

CogNav: Cognitive Process Modeling for Object Goal Navigation with LLMs

Yihan Cao^{1,*}
Zheng Qin³

Jiazhao Zhang^{2,*}
Qin Zou⁴

Zhinan Yu¹
Bo Du⁴

Shuzhen Liu¹
Kai Xu^{1,†}

¹National University of Defense Technology ²CFCS, School of Computer Science, Peking University

³Defense Innovation Institute, Academy of Military Sciences ⁴School of Computer Science, Wuhan University

Abstract

Object goal navigation (*ObjectNav*) is a fundamental task of embodied AI that requires the agent to find a target object in unseen environments. This task is particularly challenging as it demands both perceptual and cognitive processes for effective perception and decision-making. While perception has gained significant progress powered by the rapidly developed visual foundation models, the progress on the cognitive side remains limited to either implicitly learning from massive navigation demonstrations or explicitly leveraging pre-defined heuristic rules. Inspired by neuroscientific evidence that humans consistently update their cognitive states while searching for objects in unseen environments, we present *CogNav*, which attempts to model this cognitive process with the help of large language models. Specifically, we model the cognitive process with a finite state machine composed of cognitive states ranging from exploration to identification. The transitions between the states are determined by a large language model based on an online built heterogeneous cognitive map containing spatial and semantic information of the scene being explored. Extensive experiments on both synthetic and real-world environments demonstrate that our cognitive modeling significantly improves *ObjectNav* efficiency, with human-like navigation behaviors. In an open-vocabulary and zero-shot setting, our method advances the SOTA of the HM3D benchmark from 69.3% to 87.2%. The code and data will be released.

1. Introduction

Navigating an unseen environment to find a target object, known as object goal navigation (*ObjectNav*) [18, 38], is a fundamental task for embodied agents and has garnered significant attention in the computer vision and robotics com-




Figure 1. We propose to model the cognitive process of object goal navigation with an LLM. The LLM is leveraged to reason the transitions of a spectrum of states ranging from exploration to identification via being prompted by a heterogeneous cognitive map. The cognitive map is constructed online and dynamically updated/corrected through, again, prompting the LLM.

munities. To achieve *ObjectNav*, an agent must efficiently explore the environment, effectively reason the arrangement of objects of interest in the scene, and accurately identify the target object upon approaching it. Consequently, *ObjectNav* is widely recognized as a challenging task that integrates both perceptual and cognitive processes [7, 31].

With the recent development of visual foundation models, the capability of visual perception has gained significant boost, demonstrating astonishing performance in open-vocabulary scene understanding. In contrast, the modeling of the cognitive process of *ObjectNav* has received limited progress; existing works approach it either by implicitly learning from massive navigation demonstrations [5, 9], or by explicitly leveraging heuristic rules [25, 30]. Both pathways demonstrate underwhelming results compared to manually controlled *ObjectNav*. We hypothesize that this limitation is attributed to the lack of a strong modeling of the cognitive process in *ObjectNav*.

* Joint first authors; † Corresponding author;

Homepage: <https://yhancao.github.io/CogNav/>

Neuroscientific evidence suggests that humans continuously update their cognitive states during object searches, for instance, by correcting misidentifications or making additional observations to improve accuracy [8, 11]. Thus, modeling the human cognitive process requires representing both cognitive states and the transitions between them. Therefore, the two key questions here are: *How to set up the cognitive states and how to learn the state transitions to achieve efficient ObjectNav?* The latter requires extensive demonstrations to learn and is often difficult to attain cross-target or cross-scene generalization.

We propose CogNav, a framework that models the cognitive process of ObjectNav by leveraging the common-sense reasoning abilities of large language models (LLMs). The LLM reasons the transitions of a carefully designed spectrum of cognitive states ranging from exploration to identification (Fig. 1). We show that an LLM is able to direct the ObjectNav process effectively via *deciding which state to take in the next*, by processing the abstract prompt of an online constructed cognitive map to be introduced next. In particular, the LLM is prompted to examine the in-alignment of the cognitive map and reasons about the cognitive state transitions with realtime grounding of the target environment.

To maintain the incremental observations of the environment during navigation, we propose online construction of a heterogeneous cognitive map which encompasses: 1) a semantic object graph, where nodes represent detected objects with semantic descriptions, and edges encode spatial relationships; 2) a navigation landmark graph, which records locations of interest for finding the target object; and 3) a top-view occupancy map for path planning. The heterogeneous cognitive map is incrementally constructed and can be dynamically updated or corrected through, again, prompting an LLM to ensure the map quality.

We found, surprisingly, that CogNav, with LLM-driven cognitive process modeling, leads to highly efficient and even human-like navigation behaviors without needing fine-tuning of LLMs. CogNav outperforms previous SOTA with significant margins on both synthetic and real-world environments. In particular, it improves the HM3D ObjectNav success rate from 69.3% to 87.2% absolutely and the MP3D ObjectNav success rate from 40.2% to 61.1%.

The promising results indicate that our method achieves arguably a full exploitation of the cognitive potential of LLMs in realizing spatial intelligence, saving the effort of training a policy model with numerous samples or trials and limited generality. Our contributions include:

- The first, to our knowledge, attempt of cognitive process modeling for ObjectNav via exploiting the commonsense and spatial reasoning capability of LLMs.
- The design of the cognitive states and the prompts for grounded reasoning of state transitions with an LLM.

