

4D mmWave Radar in Adverse Environments for Autonomous Driving: A Survey

Xiangyuan Peng^{1,2†}, Miao Tang^{3†}, Huawei Sun^{1,2}, Lorenzo Servadei¹ and Robert Wille¹

Abstract—Autonomous driving systems require accurate and reliable perception. However, adverse environments, such as rain, snow, and fog, can significantly degrade the performance of LiDAR and cameras. In contrast, 4D millimeter-wave (mmWave) radar not only provides 3D sensing and additional velocity measurements but also maintains robustness in challenging conditions, making it increasingly valuable for autonomous driving. Recently, research on 4D mmWave radar under adverse environments has been growing, but a comprehensive survey is still lacking. To bridge this gap, this survey comprehensively reviews the current research on 4D mmWave radar under adverse environments. First, we present an overview of existing 4D mmWave radar datasets encompassing diverse weather and lighting scenarios. Next, we analyze methods and models according to different adverse conditions. Finally, the challenges faced in current studies and potential future directions are discussed for advancing 4D mmWave radar applications in harsh environments. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first survey specifically focusing on 4D mmWave radar in adverse environments for autonomous driving.

I. INTRODUCTION

Autonomous driving has become a highly discussed topic in transportation, driving the development and application of modern intelligent transportation systems [1]. To achieve the safety and dependability, autonomous driving relies on accurate and reliable sensing and perception. Currently, human operation error remains the leading cause of traffic accidents [2]. Thus, autonomous driving systems aim to address this issue through intelligent perception and decision-making while optimizing traffic flow and reducing energy consumption. However, adverse environments severely affect the robustness of autonomous driving systems in real-world scenarios [3]. Sun glare, rain, fog, and snow can degrade the performance of autonomous driving by introducing noise and occlusions [4]. Rainfall can affect the road surface conditions by creating driving hazards [5]. According to statistics from the United States, around 24% of crashes occur on snowy, muddy, or icy roads [6]. Furthermore, phenomena such as fog, sandstorms, and smoke also reduce the visibility [7].

Various sensors, including radar, LiDAR, and camera have been explored for perception and Simultaneous Localization and Mapping (SLAM) under adverse environments [4], as shown in Fig. 1. Cameras excel in 2D detection by high-resolution RGB images but struggle with occlusion and poor depth perception under challenging lighting and weather



Fig. 1: Visualization of camera, LiDAR and 4D mmWave data in rainy nighttime. The raw data is from the Dual Radar dataset [13]. (a) shows the camera image. (b) illustrates LiDAR point clouds in blue and 4D mmWave radar (Arbe Phoenix) point clouds in red.

conditions [8]. On the other hand, LiDAR generates 3D point clouds with precise geometric information and is less affected by lighting [9]. However, despite research efforts to enhance its robustness [10]–[12], LiDAR’s measurement accuracy and point density still deteriorate due to noisy interference of adverse conditions.

As an alternative, radar has attracted significant interest. In autonomous driving, millimeter-wave (mmWave) radar is widely employed due to its compact size, cost-effectiveness, velocity-measuring capability, long detection range, and all-weather adaptability [14], [15]. In particular, 4D mmWave radar enhances traditional 3D mmWave radar by adding height measurement, enabling 3D spatial perception. A detailed comparison of cameras, LiDAR, and 4D mmWave radar across different environments and their features is presented in Fig. 2. Compared to other sensors, 4D mmWave radar can penetrate small airborne particles, achieving consistent and reliable operation in challenging environments [16]. As illustrated in Fig. 2, 4D mmWave radar outperforms LiDAR and cameras across various scenarios, especially in the rain, snow, fog, and smoke conditions.

To leverage the robustness of 4D mmWave radar under severe environments, advancements have introduced weather-included 4D mmWave radar datasets and methods [17]–[19]. These studies target on different challenging scenes such as land, waterways, and mines, as well as different applications like single-agent and cooperative perception. The developments highlight the growing importance of addressing adverse environmental conditions with 4D mmWave radar. Several surveys have been conducted on 4D mmWave radar technologies. [20] is the first review on learning-based 4D mmWave radar datasets and applications in autonomous driving, while [21] focused on 4D mmWave radar-based

¹Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

²Infineon Technologies AG, Neubiberg, Germany

³China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, China

[†]Xiangyuan Peng and Miao Tang contribute equally to this work.




Fig. 2: Analysis of 4D mmWave radar, LiDAR, and cameras under adverse environments and their features.

tracking tasks. Similarly, [16] discussed the principles and advantages of 4D mmWave radar over other sensors for detection and tracking. However, there remains a lack of a dedicated survey specifically focusing on 4D mmWave radar performance under adverse environments. To bridge this gap, this paper provides a comprehensive summary of 4D mmWave radar in adverse environments for autonomous driving, providing valuable insights and a foundation for future research. The main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- To the best of our knowledge, this is the first survey comprehensively summarizing the current state of 4D mmWave radar datasets, methodologies, and applications which are designed for adverse environments.
- A detailed summary of 4D mmWave radar datasets with adverse conditions for perception and SLAM is provided, covering diverse weather and illumination scenarios.
- Existing methods for 4D mmWave radar in adverse environments are analyzed, including generalized strategies for multiple challenging conditions and specialized techniques for specific weather.
- Challenges and future trends, including noise and sparsity handling, simulation, new tasks, and new scenes, are discussed for 4D mmWave radar in adverse environments.

The structure of this paper is organized as follows: Section II introduces public datasets that include various weather and lighting conditions. Section III provides a detailed analysis of research with 4D mmWave radar under different adverse environmental conditions. In Section IV, we discuss the challenges and future prospects for 4D mmWave radar in diverse environments. Finally, Section V draws the conclusion.

