7495	0.4329	0.8035	0.8609	1.4958
	neg. dist.	16	uniform	RO	0.7478	0.4317	0.8029	0.8576	1.4890
	neg. dist.	32	neg. dist.	RO	0.7407	0.4190	0.7985	0.8503	1.6472
	neg. dist.	32	uniform	RO	0.7403	0.4179	0.7986	0.8497	1.6568
	neg. dist.	64	neg. dist.	RO	0.7309	0.4012	0.7917	0.8411	1.8701
	neg. dist.	64	uniform	RO	0.7284	0.3962	0.7879	0.8417	1.9574
Top-16	prob	16	prob	GT	0.6439	0.3309	0.6912	0.7619	1.8744
Top-16 + distance filter	prob	16	prob	GT	0.6904	0.3375	0.7489	0.8169	1.7991
Top-16 + distance based sampling	prob	16	neg. dist.	GT	0.7233	0.3675	0.7808	0.8528	1.4876
Top-32	prob	32	prob	GT	0.6395	0.3324	0.6882	0.7522	1.8961
Top-32 + distance filter	prob	32	prob	GT	0.6950	0.3400	0.7560	0.8193	1.8194
Top-32 + distance based sampling	prob	32	neg. dist.	GT	0.7229	0.3663	0.7843	0.8477	1.6470
Top-64	prob	64	prob	GT	0.6381	0.3318	0.6846	0.7535	1.9117
Top-64 + distance filter	prob	64	prob	GT	0.6979	0.3407	0.7590	0.8234	1.8172
Top-64 + distance based sampling	prob	64	neg. dist.	GT	0.7208	0.3660	0.7823	0.8446	1.7260
Trajenglish top-5, sampled w/ policy prob.	neg. dist.	5	prob	GT	0.7596	0.4513	0.8089	0.8723	1.3116
Trajenglish top-32, sampled w/ policy prob.	neg. dist.	32	prob	GT	0.7526	0.4320	0.8069	0.8659	1.3569
SMART top-5, sampled w/ policy prob.	neg. dist.	5	prob	RO	0.7589	0.4510	0.8085	0.8709	1.3135
SMART top-32, sampled w/ policy prob.	neg. dist.	32	prob	RO	0.7580	0.4533	0.8093	0.8661	1.3325

Table 5. **Ablation study on WOSAC 2% validation split.** We compare different ways to fine-tune the same base mode (BC pre-training). "Sampled from" indicates how the action is sampled during fine-tuning, either based on the distance to the GT ("neg. dist", "uniform", "closest") or based on the model outputs ("prob", "max-prob"). Here dist. is the abbreviation of distance. RO stands for rollout, i.e., the next target action is computed based on the rollout, not the GT state. RMM stands for the realism meta metric of WOSAC.

ment that is closest to the GT, leaving the other components untrained. However, this approach did not work, and the training diverged. We then investigate the impact of Trajenglish and SMART’s data augmentation on fine-tuning the ego policy. The results indicate that the effectiveness of these off-policy data augmentation methods is marginal: the RMM shows slight improvement, while the collision and off-road rates are marginally worse. Next, we explore the use of top-K sampling for fine-tuning the BC policy. As expected, top-K sampling alone does not work. However, when combined with distance-based filtering or sampling, top-K sampling can significantly enhance the BC policy’s performance, achieving results comparable to those of our CAT-K fine-tuning approach. This justifies the effectiveness of this approach when the expert demonstrations are generally well-behaved and less diverse, which is consis-

tent with prior work that applies this sampling strategy for fine-tuning to only vehicles [18], often within the context of highway scenarios [33]. Compared to top-K sampling with distance-based filtering or sampling, our method significantly outperforms in off-road rate and minADE, while other metrics remain on par. Overall, fine-tuning with CAT-K rollout achieves the best performance, with peak performance at $K = 2$ or $K = 3$, which aligns with the fact that the ego vehicle’s behavior is less multimodal. For traffic simulations where demonstrations are highly multimodal and involve various traffic participants (vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists) whose behaviors do not necessarily obey traffic rules, the advantage of our CAT-K rollout becomes more significant.

Method (<i>Local val. split</i>)	Collision rate ↓	Off-road rate ↓	RMM ↑	ADE ↓	minADE ³² ↓
BC pre-training	0.0568	0.0053	0.8108	1.3623	1.3537
BC fine-tuning w/ hard-assignment (training diverged)	0.1574	0.0637	0.7409	5.3507	5.3447
Trajeglish noisy tokenization ($K = 3$, neg. dist., GT)	0.0611	0.0057	0.8117	1.3563	1.3575
SMART trajectory perturbation ($K = 3$, uniform, RO)	0.0590	0.0057	0.8118	1.3713	1.3771
Top-3	0.0415	0.0140	0.8072	1.2004	0.8249
Top-3 + distance filter	0.0409	0.0076	0.8128	1.1639	0.8577
Top-3 + distance based sampling	0.0410	0.0070	0.8163	1.3245	0.7610
CAT-1 (Deterministic rollout)	0.0433	0.0138	0.8081	1.1799	0.7962
CAT-2	0.0437	0.0038	0.8147	1.5117	0.6323
CAT-3	0.0422	0.0035	0.8169	1.3096	0.6912
CAT-4	0.0500	0.0035	0.8137	1.5699	1.4840
CAT-8	0.0771	0.0045	0.8050	1.6775	1.6704

Table 6. **Performance of ego policies on WOSAC with local evaluation on 2% validation split.** All models are fine-tuned for 5 epochs based on the BC pre-training model, which is trained for 32 epochs. We use deterministic rollout during inference and compute all metrics, except for the minADE³². For minADE³², we generate 32 rollouts by using top-3 sampling with a temperature of 1.0 to first sample the categorical distribution over the mixtures, then selecting the mean of the sampled Gaussian mixture. RMM stands for the realism meta metric of WOSAC.