- A heterogeneous cognitive map representation which is constructed online and can be corrected through prompting an LLM to ensure high map accuracy.

2. Related works

Object Goal Navigation. Object goal navigation (ObjectNav) is a fundamental task for embodied agents that has been extensively researched. Existing approaches to ObjectNav are divided into two pathways: end-to-end learning approaches [5, 9, 36, 39, 42] and modular-based approaches [7, 25, 44, 47, 51]. End-to-end learning approaches map observations directly to actions using reinforcement learning (RL) [9, 36, 42] or imitation learning (IL) [26, 27], which still face a significant sim-to-real gap and require extensive computational resources. In contrast, modular approaches decompose navigation into three parts based on the framework proposed in [7]: a mapping module building a map or graph online to represent the environment [28, 30, 47], a policy module to generate a long-term goal based on the map [7, 25, 47] and a path planning module for agent specific action navigating to the long-term goal [29].

With the development of multi-modal representation learning [23], ObjectNav implements finding the target object in open-vocabulary set, unlike previous methods limited to close-set object categories. CoWs [12] and ZSON [22] first use CLIP [23] to pair images to the category of target object. Later with the advent of the pretrained vision-and-language grounding model (VLMs) [19, 33], ESC [51] and OpenFMNav [17] utilize VLMs to detect objects and rooms and construct a semantic map. Furthermore, with the development of the large language models (LLMs) [1, 3], L3MVN [44], PixelNav [4], InstructNav [20] and OVEp [34] leverages LLMs to reason on scene information to pick the next goal in a given candidate set. We take a more generalized approach, using foundation models like CLIP [23] or VLMs [33] to identify objects in a scene, and leveraging LLMs to reason over scene knowledge to achieve open-vocabulary zero-shot navigation.

Scene Representation for ObjectNav. Scene representation is essential in object goal navigation, as it extracts useful information from the observations and helps the agent understand the scene to give the next goal. Most modular-based methods [17, 44] utilize an explicit top-down semantic grid map based on [7, 50] where frontiers are extracted from the map for agent navigation. [46, 47] enhance this approach by incorporating a 3D point scene representation as policy inputs. VoroNav [37] introduces the Reduced Voronoi Graph to extract exploratory paths and planning nodes instead of frontiers for more efficient navigation. InstructNav [20] employs Multi-sourced Value Maps to model key navigation elements. [35] leverages a hierarchical scene graph to represent a whole building for diverse navigation




Figure 2. **Pipeline of CogNav:** Our method takes a posed RGB-D sequence as input and incrementally constructs an online cognitive map, comprising a scene graph, a landmark graph, and an occupancy map. We then perform cognitive map prompting by encoding cognitive information and goal object into a text prompt used to query the LLM to determine the next cognitive state. Based on the state, the LLM is queried again to select a landmark to guide the robot. A deterministic local planner is used to generate a path to the selected landmark.

tasks. [21, 43] navigates with a scene graph as a more comprehensive representation of the scene [13, 40].

Large Language Models for ObjectNav. Large Language Models (LLMs) [1, 3, 48] have become increasingly relevant for common-sensing reasoning in zero-shot navigation, thanks to their powerful commonsense reasoning ability and generalization. [4, 17, 44] utilizes LLMs to infer the commonsense knowledge of LLMs between objects and rooms to select the best one from the candidate set. [20] leverages the Dynamic Chain-of-Navigation as a prompt of LLMs for different types of navigation instructions. [43] designs a hierarchical Chain-of-thought for prompting its local scene graph. By drawing on scene representation, LLMs play an increasingly important role in providing the long-term goals in navigation.

3. Method

Task definition. The object goal navigation task requires the agent to navigate within an unknown environment to find an object o in a given category c . At each time step t , the agent receives a posed RGB-D image $I_t = \langle I_t^{\text{rgb}}, I_t^{\text{depth}}, p_t \rangle$ where pose p_t includes both location and orientation $p_t = (x_t, y_t, \theta_t)$. The policy then predicts and executes an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} consists of six actions: `move_forward`, `turn_left`, `turn_right`, `look_up`, `look_down`, and `stop`. Given a limited time budget of 500 steps, the task succeeds if the agent stops within 1 meter of an object of o . By leveraging a foundation model [1, 3, 23], our method enables finding the target object in an open-vocabulary and zero-shot manner: the target category c can be freely specified with text and the navigation system does not require any training or fine-tuning.

Overview. Figure 2 provides an overview of CogNav. Our method takes the target category c and posed RGB-D frames as input and online construct a *heterogeneous cognitive map* \mathcal{C} , which consists of a semantic scene graph \mathcal{S} , a landmark

graph \mathcal{L} and a top-down occupancy map \mathcal{M} (Sec. 3.1). We then employ a carefully designed prompting strategy to obtain a comprehensive and detailed description of landmarks of the cognitive map \mathcal{C} (Sec. 3.2). All prompting cognitive map information is passed to the large language model, to determine the current cognitive state, various from broad exploration to target confirmation. With a given cognitive state, the large language model is prompted to adopt a specific skill to determine the next goal, such as exploration to another room or stopping at one landmark (Sec. 3.3). This goal will be sent to the local planner for low-level action planning to execution.