II. DATASET

Numerous 4D mmWave radar datasets have been developed. Datasets such as Astyx [22], VoD [23], RADIAL [24], and ZJOUNDset [25] focus on 3D object detection based on 4D mmWave radar with synchronized LiDAR, and camera data. RaDelft [26], SJTU4D [27], Colorado [28],

and DRIO [29] provide radar point clouds and multisensor data with ground truth poses for SLAM task. Although these datasets have facilitated significant advancements in research under standard environments, they are limited in evaluating performance in more complex and adverse environments. Therefore, the performance of 4D mmWave radar under adverse conditions has gained increasing attention in recent years [17]. The current public 4D mmWave radar datasets with adverse environments are summarized in Table I.

A. Datasets for perception

TJ4DRadSet [30] comprises 7757 frames of synchronized 4D mmWave radar, LiDAR, and camera data for 3D object detection and tracking. It considers diverse driving scenarios such as urban roads, elevated highways, and industrial zones with different lightness, making it a foundation for radar perception under varying light and driving conditions.

Beyond driving conditions and lighting, to leverage the advantages of the 4D mmWave radar in adverse weather, K-Radar [17] is collected as the first large-scale 4D mmWave radar dataset specifically focused on adverse weather scenarios. It includes 35K frames of 4D radar tensors (Doppler, range, azimuth, and elevation) and point clouds, calibrated with LiDAR, stereo cameras, IMU, and RTK-GPS for odometry. The dataset encompasses a wide range of weather conditions, including normal weather, overcast, fog, rain, sleet, and snow within a middle detection range of 120m. Notably, it demonstrates the superior robustness of 4D mmWave radar in challenging weather compared to LiDAR.

However, the K-Radar dataset [17] lacks long-range 4D radar point clouds. In contrast, the aiMotive dataset [19] provides long-range perception up to 200 meters, utilizing two identical 4D mmWave radars, one LiDAR, and four 360° cameras. Similarly, the Dual Radar dataset [13] incorporates two 4D mmWave radar systems (Arbe Phoenix and ARSS48 RDI), supporting both middle- and long-range detection and enabling comparative analysis of different 4D mmWave radar systems within the same scenes. Added to this, the L-RadSet dataset [31] extends long-range detection capabilities to 220 meters using 4D mmWave radar, 360° LiDAR, and cameras. While all three datasets cover diverse weather scenarios, including sunny, rainy, cloudy, and nighttime conditions, aiMotive [19] also captures a small number of glare scenes, and L-RadSet additionally features foggy weather data.

To further enhance the data scale, the Bosch Street dataset [32] provides 1.3M frames of synchronized data across 13.6K different scenes. The data is collected by nine 4D mmWave radars, four LiDARs, and three cameras with a 360° field of view within a long distance of 200m.

The cross-sensor domain adaptation can mitigate sensor-based disparities. Therefore, CMD [33] is the first dataset designed for cross-sensor domain adaptation, incorporating data from a 4D mmWave radar, a 128-beam LiDAR, a 32-beam LiDAR, a solid-state LiDAR, and three cameras under diverse lighting conditions. It considers differences in density, intensity, and geometry among different sensors, providing research for cross-sensor adaptation research.

TABLE I: Publicly available 4D mmWave radar datasets with adverse weather and light conditions.

| Dataset | Year | Task | Label | Source | Size | Adverse Weather | | | | | Adverse Lightness | | |
|-------------------------|------|---------|-----------------------|--------|-------|-----------------|------|-------|------|-------|-------------------|-------|-------|
| | | | | | | fog | rain | sleet | snow | gloom | smoke | night | glare |
| Datasets for Perception | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TJ4DRadSet [30] | 2022 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 7.8K | | | | | | | ✓ | |
| K-Radar [17] | 2022 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 35K | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| aiMotive [19] | 2023 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 26.5K | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Dual Radar [13] | 2023 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 50K | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| L-Radset [31] | 2024 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 11.2K | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Bosch Street [32] | 2024 | OD | 3D box | RT | 1.3M | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| CMD [33] | 2024 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 10K | | | | | | | ✓ | |
| MAN TruckScenes [34] | 2024 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | RT | 30K | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| VOD-Fog [35] | 2024 | OD,T | 3D box,track ID | SIM | 8.7K | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| V2X-Radar [36] | 2024 | OD | 3D box | RT | 20K | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| V2X-R [37] | 2024 | OD | 3D box | SIM | 37.7K | ✓ | | | ✓ | | | | |
| ZJU-Multispectrum [38] | 2024 | DE | - | RT | 21.5K | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| OmniHD-Scenes [39] | 2024 | OP,OD,T | 3D box,track ID,point | RT | 450K | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| WaterScenes [40] | 2024 | OD,S | 2D box,point | RT | 54K | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| Datasets for SLAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MSC RADAR [41] | 2023 | SLAM | - | RT | 90.8K | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| NTU4DRadLM [42] | 2023 | SLAM | - | RT | 61K | | ✓ | | | ✓ | | ✓ | |
| DIDLm [43] | 2024 | SLAM | - | RT | - | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | |
| MINE4DRAD [44] | 2024 | SLAM | - | RT | - | | | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | |

OD, T, OP, S, and DE denote object detection, tracking, occupancy prediction, segmentation, and depth estimation. RT indicates real-world data, while SIM means simulated data. Gloom includes overcast and cloud scenarios. Low-light indicates the dawn and dusk periods.

To advance truck-specific autonomous perception, MAN TruckScenes [34] provides a comprehensive dataset with a detection range of up to 230 meters. The dataset is collected under diverse weather and lighting conditions, filling a critical gap in tracking for heavy vehicles.

