A Concise Survey on Lane Topology Reasoning for HD Mapping

Yi Yao[1,†], Miao Fan[2,†,*], Shengtong Xu[3], Haoyi Xiong[4], Xiangzeng Liu[5], Wenbo Hu[6], and Wenbing Huang[7]

Abstract— Lane topology reasoning techniques play a crucial role in high-definition (HD) mapping and autonomous driving applications. While recent years have witnessed significant advances in this field, there has been limited effort to consolidate these works into a comprehensive overview. This survey systematically reviews the evolution and current state of lane topology reasoning methods, categorizing them into three major paradigms: procedural modeling-based methods, aerial imagery-based methods, and onboard sensors-based methods. We analyze the progression from early rule-based approaches to modern learning-based solutions utilizing transformers, graph neural networks (GNNs), and other deep learning architectures. The paper examines standardized evaluation metrics, including road-level measures (APLS and TLTS score), and lane-level metrics (DET and TOP score), along with performance comparisons on benchmark datasets such as OpenLane-V2. We identify key technical challenges, including dataset availability and model efficiency, and outline promising directions for future research. This comprehensive review provides researchers and practitioners with insights into the theoretical frameworks, practical implementations, and emerging trends in lane topology reasoning for HD mapping applications.

Index Terms— Topology reasoning, high-definition maps, road network, deep learning, procedural modeling, aerial imagery, onboard sensors.

I. INTRODUCTION

High-definition (HD) maps are fundamental for autonomous driving, providing detailed representations of road networks, lane configurations, and traffic elements [1], [2], [3]. Among the various aspects of HD mapping, lane topology reasoning - the understanding of how different lanes connect and relate to each other (see Fig. 3) - is particularly crucial for safe and efficient autonomous navigation [4]. This field has evolved significantly over the past two decades, progressing from simple rule-based approaches to sophisticated deep-learning methods.

The development of lane topology reasoning methods can be broadly categorized into three major paradigms. Early approaches relied on procedural modeling techniques, utilizing computer graphics and rule-based systems to generate road networks. While foundational, these methods were limited by their reliance on manually designed rules and lack of flexibility. The advent of aerial imagery-based methods marked

[1] Senior engineer at NavInfo Co., Ltd., China.
[2] Chief scientist at NavInfo Co., Ltd., China. Senior member of IEEE.
[3] Principal product manager at Autohome Inc., China.
[4] Principal scientist at Baidu Inc., China. Senior member of IEEE.
[5] Associate professor at Xidian University of Technology, China.
[6] Associate professor at Hefei University of Technology, China.
[7] Associate professor at Renmin University of China.
†Equal contribution.
*Correspondence: miao.fan@ieee.org.

Fig. 1. Illustration of lane topology reasoning for high-definition (HD) mapping, adapted from OpenLane-V2 [5]. This example demonstrates the transformation from multi-perspective onboard camera images to a comprehensive bird's-eye view (BEV) lane topology representation.

a significant shift, introducing computer vision techniques to extract road topology from overhead views. However, these approaches often struggled with occlusions caused by buildings and trees, and could only extract coarse, road-level networks. In recent years, we have witnessed the emergence of onboard sensors-based methods (see Fig. 1), which represent the current state-of-the-art in lane topology reasoning field. These approaches leverage deep learning architectures, typically consisting of several key components: a backbone network for feature extraction (such as ResNet [6] or Swin Transformer [7]), perspective transformation for bird's-eye view conversion, lane centerline detection, and topology reasoning modules. Modern methods often incorporate multiple input modalities, including cameras, LiDAR, and existing SD maps [8], to enhance performance. The introduction of transformer-based architectures and graph neural networks (GNNs) has further advanced the field, enabling more sophisticated topology reasoning capabilities.

Existing surveys [1], [2], [4] have detailed HD map creation and lane topology construction, but they lack a systematic presentation of the latest research. This survey provides a comprehensive review of lane topology reasoning methods, analyzing their evolution, capabilities, and limitations. We examine different evaluation metrics used in the field, including road-level and lane-level metrics, and compare the performance of various approaches on standard benchmarks. Furthermore, we discuss current challenges and identify promising directions for future research, aiming to provide researchers and practitioners with valuable insights into this rapidly evolving field.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II details the three major paradigms; Section III discusses common datasets, evaluation metrics, and performance comparisons; Section IV identifies challenges and future directions; and Section V concludes.

2025

Driving Scene Understanding with Traffic Scene-Assisted Topology Graph Transformer
(Rong et al.)

Roadpainter: Points are ideal navigators for topology transformer
(Ma et al.)

Enhancing 3D Lane Detection and Topology Reasoning with 2D Lane Priors
(Li et al.)