3.1. Cognitive Map Construction

To comprehensively encode the scene environments, we online build a heterogeneous cognitive map \mathcal{C} . It encompasses a scene graph, a 2D occupancy map, and a landmark graph, defined as follows:

Scene graph. The scene graph $\mathcal{S}_t = \langle \mathcal{N}_t, \mathcal{E}_t \rangle$ is composed of the instance nodes \mathcal{N}_t and spital informative edges \mathcal{E}_t . Here each node $n_t \in \mathcal{N}_t$ is an instance in the environment along with its detailed description of its semantics and spatial context and each edge $e_t \in \mathcal{E}_t$ indicates a spatial relationship between two nodes in \mathcal{N}_t from a candidate set { 'next to', 'on top of', 'inside of', 'under', 'hang on' }.

During navigation, we employ an open-vocabulary segmentation approach [45] to obtain 3D instances along with semantic features by clustering instance segmentations in 3D space in an online manner. Specifically, at each time step t , objects are segmented from I_t^{rgb} and their 2D instance masks are back-projected into a global 3D space using depth map I_t^{depth} and pose θ_t to achieve 3D instance segmentation o_t^i . Subsequently, these segmented instances are merged with existing instances O_{t-1} to update the instance nodes O_t via DBSCAN clustering [16], following existing methods [13]. These instance nodes provide an initial representation of semantic and spatial information to construct

the edges \mathcal{E}_t .

However, directly obtaining segmentation results from the clustering algorithm is often noisy and prone to errors. For a more accurate and detailed description of instance nodes and edges, we leverage the vision-language model (GPT-4v [1] in our implementation) to infer the observation. We adopt a SoM [41] technique by labelling 2D instances with projected O_t and then reasoning the spatial information and semantic information, such as the room type. For time efficiency, we perform the VLM inference every 10 steps, and only reason the newly fused instance and corresponding edges. We find this technique significantly removes the wrong instances and provides more accurate and detailed spatial information. We elaborate more on this in the supplementary.

Occupancy map. To provide spatial scene information, such as explored areas, unexplored areas, and frontiers, we construct a top-down occupancy map $\mathcal{M}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times M \times 4}$ from I_t , following the approach in [7]. $M \times M$ defines the map size with a grid resolution of 5cm. The first three channels indicate occupied areas, explored regions, and unexplored areas, respectively. The fourth channel incorporates the projected 3D instance nodes O_t . The occupancy map \mathcal{M}_t is updated at each navigation step.

Landmark graph. To anchor the scene graph and occupancy map information to navigation, we use a landmark graph $\mathcal{L}_t = \{l_{t,i}\}$ to discretize the navigation area, where $l_{t,i}$ is a 2D location extracted from a Voronoi node graph [15]. The Voronoi graph partitions the navigation area based on proximity to a set of key locations. Specifically, we define two types of key locations: *frontier locations* representing the spatial information and *instance locations* representing the object information. The frontier locations are clustered from the occupancy map following the method in [44]. The instance locations are the projection of instance nodes \mathcal{N}_t in the occupancy map. Using these frontier and instance locations, we construct a Voronoi graph with a Generalized Voronoi Diagram [37]. The landmark graph is updated every 10 frames, consistent with the scene graph update frequency. We elaborate more on this in the supplementary.

3.2. Cognitive Map Prompting

We encode the cognitive map knowledge in natural language by constructing landmark-centred prompts that embed scene information along with agent information into each landmark (Figure 3). Our cognitive map prompting comprises two types of information: (1) map-to-landmark prompts, which include details about neighbouring objects and spatial relationships within the scene e.g., next to a chair or near the scene boundary; and (2) agent-to-landmark descriptions, which convey navigational information relative to the landmarks, e.g., explored landmarks or close to the




Figure 3. **Cognitive Map Prompting:** We encode knowledge from the cognitive map by constructing landmark-centered prompts encompassing both scene and agent information.

agent.

Map-to-landmark prompts. For each landmark $l_{t,i} \in \mathcal{L}_t$, we integrate the scene information including surrounding objects along with their relationships, the room type and the frontier property. We select object nodes $\mathcal{N}_{t,l_i} \subseteq \mathcal{N}_t$ within a certain distance threshold from a landmark $l_{t,i}$ in the scene graph \mathcal{S}_t as the surrounding objects. These nodes are prompted to incorporate their semantic information and spatial relationships to other nodes, thereby embedding the structural information of the scene graph to achieve a richer understanding of the surrounding environment. Additionally, we integrate room type information obtained from the VLM during scene graph construction (Sec. 3.1) and calculate the distance to the nearest frontiers in the occupancy map, considering them as frontiers when the distance is less than 1 meter.

Agent-to-landmark prompts. We prompt the spatial relationship between the landmark and the agent. For each landmark $l_{t,i}$, we compute the landmark path from the agent to the landmark. Specifically, we calculate the distance between the landmark and the agent using the landmark graph \mathcal{L}_t via Dijkstra’s Algorithm. We also record whether this landmark has previously been reached by the agent, which helps to avoid redundant exploration.