Since collecting real-world data under adverse conditions is challenging, simulation has become a practical alternative. Building on the real-world VoD dataset [23], the work of [35] simulated fog effect in different levels [45] and applied them to LiDAR point clouds, while leaving 4D mmWave radar point clouds unchanged. This extension, known as the VoD-Fog dataset, is designed to facilitate research on 4D mmWave radar and LiDAR fused 3D object detection and tracking in foggy conditions.

Cooperative perception is crucial for extending range and overcoming occlusions compared to single-vehicle perception. However, 4D mmWave radar datasets in the vehicle-to-everything (V2X) domain remain scarce. Therefore, V2X-Radar [36] introduces the first real-world V2X 4D mmWave radar dataset for 3D object detection, covering sunny and rainy scenarios. It includes subsets for cooperative (V2X-Radar-C), roadside (V2X-Radar-I), and single-vehicle perception (V2X-Radar-V). Complementing this, V2X-R [37] is the first simulated V2X dataset featuring 4D mmWave radar, LiDAR, and cameras via CARLA [46]. Through simulation, fog and snow weather are incorporated. With a multi-modal diffusion strategy, V2X-R [37] integrates 4D mmWave radar features to denoise LiDAR data.

Beyond detection and tracking, some 4D mmWave radar datasets tackle diverse multimodal sensing tasks. ZJU-Multispectrum [38] focuses on depth estimation using 4D mmWave radar and thermal camera. It incorporates artificial smoke scenarios to evaluate interference handling. Besides, OmniHD-Scenes [39] targets occupancy prediction alongside detection and tracking, offering over 450K synchronized frames of 4D mmWave radar, camera, and LiDAR data.

The data is collected in sunny, cloudy, and rainy conditions, during both day and night.

In addition to road-based autonomous driving, WaterScenes [40] is the first 4D radar-camera dataset for waterway autonomous navigation. It supports object detection, instance and semantic segmentation, with 2D boxes and pixel-level labels for images, as well as 3D point labels. It covers diverse weather and lighting conditions, pioneering 4D mmWave radar applications in waterway environments.

B. Datasets for SLAM

Due to the robustness under various conditions, 4D mmWave radar is also increasingly being adopted for SLAM applications [41]. Some 4D mmWave radar-based datasets have been specifically designed to support SLAM tasks in challenging environments.

Designed for large-scale SLAM in urban environments, MSC RADAR [41] features 4D mmWave radar with a detection range of up to 400 meters, complemented by odometry sensors such as LiDAR, stereo cameras, RTK-GPS, IMU, and wheel encoders. The dataset includes scenarios of normal and snowy weather, along with artificial smoke environments on the campus.

NTU4DRadLM [42] is a 4D mmWave radar dataset collected by both robotic and vehicular platforms across various conditions, emphasizing structural diversity and scalability. Derived from it, NTU4DPR [47] serves as a benchmark for place recognition with GPS and 4D mmWave radar data. In contrast, DIDLm [43] integrates infrared cameras, depth cameras, LiDAR, and 4D mmWave radar for 3D mapping. It spans indoor and outdoor scenarios, covering weather including sunny, rainy, and snowy.

MINE4DRAD [44] emerges as the first 4D mmWave radar dataset for open-pit mines, focusing on detecting static obstacles for haulage. The 4D radar point clouds are calibrated with LiDAR point clouds and images, covering a

wide range of dusty and smoky mining scenarios, including loading sites, dumping sites, haulage maintenance areas, and commute roads. It offers valuable data for addressing the specific challenges of open-pit mine environments.

The aforementioned 4D mmWave radar datasets address a range of tasks, including perception and SLAM. By encompassing adverse weather conditions and lighting scenarios through both real-world data collection and simulation, these datasets establish a foundation for advancing 4D mmWave radar research in challenging environments.

III. METHOD

Many studies aim to improve the overall performance across multiple adverse conditions, while some only target specific weather due to the different characteristics of different conditions. For instance, rain and snow significantly affect 4D mmWave radar performance due to attenuation and backscatter [48], whereas fog and smoke have relatively minimal impact [49]. Based on real-world and simulated datasets, 4D mmWave radar methods have been developed to address challenges in adverse environments, as shown in Fig. 3. While single-modal approaches focus on preprocessing and backbone enhancement, multimodal methods fuse modalities at the data, features, or decision level [50]. Tasks like auto-labeling and knowledge transfer further leverage one modality’s strengths and apply them to another. In this section, we provide a comprehensive analysis of existing research, categorizing by their focus on different adverse environments.

A. Overall Adverse Environments

Some studies designed generalized strategies to improve robustness across multiple adverse environments. These methods are normally evaluated on datasets with diverse adverse environments, such as the K-Radar dataset [17].

RadarOcc [51] is the first study on 3D occupancy prediction using 4D mmWave radar under severe conditions. It encodes Doppler bins and selects the Top- N elements for each range to convert 4D radar tensors into a sparse format. Spherical coordinates are later transformed into Cartesian coordinates using deformable attention in the backbone. Compared to 4D tensors, point clouds are more computationally efficient. When generating point clouds from 4D tensors, noise from adverse environments can be filtered out during preprocessing. A two-level point cloud generation method is introduced in [52] to reduce the data density. Through CA-CFAR [53] and sidelobe filtering, noise from rain, snow, sleet, and fog is removed, as shown in Fig. 3(a). Further hyperparameter tuning is conducted to refine the point cloud generation in [54].

A CNN-based human detection model is proposed by [55], as in Fig. 3(b). It processes multi-view radar heatmaps, including elevation, azimuth, range, and Doppler velocity dimensions. The data was collected in four challenging environments—an underground mine, a large car wash, an industrial tent, and an outdoor wooded area—where visibility is reduced by dust, water spray, and smoke. Despite

these advancements, the impact of varying environments, including different weather patterns and road types, is often overlooked. Therefore, the domain shifts across different weather and road conditions are examined in [49], especially for snow, rain, and sleet weather.

For multi-modal methods, a 4D radar-LiDAR fused detection framework in [56] enhances 3D object detection by integrating LiDAR’s precise spatial information with 4D mmWave radar’s robustness, as illustrated in Fig. 3(d). With an attention mechanism, each LiDAR voxel is fused with its surrounding 4D radar voxels. The weather-sensitive image features later serve as gating elements to control the fused information flow.

To address the performance degradation of cameras under adverse conditions, DPFT [57] projects radar data onto the front view and BEV planes, and fuses them with camera images. [58] uses a transformer to generate LiDAR-camera BEV features and combine them with 4D radar BEV features for tracking. Besides, detection outputs in [59] are taken as inputs and validate tracking results by inner-modality matching and cross-modality checking, as Fig. 3(e). The unreliable detections are mitigated by the decision level improvement.

However, extracting features from two modalities requires high computational costs. Since distillation is often employed for transition from larger models to smaller ones, a knowledge distillation method is proposed by [60], as shown in Fig. 3(g). A teacher model is trained using the 4D radar-LiDAR fusion method. Then, the weather-insensitive features are distilled into a LiDAR-only student model from different stages.

Besides, recognizing targets on 4D radar tensors such as K-Radar [17] is challenging, making the manual annotation time-consuming. To address this, an auto-labeling method is introduced for all-weather 4D radar tensors [61], as shown in Fig. 3(f). A LiDAR-based detection network is trained by LiDAR point clouds and generates bounding box labels for 4D radar tensors. The autogenerated labels are used to train a 4D radar-based detection network, which achieves comparable performance as those with manual labels in normal and adverse weather. Notably, performance improves when the model is trained on a wider variety of weather conditions.

B. Rain and Snow

Waterdrops and moisture can absorb radar signals, while the reflected signals from water droplets also create clutter [62]. Therefore, precipitation, such as rain and snow, can severely degrade radar performance [63]. To address this problem, some research specifically focuses on improving 4D mmWave radar performance in rainy and snowy conditions.

TransLoc4D [47] is the first end-to-end 4D mmWave radar place recognition framework. It employs ego-velocity regression and RANSAC filtering [64] to remove noisy and dynamic points. A linear Transformer integrates local features with the global context, as in Fig. 3(b). It demonstrates that radar intensity is highly sensitive to rainfall, and




Fig. 3: Overview of 4D mmWave radar algorithms in adverse environments. (a) illustrates data preprocessing and denoising approaches. (b) shows methods for 4D mmWave radar backbone enhancement. (c), (d), and (e) include data-, feature-, and decision-level fusion strategies, respectively. Auto-labeling (f) and knowledge distillation (g) are special multi-modality tasks. However, the fusion strategy is not their main focus.

leveraging global context can enhance performance under rainy and nighttime scenarios.

Unlike real-world scenarios, a simulated 4D radar-camera tracking framework is introduced by [65] using SUMO [66] and CARLA [46] for the highway roadside scenarios. It incorporates various rain conditions and demonstrates that the 4D radar-camera fusion method outperforms camera-only approaches during rainy night. Another multi-modal training strategy is proposed by [67], combining real-world 4D mmWave radar and LiDAR data with simulated disturbances. Snow is modeled as adding points, losing points, and information shift [68] on Astyx LiDAR data [22]. Incorporating simulated snow can mitigate performance degradation. Similar effectiveness is demonstrated for fog on the VoD dataset [23].

Compared to single-agent perception, cooperative perception enhances environment understanding by sharing observations among vehicles and infrastructure [69]. However, multi-agent systems can amplify environmental noise during communication. To address this, [37] proposes a 4D radar-LiDAR fusion detection method for simulated V2X scenarios. Since LiDAR point clouds are degraded by snow and fog, 4D radar features are used to guide a diffusion process

to denoise LiDAR data as in Fig. 3(c). The method is also tested on real-world datasets, showing better improvement in snow and rain weather.

C. Fog and Smoke

Fog and smoke cause minimal Rayleigh scattering on millimeter waves due to the large size disparity between their particles and wavelength [70]. Therefore, their impact on 4D mmWave radar is less pronounced compared to rain and snow.

The perception of LiDAR and camera degrades in fog, while 4D mmWave radar remains relatively unaffected. Thus, some methods simulate fog on real-world LiDAR or camera data and fuse it with 4D mmWave radar data to increase robustness. L4DR [35] simulates different levels of fog on the VoD dataset [23]. It addresses disparities between LiDAR and 4D mmWave radar point clouds through bidirectional data-level fusion (Fig. 3(c)) and extracts features via intra- and inter-modal backbones (Fig. 3(d)). The foggy noise is effectively filtered out during multi-stage fusion. Similarly, TL-4DR [71] implements a two-stage fusion of 4D mmWave radar and camera data on the VoD-Fog dataset [35]. 4D radar point clouds are first projected onto camera coordinates. Later, voxels and pixels are correlated

through frustum association and cross-attention mechanisms. It demonstrates superior robustness in foggy weather.

Smoke conditions are simulated by deleting LiDAR scans in certain sequences in [72]. When LiDAR degradation is detected through radar-LiDAR overlap, static radar points will be used. Otherwise, static LiDAR points are as input for odometry and dynamic point identification. Experiments show that 4D radar-LiDAR fusion achieves better odometry performance, while LiDAR-only methods suffer severe drift in dense smoke.