3.3. Cognitive Process Modeling

States definition. Following the neuroscience evidence [8], we mimic the cognitive process of humans that continuously update their cognitive states during object searches. Specifically, we model this process by defining five cognitive states that range from exploration to identification:

- **Broad Search (BS):** Explore the environment without observing any specific object or room information related to the target object category c .
- **Contextual Search (CS):** Explore rooms that may contain the target object or examine surrounding landmarks asso-

Algorithm 1: CogNav

Input : Target category c

Output: Task completion status (True/False)

```
1 goal  $\leftarrow$  LLMLandmarkSelection( $\mathcal{P}_0, \mathcal{L}_{0, \text{frontier}}$ );
2 target  $\leftarrow$  null;
3 repeat
4    $\mathcal{I}_t \leftarrow$  AgentObservation( $t$ );
5    $\mathcal{C}_t, \text{target} \leftarrow$  CognitiveMapConstruction( $\mathcal{I}_t$ );
6    $\mathcal{P}_t \leftarrow$  CognitiveMapPrompting( $\mathcal{C}_t$ );
7    $\text{state}_t \leftarrow$  LLMCogStateReasoning( $\mathcal{P}_t$ );
8   if  $\text{state}_t = \text{BS}$  then goal  $\leftarrow$ 
      LLMLandmarkSelection( $\mathcal{P}_t, \text{state}_t, \mathcal{L}_{t, \text{frontier}}$ );
9   if  $\text{state}_t = \text{CS}$  then goal  $\leftarrow$ 
      LLMLandmarkSelection( $\mathcal{P}_t, \text{state}_t, \mathcal{L}_{t, \text{relevant}}$ );
10  if  $\text{state}_t = \text{OT}$  then goal  $\leftarrow$ 
      VMLLandmarkSelection( $\mathcal{P}_t, \text{state}_t, \mathcal{L}_{t, \text{target}}$ );
11  if  $\text{state}_t = \text{CV}$  then goal  $\leftarrow$ 
      VMLLandmarkSelection( $\mathcal{P}_t, \text{state}_t, \mathcal{L}_{t, \text{verify}}$ );
12  if  $\text{state}_t = \text{TC}$  then goal  $\leftarrow$   $\mathcal{L}_{t, \text{target}}$ ;
13   $a_t \leftarrow$  FastMarchingMethod(goal);
14 until stop;
15 return category of target =  $c$ 
```

ciated with objects more closely related to the target.

- Observe Target (OT): Detect a suspected target object o based on the foundational model’s detection output.
- Candidate Verification (CV): Navigate to more landmarks to verify the suspected suspected target object.
- Target Confirmation (TC): Confirm the suspected object as the target o with the surrounding environments and navigation history and approach it directly.

These states provide a detailed model of the cognitive navigation process and allow for transitions between them. However, given the open-set vocabulary targets in previously unseen environments, it is challenging to define strict constraints or thresholds to trigger these transitions. To address this, we leverage the capabilities of a large language model (LLM) to achieve state transitions. We provide the detailed prompt for the LLM’s state reasoning in the Supplementary.

State transitions and planing. We describe the pipeline of cognitive process in Algo. 1. Given the cognitive map promoting in Sec. 3.2, we leverage LLM (ChatGPT [1] in implementation) for reasoning the current state. Then, with a given cognitive state, we prompt LLM to plan target landmarks (see Fig. 4 for an example) that satisfy the target of the cognitive state (See Fig. 4).

Firstly, the agents are required to broadly search (*Broad Search*) the scene environment to maximize the prior knowledge of the agent to the scenes. In this case, the agent is required to navigate between the frontiers landmarks $\mathcal{L}_{t, \text{frontier}}$. Once the agent observes environments that are related to the target, such as a room that may contain the




Figure 4. **State-related landmarks** (red dots) activated by different cognitive states. *Frontier landmarks* are located at the boundary between explored and unexplored areas. *Target-relevant landmarks* are distributed within a room that may contain the goal object. *Verification landmarks* appear near the vicinity of the goal object. The *target landmark* is the closest one to the goal object. See Supplementary for a detailed explanation of landmarks.

target object (*Contextual Search*). The agents are required to carefully explore the landmarks $\mathcal{L}_{t, \text{relevant}}$. These landmarks are prompted to be close to the related environments.

During exploration, when the cognitive map detects an object that could be the target object (*Observe Target*), the agent are required to approach to the target object landmark $\mathcal{L}_{t, \text{target}}$. During the approach, the cognitive map is consistently updated, the target object prediction could continue inconsistency, LLM could transfer the state to *Target Verification*. LLM then predicted landmarks $\mathcal{L}_{t, \text{verify}}$ that are near the potential target object.

Finally, when the LLM believes the cognitive map strongly supports the observed object is the target, it will reason the current cognitive state as *Target Confirmation* and directly guide the agent to the target landmarks $\mathcal{L}_{t, \text{target}}$. Note that, the cognitive states are not sequentially executed. Instead, LLM analyzes the online updated cognitive map to decide the current state. Therefore, CogNav supports recovery from wrong predictions, such as from Target Verification to Broad Search. During navigation, we employ the Fast Marching Method (FMM) [29] to guide the agent to the target object. Once the agent arrives at the target and the current cognitive state is Target Confirmation, the agent

Method	Open-Set	Zero-Shot	HM3D		MP3D	
			SR (%) \uparrow	SPL (%) \uparrow	SR (%) \uparrow	SPL (%) \uparrow
SemEXP [7]	\times	\times	–	–	36.0	14.4
PONI [25]	\times	\times	–	–	31.8	12.1
ZSON [22]	\checkmark	\times	25.5	12.6	15.3	4.8
L3MVN [44]	\times	\checkmark	54.2	25.5	34.9	14.5
ESC [51]	\checkmark	\checkmark	39.2	22.3	28.7	11.2
VoroNav [37]	\checkmark	\checkmark	42	26	–	–
SG-NAV [43]	\checkmark	\checkmark	54	24.9	40.2	16
OPENFMNAV [17]	\checkmark	\checkmark	54.9	22.4	37.2	15.7
TriHelper [49]	\checkmark	\checkmark	62	25.3	–	–
OSGs-OWNav [21]	\checkmark	\checkmark	69.3	28.3	–	–
CogNav	\checkmark	\checkmark	87.2	30.4	61.1	20.1

Table 1. Comparison of success rate of different methods on HM3D [24] and MP3D [6].

outputs *STOP* to end the search. We provide additional details on state transitions and planning in the supplementary material, including prompts and further visual results.