For depth estimation, traditional visible spectrum or near-infrared LiDAR often encounters issues such as noise and occlusion. RIDERS [38] tackles these challenges by integrating 4D mmWave radar with infrared thermal camera data in challenging smoke-laden scenarios. The monocular depth predictions are aligned with radar points using a global scaling factor, then a transformer-based network is employed to estimate confidence in radar-pixel associations.

IV. DISCUSSION

4D mmWave radar has shown significant potential in autonomous driving due to its robustness. However, research specifically addressing adverse environments remains insufficient. Additionally, the adoption of 4D mmWave radar in real-world applications faces limitations due to its inherent challenges. In this section, we discuss the key challenges in current research and analyze potential directions for the future development of 4D mmWave radar.

Noise and sparsity handling: Although 4D mmWave radar demonstrates better robustness compared to other sensors in challenging conditions, adverse weather still inevitably diminishes its performance. Noise introduced by adverse environments can be further amplified by factors such as antenna design, power constraints, and multi-path effects [35]. Due to the movement of objects, the long-tail problem can occur by the accumulation of multi-frame 4D mmWave radar data [73]. To address the noise challenges, more effective denoising and preprocessing methods are required.

Moreover, the inherent sparsity of 4D mmWave radar data leads to numerous empty voxels or pillars during feature extraction [74]. Therefore, approaches such as data completion, multi-modal fusion, multi-view fusion, and multi-format integration (e.g., ADC data, tensors, point clouds) should be further improved to increase the information density.

Dataset simulation: Collecting data in adverse conditions is challenging, making simulation methods increasingly valuable due to the configurable environments settings. Some methods simulated the entire scenes, while others augment real-world datasets with simulated weather effects, such as water droplets or spray [35]. Another strategy is to generate 4D mmWave radar data from 3D radar data by adding height information from other modalities [75].

New tasks: 4D mmWave radar holds significant potential for various new tasks. Research on 4D mmWave radar has expanded to both single-agent and multi-agent systems. The long detection range and robustness ensure stable and

reliable communication among road users in V2X scenarios [36], [37]. Another advantage of 4D mmWave radar over LiDAR and camera is its capability to measure velocity using Doppler effects. The velocity measurement enables 4D mmWave radar to excel in motion-centric tasks such as moving object segmentation [76], velocity prediction [77], and scene-flow estimation [78] in adverse environments. By leveraging velocity in a single frame, 4D mmWave radar supports more motion-related tasks while reducing computational costs and enhancing real-time performance.

New scenes: 4D mmWave radar is also being applied to a variety of new scenes, such as aquatic settings, indoor spaces, and human-centric scenarios. When mounted on robots, 4D mmWave radar effectively extends robots' long-range perception. In intelligent construction, airborne dust poses a major challenge to conventional sensors. 4D mmWave radar can serve as an excellent complement in construction site monitoring, environmental understanding, and worker health monitoring [79]. Moreover, 4D mmWave radar is well-suited for some specialized industrial applications, such as mining environments with heavy dust and smoke. It can be utilized for perception in tasks including loading, trail monitoring, dumping, and maintenance, contributing to improving the mining automation [80].

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we provide the first comprehensive survey of 4D mmWave radar under adverse environments for autonomous driving. The advantages of 4D mmWave radar over other sensors under challenging conditions are first highlighted. Then, we summarize the 4D mmWave radar datasets, which cover a wide range of adverse weather and illumination scenarios. Based on the open-source datasets, current 4D mmWave radar technologies are analyzed, focusing on their strategies for handling adverse environments. Finally, we discussed the challenges faced by 4D mmWave radar in adverse environments and proposed potential directions for future development. We hope this work provides a valuable resource and inspires further advancements in 4D mmWave radar research in adverse environments.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research has been conducted as part of the DELPHI project, which is funded by the European Union, under grant agreement No 101104263. Views and opinions expressed are those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Climate, Infrastructure and Environment Executive Agency (CINEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Chen, P. Wu, K. Chitta, B. Jaeger, A. Geiger, and H. Li, "End-to-end autonomous driving: Challenges and frontiers," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [2] K. Bucsuházy, E. Matuchová, R. Zůvala, P. Moravcová, M. Kostíková, and R. Mikulec, "Human factors contributing to the road traffic accident occurrence," *Transportation research procedia*, vol. 45, pp. 555–561, 2020.