4. Experiment

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our approach by comparing it with several baselines in a simulated environment [32]. We further conduct several ablation studies to validate the effectiveness of our design. Additionally, we apply our approach in a real-world robot platform to demonstrate its practicality for navigational tasks.

4.1. Experiment Setup

Datasets. Our simulated experiments are conducted on two datasets: 1) The HM3D [24] dataset, a large-scale 3D indoor scene dataset designed for simulating embodied AI tasks. It includes 20 high-fidelity reconstructions of entire buildings and 2K validation episodes for object navigation tasks across six goal object categories; 2) The MP3D [6] dataset, a comprehensive 3D indoor environment dataset created from real-world building scans. It contains 11 indoor scenes and 1.8K validation episodes for object navigation tasks across 20 goal object categories.

Evaluation Metrics. We use three metrics [2] to evaluate object navigation performance: 1) Success Rate (SR): The percentage of navigation episodes in which the robot successfully reaches within a certain distance of the target object; 2) Success weighted by Path Length (SPL): The success rate normalized by the optimal path length, favoring agents that navigate efficiently. Shorter paths are preferred over longer, suboptimal routes; 3) Distance to Goal (DTG): The final distance between the agent and the target object at the end of the navigation episode.

Implementation Details. For each episode, we set the maximum navigation step to 500. The observation of the agent is 640×480 RGB-D images, with depth values rang-

ing from 0.5m to 5m. The camera of agent is 0.9m above the ground, with each forward action advancing 0.25m and each rotation covering 30° . The occupancy map is configured as 960×960 with a resolution of 0.05m. For instance detection and segmentation, we utilize OpenSEED [45] as our 2D foundation model. In the cognitive process, GPT-3 [3] is used as the large language model (LLM), and GPT-4v [1] serves as the vision-language model (VLM) for decision-making during navigation.

Baselines. We compare CogNav with several recent works, focusing on open-set and zero-shot object navigation baselines to verify the effectiveness of our framework. Baselines are categorized into 'Open-Set' and 'Zero-Shot' methods: 'Open-Set' indicates that the approach can detect and navigate to any object category as specified and 'Zero-shot' indicates the approach can find and navigate toward target objects it has never encountered during training. For closed-set and unsupervised approaches, we cover SemExp [7] and PONI [25]. For open-set and unsupervised approach, we choose ZSON [22]. For closed-set and zero-shot method, we choose L3MVN [44]. For open-set and zero-shot methods, we cover ESC [51], VoroNav [37], SG-NAV [43], OPENFMNAV [17], TriHelper [49] and OSGs-OWNAV [21].

4.2. Quantitive Experiments

We evaluate our approach on the HM3D (val) and MP3D (val) datasets with other baselines, including both open-set and zero-shot methods. The results are presented in Table 1. Our approach achieves state-of-the-art performance on both datasets, outperforming other methods by a significant margin. For the success rate (SR) metric, our approach achieves a 17.9% improvement on HM3D and a 20.9% improvement on MP3D. For success weighted by path length (SPL), our approach achieves a 2.1% improvement on HM3D and a 4.1% improvement on MP3D. Note that, the improvement in SR is more pronounced than in SPL. This is because




Figure 5. **Navigation process visualization of CogNav.** We provide visual results of navigation process for one synthetic scene and one real-world one. Cognitive maps encode scene information and facilitate landmark prompting, enabling the agent to explore environments efficiently and identify target objects accurately. More results can be found in Supplementary.

Method	sofa	bed	chair	plant	toilet	tv_monitor	average
L3MVN	50.1	52.3	51.6	46.4	41.5	55.2	49.5
TriHelper	62.2	57.1	58.6	58.3	52.9	61.1	58.4
CogNav	81.7	82.8	89.4	89.1	88.5	90.2	86.9

Table 2. The success rate of each category on HM3D [24]. The HM3D dataset contains six object categories in total. The 'average' represents the mean success rate across these six categories.

our cognitive process modeling enables the agent to recover from incorrect predictions, significantly enhancing the success rate. However, during candidate verification, the agent must approach the goal object and observe it from multiple views. Consequently, this may increase the navigation path length.

We present a comparison of the success rates across different goal categories with various zero-shot methods in Table 2. CogNav consistently outperforms the other methods, particularly in categories with lower success rates in alternative approaches, such as `plant` and `toilet`. We also conduct a breakdown experiment to investigate the cognitive state modeling during navigation. Specifically, we




Figure 6. State ratio across normalized time. States with higher ratios at specific steps are highlighted in dark color.

plot the state ratio across different time horizons (Figure 6). Notably, when searching for a `sofa`, the states typically follow an orderly sequence from exploration to identification. In contrast, when searching for a `plant`, the states

BS	CS	OT	CV	TC	HM3D		
					SR (%) \uparrow	SPL (%) \uparrow	DTG (m) \downarrow
\checkmark	\times	\checkmark	\times	\times	63.7	32.4	1.422
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	\times	69.4	35.3	1.432
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	78.0	28.9	1.118
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\times	\checkmark	83.5	40.1	0.877
\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	87.2	30.4	0.775

Table 3. Ablation study of leveraging different cognitive states. BS, CS, CV and TC represent Broad Search, Contextual Search, Candidate Verification and Target Confirmation in Cognitive Process Modeling, respectively on HM3D [24].

Method	HM3D		
	SR (%) \uparrow	SPL (%) \uparrow	DTG (m) \downarrow
Only object categories	65.7	9.49	1.42
Remove edges	79.3	24.6	1.06
Remove room-type	82.1	28.3	0.977
Remove spatial information	55.16	17.8	1.752
Remove navigation history	62.3	25.2	1.633
Complete Prompt	87.2	30.4	0.775

Table 4. Ablation study of using different prompt strategies on HM3D [24] by removing respective parts from the map-to-landmark (rows 1-3) and agent-to-landmark prompts (rows 4-5).

are distributed irregularly, with frequent transitions between states. This comparison demonstrates that our cognitive process model adapts to the complexity of finding different object categories.

4.3. Qualitative Experiments

We visualize the navigation process of CogNav in Figure 5. The upper example (rows 1-2) illustrates the task of finding a plant on HM3D, demonstrating how the agent transitions between states by utilizing the large language model’s (LLM) analysis of the scene and executing appropriate strategies to find the target object. We also deploy our approach on a real robot for object navigation in a real-world environment. A detailed description of the robot is in the supplementary. The lower example (rows 3-4) shows the task of finding a cup in a real-world scene, demonstrating that CogNav can perform open-set object navigation tasks in real environments.

4.4. Ablation Study

In Table 3, we compare the effects of different states in cognitive process modeling. Exploration in an unknown environment requires BS states, so we remove other states to verify the role of the remaining four states. As shown in the table, each state is critical to successfully finding the target object. Note that, removing the candidate verification state (row 4) decreases 3.7% in SR but increases 9.7% in SPL, due to the increased navigation path length when the agent needs to visit different viewpoints of the target object for

LLM	VLM	HM3D		
		SR (%) \uparrow	SPL (%) \uparrow	DTG (m) \downarrow
LLaMa3	CogVLM2	75.3	20.3	2.057
GPT-3	CogVLM2	77.1	21.6	1.882
LLaMA3	GPT-4v	83.5	26.5	1.664
GPT-3	GPT-4v	87.2	30.4	0.775

Table 5. Comparison of various large language models on HM3D [24]. We replace GPT models [1, 3] in CogNav with Llama3.1-8B-Instruct [10] and Cogvlm2-llama3-chat-19B [14].

observation and confirmation.

We also perform an ablation study to examine the effectiveness of different cognitive prompt components in our approach. Results are shown in Table 4. Adding edges with room-type in map-to-landmarks prompts (row 1) significantly improves performance by incorporating relationships with surrounding objects and the room in which the agent is located. Additionally, rows 4-5 confirm the effectiveness of prompting spatial information and navigation history for LLM inference, respectively. We further replace the LLM and VLM to evaluate the reasoning and decision-making abilities of different large models in navigation. As shown in Table 5, GPT (row 1) demonstrates superior analysis and decision-making capabilities in navigation tasks. Note that, after replacing it with two open-source large models (rows 1-3), our method still outperforms others on HM3D.

5. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we have proposed CogNav, a zero-shot framework that models the cognitive process for object goal navigation using large language models (LLMs). Our method constructs a heterogeneous cognitive map and models the cognitive process with a finite state machine composed of cognitive states range from exploration to identification to navigate the agent. Our method achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance among all methods and validates the feasibility with a robot to navigate an object in a real-world scene.