- [3] J. Guo, U. Kurup, and M. Shah, "Is it safe to drive? an overview of factors, metrics, and datasets for driveability assessment in autonomous driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 8, pp. 3135–3151, 2019.
- [4] Y. Qi, C. Liu, M. Scaioni, Y. Li, Y. Qiao, X. Ma, H. Wu, K. Zhang, and D. Wang, "Geometric information constraint 3d object detection from lidar point cloud for autonomous vehicles under adverse weather," *Transportation research part C: emerging technologies*, vol. 161, p. 104555, 2024.
- [5] P. Mondal, "Are road accidents affected by rainfall? a case study from a large indian metropolitan city," *Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 16–26, 2011.
- [6] Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), "Road weather management: Snow and ice," https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/weather/weather-events/snow_ice.htm, 2021, accessed: 2021-12-23.
- [7] A. Mehra, M. Mandal, P. Narang, and V. Chamola, "Reviewnet: A fast and resource optimized network for enabling safe autonomous driving in hazy weather conditions," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 22, no. 7, pp. 4256–4266, 2021.
- [8] Y. Ma, J. Mei, X. Yang, L. Wen, W. Xu, J. Zhang, X. Zuo, B. Shi, and Y. Liu, "Licrocc: Teach radar for accurate semantic occupancy prediction using lidar and camera," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024.
- [9] Y. Zhang, A. Carballo, H. Yang, and K. Takeda, "Perception and sensing for autonomous vehicles under adverse weather conditions: A survey," *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, vol. 196, pp. 146–177, 2023.
- [10] M. Dreißig, D. Scheuble, F. Piewak, and J. Boedecker, "Survey on lidar perception in adverse weather conditions," in *2023 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [11] P. Jiang, X. Deng, W. Wu, L. Lin, X. Chen, C. Chen, and S. Wan, "Weather-aware collaborative perception with uncertainty reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2024.
- [12] H. Zhao, J. Zhang, Z. Chen, S. Zhao, and D. Tao, "Unimix: Towards domain adaptive and generalizable lidar semantic segmentation in adverse weather," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 14 781–14 791.
- [13] X. Zhang, L. Wang, J. Chen, C. Fang, L. Yang, Z. Song, G. Yang, Y. Wang, X. Zhang, Q. Yang, and J. Li, "Dual radar: A multi-modal dataset with dual 4d radar for autonomous driving," *arXiv:2310.07602*, 2023.
- [14] A. Srivastav and S. Mandal, "Radars for autonomous driving: A review of deep learning methods and challenges," *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [15] H. Kong, C. Huang, J. Yu, and X. Shen, "A survey of mmwave radar-based sensing in autonomous vehicles, smart homes and industry," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, 2024.
- [16] L. Fan, J. Wang, Y. Chang, Y. Li, Y. Wang, and D. Cao, "4d mmwave radar for autonomous driving perception: a comprehensive survey," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2024.
- [17] D.-H. Paek, S.-H. Kong, and K. T. Wijaya, "K-radar: 4d radar object detection for autonomous driving in various weather conditions," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 3819–3829, 2022.
- [18] Y. Chae, H. Kim, and K.-J. Yoon, "Towards robust 3d object detection with lidar and 4d radar fusion in various weather conditions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 15 162–15 172.
- [19] T. Matuszka, I. Barton, Á. Butykai, P. Hajas, D. Kiss, D. Kovács, S. Kunsági-Máté, P. Lengyel, G. Németh, L. Pető *et al.*, "aimotive dataset: A multimodal dataset for robust autonomous driving with long-range perception," *arXiv:2211.09445*, 2022.
- [20] Z. Han, J. Wang, Z. Xu, S. Yang, L. He, S. Xu, J. Wang, and K. Li, "4d millimeter-wave radar in autonomous driving: A survey," *arXiv:2306.04242*, 2023.
- [21] J. Liu, G. Ding, Y. Xia, J. Sun, T. Huang, L. Xie, and B. Zhu, "Which framework is suitable for online 3d multi-object tracking for autonomous driving with automotive 4d imaging radar?" in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1258–1265.
- [22] M. Meyer and G. Kuschik, "Automotive radar dataset for deep learning based 3d object detection," in *2019 16th European Radar Conference (EuRAD)*, 2019, pp. 129–132.
- [23] A. Palffy, E. Pool, S. Baratam, J. F. P. Kooij, and D. M. Gavrila, "Multi-class road user detection with 3+1d radar in the view-of-delft dataset," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 4961–4968, 2022.