Limitations and Future Work. Despite the great performance, CogNav still has several limitations: (1) CogNav relies on the detection and segmentation results from a 2D foundation model. If the model consistently fails to detect the target object, CogNav cannot locate the target within the time budget. (2) Currently, CogNav is limited to object-goal navigation and does not support navigation based on free-form language descriptions or specific navigation instructions. However, given the powerful generalization abilities of LLMs and vision-language models (VLMs), our approach can be further extended to handle navigation tasks with unlimited input formats in future work.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [2] Peter Anderson, Angel Chang, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Saurabh Gupta, Vladlen Koltun, Jana Kosecka, Jitendra Malik, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Manolis Savva, et al. On evaluation of embodied navigation agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.06757*, 2018.
- [3] Tom B Brown. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [4] Wenzhe Cai, Siyuan Huang, Guangran Cheng, Yuxing Long, Peng Gao, Changyin Sun, and Hao Dong. Bridging zero-shot object navigation and foundation models through pixel-guided navigation skill. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5228–5234. IEEE, 2024.
- [5] Tommaso Campari, Paolo Eccher, Luciano Serafini, and Lamberto Ballan. Exploiting scene-specific features for object goal navigation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 406–421. Springer, 2020.
- [6] Angel Chang, Angela Dai, Thomas Funkhouser, Maciej Halber, Matthias Niessner, Manolis Savva, Shuran Song, Andy Zeng, and Yinda Zhang. Matterport3D: Learning from RGB-D data in indoor environments. *International Conference on 3D Vision (3DV)*, 2017.
- [7] Devendra Singh Chaplot, Dhiraj Prakashchand Gandhi, Abhinav Gupta, and Russ R Salakhutdinov. Object goal navigation using goal-oriented semantic exploration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4247–4258, 2020.
- [8] Jordan Crivelli-Decker, Alex Clarke, Seongmin A Park, Derek J Huffman, Erie D Boorman, and Charan Ranganath. Goal-oriented representations in the human hippocampus during planning and navigation. *Nature communications*, 14(1):2946, 2023.
- [9] Ronghao Dang, Liuyi Wang, Zongtao He, Shuai Su, Jiagui Tang, Chengju Liu, and Qijun Chen. Search for or navigate to? dual adaptive thinking for object navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8250–8259, 2023.
- [10] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024.
- [11] John DE Gabrieli. Cognitive neuroscience of human memory. *Annual review of psychology*, 49(1):87–115, 1998.
- [12] Samir Yitzhak Gadre, Mitchell Wortsman, Gabriel Ilharco, Ludwig Schmidt, and Shuran Song. Cows on pasture: Baselines and benchmarks for language-driven zero-shot object navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23171–23181, 2023.
- [13] Qiao Gu, Ali Kuwajerwala, Sacha Morin, Krishna Murthy Jatavallabhula, Bipasha Sen, Aditya Agarwal, Corban Rivera, William Paul, Kirsty Ellis, Rama Chellappa, et al. Conceptgraphs: Open-vocabulary 3d scene graphs for perception and planning. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5021–5028. IEEE, 2024.
- [14] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Ming Ding, Wenmeng Yu, Qingsong Lv, Yan Wang, Yean Cheng, Shiyu Huang, Junhui Ji, Zhao Xue, et al. Cogvlm2: Visual language models for image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16500*, 2024.
- [15] Nidhi Kalra, Dave Ferguson, and Anthony Stentz. Incremental reconstruction of generalized voronoi diagrams on grids. *Robotics and Autonomous Systems*, 57(2):123–128, 2009.
- [16] Kamran Khan, Saif Ur Rehman, Kamran Aziz, Simon Fong, and Sababady Sarasvady. Dbscan: Past, present and future. In *The fifth international conference on the applications of digital information and web technologies (ICADIWT 2014)*, pages 232–238. IEEE, 2014.
- [17] Yuxuan Kuang, Hai Lin, and Meng Jiang. Openfmnav: Towards open-set zero-shot object navigation via vision-language foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10670*, 2024.
- [18] Baosheng Li, Jishui Han, Yuan Cheng, Chong Tan, Peng Qi, Jianping Zhang, and Xiaolei Li. Object goal navigation in embodied ai: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 2022 4th International Conference on Video, Signal and Image Processing*, pages 87–92, 2022.
- [19] Liduan Harold Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Haotian Zhang, Jianwei Yang, Chunyuan Li, Yiwu Zhong, Lijuan Wang, Lu Yuan, Lei Zhang, Jenq-Neng Hwang, et al. Grounded language-image pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 10965–10975, 2022.
- [20] Yuxing Long, Wenzhe Cai, Hongcheng Wang, Guanqi Zhan, and Hao Dong. Instructnav: Zero-shot system for generic instruction navigation in unexplored environment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.04882*, 2024.
- [21] Joel Loo, Zhanxin Wu, and David Hsu. Open scene graphs for open world object-goal navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02473*, 2024.
- [22] Arjun Majumdar, Gunjan Aggarwal, Bhavika Devnani, Judy Hoffman, and Dhruv Batra. Zson: Zero-shot object-goal navigation using multimodal goal embeddings. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:32340–32352, 2022.
- [23] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [24] Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Aaron Gokaslan, Erik Wijmans, Oleksandr Maksymets, Alexander Clegg, John M Turner, Eric Undersander, Wojciech Galuba, Andrew Westbury, Angel X Chang, Manolis Savva, Yili Zhao, and Dhruv