- [24] J. Rebut, A. Ouaknine, W. Malik, and P. Pérez, "Raw high-definition radar for multi-task learning," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2022, pp. 17 021–17 030.
- [25] R. Xu, Z. Xiang, J. Zhao, R. Dang, and Z. Wu, "Zjuodset: a long range 3d object detection dataset with 4d radar," in *7th International Conference on Vision, Image and Signal Processing (ICVISP 2023)*, vol. 2023, 2023, pp. 101–105.
- [26] I. Roldan, A. Palffy, J. F. P. Kooij, D. M. Gavrila, F. Fioranelli, and A. Yarovoy, "A deep automotive radar detector using the radelft dataset," *IEEE Transactions on Radar Systems*, vol. 2, pp. 1062–1075, 2024.
- [27] X. Li, H. Zhang, and W. Chen, "4d radar-based pose graph slam with ego-velocity pre-integration factor," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 5124–5131, 2023.
- [28] A. Kramer, K. Harlow, C. Williams, and C. Heckman, "Coloradar: The direct 3d millimeter wave radar dataset," *The International Journal of Robotics Research*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 351–360, 2022.
- [29] H. Chen, Y. Liu, and Y. Cheng, "Drio: Robust radar-inertial odometry in dynamic environments," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 5918–5925, 2023.
- [30] L. Zheng, Z. Ma, X. Zhu, B. Tan, S. Li, K. Long, W. Sun, S. Chen, L. Zhang, M. Wan, L. Huang, and J. Bai, "Tj4dradset: A 4d radar dataset for autonomous driving," in *2022 IEEE 25th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2022, pp. 493–498.
- [31] J. Li, Y. Wang, L. Yang, J. Lin, G. Kang, Z. Shi, Y. Chen, Y. Jin, and K. Akiyama, "L-radset: A long-range multimodal dataset with 4d radar for autonomous driving and its application," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, pp. 1–16, 2024.
- [32] K. Armanious, M. Quach, M. Ulrich, T. Winterling, J. Friesen, S. Braun, D. Jenet, Y. Feldman, E. Kosman, P. Rapp *et al.*, "Bosch street dataset: A multi-modal dataset with imaging radar for automated driving," *arXiv:2407.12803*, 2024.
- [33] J. Deng, W. Ye, H. Wu, X. Huang, Q. Xia, X. Li, J. Fang, W. Li, C. Wen, and C. Wang, "Cmd: A cross mechanism domain adaptation dataset for 3d object detection," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2025, pp. 219–236.
- [34] F. Fent, F. Kuttnerreich, F. Ruch, F. Rizwin, S. Juergens, L. Lechermann, C. Nissler, A. Perl, U. Voll, M. Yan *et al.*, "Man truckscenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous trucking in diverse conditions," *arXiv:2407.07462*, 2024.
- [35] X. Huang, Z. Xu, H. Wu, J. Wang, Q. Xia, Y. Xia, J. Li, K. Gao, C. Wen, and C. Wang, "L4dr: Lidar-4dradar fusion for weather-robust 3d object detection," *arXiv:2408.03677*, 2024.
- [36] L. Yang, X. Zhang, J. Li, C. Wang, Z. Song, T. Zhao, Z. Song, L. Wang, M. Zhou, Y. Shen *et al.*, "V2x-radar: A multi-modal dataset with 4d radar for cooperative perception," *arXiv:2411.10962*, 2024.
- [37] X. Huang, J. Wang, Q. Xia, S. Chen, B. Yang, C. Wang, and C. Wen, "V2x-r: Cooperative lidar-4d radar fusion for 3d object detection with denoising diffusion," *arXiv:2411.08402*, 2024.
- [38] H. Li, Y. Ma, Y. Huang, Y. Gu, W. Xu, Y. Liu, and X. Zuo, "Riders: Radar-infrared depth estimation for robust sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 18 764–18 778, 2024.
- [39] L. Zheng, L. Yang, Q. Lin, W. Ai, M. Liu, S. Lu, J. Liu, H. Ren, J. Mo, X. Bai *et al.*, "Omnihd-scenes: A next-generation multimodal dataset for autonomous driving," *arXiv:2412.10734*, 2024.
- [40] S. Yao, R. Guan, Z. Wu, Y. Ni, Z. Huang, R. W. Liu, Y. Yue, W. Ding, E. G. Lim, H. Seo, K. L. Man, J. Ma, X. Zhu, and Y. Yue, "Waterscenes: A multi-task 4d radar-camera fusion dataset and benchmarks for autonomous driving on water surfaces," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 16 584–16 598, 2024.
- [41] M. Choi, S. Yang, S. Han, Y. Lee, M. Lee, K. H. Choi, and K.-S. Kim, "Msc-rad4r: Ros-based automotive dataset with 4d radar," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 7194–7201, 2023.
- [42] J. Zhang, H. Zhuge, Y. Liu, G. Peng, Z. Wu, H. Zhang, Q. Lyu, H. Li, C. Zhao, D. Kircali, S. Mharolkar, X. Yang, S. Yi, Y. Wang, and D. Wang, "Ntu4dradlm: 4d radar-centric multi-modal dataset for localization and mapping," in *2023 IEEE 26th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2023, pp. 4291–4296.
- [43] W. Gong, C. He, K. Su, and Q. Li, "Didlm: A comprehensive multi-sensor dataset with infrared cameras, depth cameras, lidar, and