- Batra. Habitat-matterport 3d dataset (HM3d): 1000 large-scale 3d environments for embodied AI. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2021.
- [25] Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Ziad Al-Halah, Jitendra Malik, and Kristen Grauman. Poni: Potential functions for objectgoal navigation with interaction-free learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 18890–18900, 2022.
- [26] Ram Ramrakhya, Eric Undersander, Dhruv Batra, and Abhishek Das. Habitat-web: Learning embodied object-search strategies from human demonstrations at scale. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 5173–5183, 2022.
- [27] Ram Ramrakhya, Dhruv Batra, Erik Wijmans, and Abhishek Das. Pirlnav: Pretraining with imitation and rl finetuning for objectnav. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 17896–17906, 2023.
- [28] Sohan Rudra, Saksham Goel, Anirban Santara, Claudio Gentile, Laurent Perron, Fei Xia, Vikas Sindhwani, Carolina Parada, and Gaurav Aggarwal. A contextual bandit approach for learning to plan in environments with probabilistic goal configurations. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 5645–5652. IEEE, 2023.
- [29] James A Sethian. A fast marching level set method for monotonically advancing fronts. *proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 93(4):1591–1595, 1996.
- [30] Aleksei Staroverov and Aleksandr I Panov. Hierarchical landmark policy optimization for visual indoor navigation. *IEEE Access*, 10:70447–70455, 2022.
- [31] Jingwen Sun, Jing Wu, Ze Ji, and Yu-Kun Lai. A survey of object goal navigation. *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, 2024.
- [32] Andrew Szot, Alex Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, Yili Zhao, John Turner, Noah Maestre, Mustafa Mukadam, Devendra Chaplot, Oleksandr Maksymets, Aaron Gokaslan, Vladimir Vondrus, Sameer Dharur, Franziska Meier, Wojciech Galuba, Angel Chang, Zsolt Kira, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, Manolis Savva, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- [33] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, et al. CogVLM: Visual expert for pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03079*, 2023.
- [34] Meng Wei, Tai Wang, Yilun Chen, Hanqing Wang, Jiangmiao Pang, and Xihui Liu. Ovexp: Open vocabulary exploration for object-oriented navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09016*, 2024.
- [35] Abdelrhman Werby, Chenguang Huang, Martin Büchner, Abhinav Valada, and Wolfram Burgard. Hierarchical open-vocabulary 3d scene graphs for language-grounded robot navigation. In *First Workshop on Vision-Language Models for Navigation and Manipulation at ICRA 2024*, 2024.
- [36] Erik Wijmans, Abhishek Kadian, Ari Morcos, Stefan Lee, Irfan Essa, Devi Parikh, Manolis Savva, and Dhruv Batra. Dd-ppo: Learning near-perfect pointgoal navigators from 2.5 billion frames. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00357*, 2019.
- [37] Pengying Wu, Yao Mu, Bingxian Wu, Yi Hou, Ji Ma, Shanghang Zhang, and Chang Liu. Voronav: Voronoi-based zero-shot object navigation with large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02695*, 2024.
- [38] Karmesh Yadav, Jacob Krantz, Ram Ramrakhya, Santhosh Kumar Ramakrishnan, Jimmy Yang, Austin Wang, John Turner, Aaron Gokaslan, Vincent-Pierre Berges, Roozbeh Mootaghi, Oleksandr Maksymets, Angel X Chang, Manolis Savva, Alexander Clegg, Devendra Singh Chaplot, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat challenge 2023, 2023.
- [39] Karmesh Yadav, Ram Ramrakhya, Arjun Majumdar, Vincent-Pierre Berges, Sachit Kuhar, Dhruv Batra, Alexei Baevski, and Oleksandr Maksymets. Offline visual representation learning for embodied navigation. In *Workshop on Reincarnating Reinforcement Learning at ICLR 2023*, 2023.
- [40] Mi Yan, Jiazhao Zhang, Yan Zhu, and He Wang. Maskclustering: View consensus based mask graph clustering for open-vocabulary 3d instance segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 28274–28284, 2024.
- [41] Jianwei Yang, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Xueyan Zou, Chunyuan Li, and Jianfeng Gao. Set-of-mark prompting unleashes extraordinary visual grounding in gpt-4v. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11441*, 2023.
- [42] Joel Ye, Dhruv Batra, Abhishek Das, and Erik Wijmans. Auxiliary tasks and exploration enable objectgoal navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 16117–16126, 2021.
- [43] Hang Yin, Xiuwei Xu, Zhenyu Wu, Jie Zhou, and Jiwen Lu. Sg-nav: Online 3d scene graph prompting for llm-based zero-shot object navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08189*, 2024.
- [44] Bangguo Yu, Hamidreza Kasaei, and Ming Cao. L3mvm: Leveraging large language models for visual target navigation. In *2023 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 3554–3560. IEEE, 2023.
- [45] Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Xueyan Zou, Shilong Liu, Chunyuan Li, Jianwei Yang, and Lei Zhang. A simple framework for open-vocabulary segmentation and detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 1020–1031, 2023.
- [46] Jiazhao Zhang, Chenyang Zhu, Lintao Zheng, and Kai Xu. Fusion-aware point convolution for online semantic 3d scene segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4534–4543, 2020.
- [47] Jiazhao Zhang, Liu Dai, Fanpeng Meng, Qingnan Fan, Xuelin Chen, Kai Xu, and He Wang. 3d-aware object goal navigation via simultaneous exploration and identification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 6672–6682, 2023.
- [48] Jiazhao Zhang, Kunyu Wang, Rongtao Xu, Gengze Zhou, Yicong Hong, Xiaomeng Fang, Qi Wu, Zhizheng Zhang, and

He Wang. Navid: Video-based vlm plans the next step for vision-and-language navigation. *Robotics: Science and Systems*, 2024.

- [49] Lingfeng Zhang, Qiang Zhang, Hao Wang, Erjia Xiao, Zixuan Jiang, Honglei Chen, and Renjing Xu. Trihelper: Zero-shot object navigation with dynamic assistance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.15223*, 2024.
- [50] Lintao Zheng, Chenyang Zhu, Jiazhao Zhang, Hang Zhao, Hui Huang, Matthias Niessner, and Kai Xu. Active scene understanding via online semantic reconstruction. In *Computer Graphics Forum*, pages 103–114. Wiley Online Library, 2019.
- [51] Kaiwen Zhou, Kaizhi Zheng, Connor Pryor, Yilin Shen, Hongxia Jin, Lise Getoor, and Xin Eric Wang. Esc: Exploration with soft commonsense constraints for zero-shot object navigation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 42829–42842. PMLR, 2023.