- 4d millimeter-wave radar in challenging scenarios for 3d mapping,” *arXiv:2404.09622*, 2024.
- [44] J. Yang, T. Gui, Y. Tong, Y. Zhang, Q. Huang, and G. Zhao, “Autonomous mining transportation systems: Integrating 4d mmwave radar for enhanced detection of obstructed static objects,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, pp. 1–12, 2024.
- [45] M. Hahner, C. Sakaridis, D. Dai, and L. Van Gool, “Fog simulation on real lidar point clouds for 3d object detection in adverse weather,” in *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, 2021, pp. 15 263–15 272.
- [46] A. Dosovitskiy, G. Ros, F. Codevilla, A. Lopez, and V. Koltun, “Carla: An open urban driving simulator,” in *Conference on robot learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 1–16.
- [47] G. Peng, H. Li, Y. Zhao, J. Zhang, Z. Wu, P. Zheng, and D. Wang, “Transloc4d: Transformer-based 4d radar place recognition,” in *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024, pp. 17 595–17 605.
- [48] S. Zang, M. Ding, D. Smith, P. Tyler, T. Rakotoarivelo, and M. A. Kaafar, “The impact of adverse weather conditions on autonomous vehicles: How rain, snow, fog, and hail affect the performance of a self-driving car,” *IEEE Vehicular Technology Magazine*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 103–111, 2019.
- [49] M. Zhang, S. Abdulatif, B. Loesch, M. Altmann, M. Schwarz, and B. Yang, “Exploring domain shift on radar-based 3d object detection amidst diverse environmental conditions,” *arXiv:2408.06772*, 2024.
- [50] L. Zheng, S. Li, B. Tan, L. Yang, S. Chen, L. Huang, J. Bai, X. Zhu, and Z. Ma, “Refusion: Fusing 4-d radar and camera with bird’s-eye view features for 3-d object detection,” *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 72, pp. 1–14, 2023.
- [51] F. Ding, X. Wen, Y. Zhu, Y. Li, and C. X. Lu, “Radarocc: Robust 3d occupancy prediction with 4d imaging radar,” *arXiv:2405.14014*, 2024.
- [52] S.-H. Kong, D.-H. Paek, and S. Lee, “Rtnh+: Enhanced 4d radar object detection network using two-level preprocessing and vertical encoding,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [53] P. P. Gandhi and S. A. Kassam, “Analysis of cfar processors in nonhomogeneous background,” *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic systems*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 427–445, 1988.
- [54] D.-H. Paek, S.-H. Kong, and K. T. Wijaya, “Enhanced k-radar: Optimal density reduction to improve detection performance and accessibility of 4d radar tensor-based object detection,” in *2023 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [55] M. Skog, O. Kotlyar, V. Kubelka, and M. Magnusson, “Human detection from 4d radar data in low-visibility field conditions,” *arXiv:2404.05307*, 2024.
- [56] Y. Chae, H. Kim, and K.-J. Yoon, “Towards robust 3d object detection with lidar and 4d radar fusion in various weather conditions,” in *2024 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024, pp. 15 162–15 172.
- [57] F. Fent, A. Palffy, and H. Caesar, “Dpft: Dual perspective fusion transformer for camera-radar-based object detection,” *arXiv:2404.03015*, 2024.
- [58] C. Zhang, H. Wang, L. Chen, Y. Li, and Y. Cai, “Mixedfusion: An efficient multimodal data fusion framework for 3-d object detection and tracking,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pp. 1–15, 2023.
- [59] S.-Y. Kuan, J.-H. Cheng, H.-W. Huang, W. Chai, C.-Y. Yang, H. Latapie, G. Liu, B.-F. Wu, and J.-N. Hwang, “Boosting online 3d multi-object tracking through camera-radar cross check,” in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 2125–2132.
- [60] Y. Chae, H. Kim, C. Oh, M. Kim, and K.-J. Yoon, “Lidar-based all-weather 3d object detection via prompting and distilling 4d radar,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2025, pp. 368–385.
- [61] M.-H. Sun, D.-H. Paek, S.-H. Song, and S.-H. Kong, “Efficient 4d radar data auto-labeling method using lidar-based object detection network,” in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2024, pp. 2616–2621.
- [62] E. O. Appiah and S. Mensah, “Object detection in adverse weather condition for autonomous vehicles,” *Multimedia Tools and Applications*, vol. 83, no. 9, pp. 28 235–28 261, 2024.
- [63] R. Gourouva, O. Krasnov, and A. Yarovoy, “Analysis of rain clutter detections in commercial 77 ghz automotive radar,” in *2017 European Radar Conference (EURAD)*, 2017, pp. 25–28.
- [64] K. G. Derpanis, “Overview of the ransac algorithm,” *Image Rochester NY*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 2–3, 2010.
- [65] H. Liu, J. Wan, P. Zhou, S. Ding, and W. Huang, “Augmented millimeter wave radar and vision fusion simulator for roadside perception,” *Electronics*, vol. 13, no. 14, p. 2729, 2024.
- [66] P. A. Lopez, M. Behrisch, L. Bieker-Walz, J. Erdmann, Y.-P. Flötteröd, R. Hilbrich, L. Lücken, J. Rummel, P. Wagner, and E. Wießner, “Microscopic traffic simulation using sumo,” in *2018 21st international conference on intelligent transportation systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 2575–2582.
- [67] F. Berens, Y. Koschinski, M. K. Badami, M. Geimer, S. Elser, and M. Reischl, “Adaptive training for robust object detection in autonomous driving environments,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, pp. 1–15, 2024.
- [68] M. Hahner, C. Sakaridis, M. Bijelic, F. Heide, F. Yu, D. Dai, and L. Van Gool, “Lidar snowfall simulation for robust 3d object detection,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2022, pp. 16 364–16 374.
- [69] E. Y. Bejarbaneh, H. Du, and F. Naghdly, “Exploring shared perception and control in cooperative vehicle-intersection systems: A review,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2024.
- [70] F. Berens, Y. Koschinski, M. K. Badami, M. Geimer, S. Elser, and M. Reischl, “Adaptive training for robust object detection in autonomous driving environments,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2024.
- [71] H. Zhang, K. Wu, R. Chen, Z. Wu, Y. Zhong, and W. Li, “Tl-4drfc: A two-level 4-d radar-camera fusion method for object detection in adverse weather,” *IEEE Sensors Journal*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 16 408–16 418, 2024.
- [72] C. Noh and A. Kim, “Adaptive lidar-radar fusion for outdoor odometry across dense smoke conditions,” *arXiv:2403.17441*, 2024.
- [73] Z. Guo, Z. Yagudin, S. Asfaw, A. Lykov, and D. Tsetsserukou, “Fadet: A multi-sensor 3d object detection network based on local featured attention,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11682*, 2024.
- [74] X. Peng, M. Tang, H. Sun, K. Bierzynski, L. Servadei, and R. Wille, “Mufasa: Multi-view fusion and adaptation network with spatial awareness for radar object detection,” in *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks*. Springer, 2024, pp. 168–184.
- [75] Z. Meng, Y. Song, Y. Zhang, Y. Nan, and Z. Bai, “Traffic object detection for autonomous driving fusing lidar and pseudo 4d-radar under bird’s-eye-view,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 18 185–18 195, 2024.
- [76] Z. Pan, F. Ding, H. Zhong, and C. X. Lu, “Ratrack: moving object detection and tracking with 4d radar point cloud,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 4480–4487.
- [77] S. Yang, M. Choi, S. Han, K.-H. Choi, and K.-S. Kim, “4d radar-camera sensor fusion for robust vehicle pose estimation in foggy environments,” *IEEE Access*, 2023.
- [78] F. Ding, A. Palffy, D. M. Gavrila, and C. X. Lu, “Hidden gems: 4d radar scene flow learning using cross-modal supervision,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 9340–9349.
- [79] S. Han, J. Zhang, Z. S. Shaikh, J. Wang, and W. Ren, “Four-dimensional (4d) millimeter wave-based sensing and its potential applications in digital construction: A review,” *Buildings*, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 1454, 2023.
- [80] J. Yang, T. Gui, Y. Zhang, S. Ge, Q. Huang, and G. Zhao, “Enhancement technology for perception in smart mining vehicles: 4d millimeter-wave radar and multi-sensor fusion,” *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 9, no. 6, pp. 5009–5013, 2024.