Lane graph as path: Continuity-preserving path-wise modeling for online lane graph construction
(Liao et al.)

Maptrv2: An end-to-end framework for online vectorized hd map construction
(Liao et al.)

SemVecNet: Generalizable Vector Map Generation for Arbitrary Sensor Configurations
(Ranganatha et al.)

LaneGraph2Seq: Lane Topology Extraction with Language Model via Vertex-Edge Encoding and Connectivity Enhancement
(Peng et al.)

TopoLogic: An Interpretable Pipeline for Lane Topology Reasoning on Driving Scenes
(Fu et al.)

LaneSegNet: Map Learning with Lane Segment Perception for Autonomous Driving
(Li et al.)

TopoMLP: A Simple yet Strong Pipeline for Driving Topology Reasoning
(Wu et al.)

Augmenting lane perception and topology understanding with standard definition navigation maps
(Luo et al.)

2024

Graph-based topology reasoning for driving scenes
(Li et al.)

Translating Images to Road Network: A Non-Autoregressive Sequence-to-Sequence Approach
(Lu et al.)

Centerlinedet: Centerline graph detection for road lanes with vehicle-mounted sensors by transformer for hd map generation
(Xu et al.)

2023

Semantic segmentation and edge detection—Approach to road detection in very high resolution satellite images
(Ghandorh et al.)

csboundary: City-scale road-boundary detection in aerial images for high-definition maps
(Xu et al.)

Topology preserving local road network estimation from single onboard camera image
(Can et al.)

2022

Hdmapgen: A hierarchical graph generative model of high definition maps
(Mi et al.)

Structured bird's-eye-view traffic scene understanding from onboard images
(Can et al.)

icurb: Imitation learning-based detection of road curbs using aerial images for autonomous driving
(Xu et al.)

Topo-boundary: A benchmark dataset on topological road-boundary detection using aerial images for autonomous driving
(Xu et al.)

2021

City-scale road extraction from satellite imagery v2: Road speeds and travel times
(Etten et al.)

Vecroad: Point-based iterative graph exploration for road graphs extraction
(Tan et al.)

Sat2graph: Road graph extraction through graph-tensor encoding
(He et al.)

2020

Improved road connectivity by joint learning of orientation and segmentation
(Batra et al.)

Topological map extraction from overhead images
(Li et al.)

Road detection and centerline extraction via deep recurrent convolutional neural network U-Net
(Yang et al.)

Neural turtle graphics for modeling city road layouts
(Chu et al.)

2019

Matching adversarial networks
(Máttyus et al.)

Beyond the pixel-wise loss for topology-aware delineation
(Mosinska et al.)

Roadtracer: Automatic extraction of road networks from aerial images
(Bastani et al.)

2018

RoadNet: Learning to comprehensively analyze road networks in complex urban scenes from high-resolution remotely sensed images
(Liu et al.)

Automatic road detection and centerline extraction via cascaded end-to-end convolutional neural network
(Cheng et al.)

Deeproadmapper: Extracting road topology from aerial images
(Máttyus et al.)

2017

Computational network design from functional specifications
(Peng et al.)

Example-driven procedural urban roads
(Nishida et al.)

Crowd-driven mid-scale layout design
(Feng et al.)

A new approach to urban road extraction using high-resolution aerial image
(Wang et al.)

2016

Worldbrush: interactive example-based synthesis of procedural virtual worlds
(Emilien et al.)

Road networks as collections of minimum cost paths
(Wegner et al.)

2015

Procedural modelling of urban road networks
(Beneš et al.)

Designing large-scale interactive traffic animations for urban modeling
(Garcia-Dorado et al.)

2014

2013

Procedural interpolation of historical city maps
(Krecklau et al.)

2012

Authoring hierarchical road networks
(Galin et al.)

2011

Procedural generation of roads
(Galin et al.)

2010

Interactive design of urban spaces using geometrical and behavioral modeling
(Vanegas et al.)

2009

Sketch-based path design
(McCrae et al.)

Interactive procedural street modeling
(Chen et al.)

Interactive example-based urban layout synthesis
(Aliaga et al.)

2008

Expeditious Modelling of Virtual Urban Environments with Geospatial L-systems
(Coelho et al.)

2007

A sketching interface for procedural city generation
(Villiers et al.)

Procedural modeling of urban land use
(Lechner et al.)

2006

2005

Image-based template generation of road networks for virtual maps
(Sun et al.)

2004

Real-time procedural generation of'pseudo infinite'cities
(Greuter et al.)

Procedural city modeling
(Lechner et al.)

2003

Template-based generation of road networks for virtual city modeling
(Sun et al.)

2002

Procedural modeling of cities
*(Parish et al.)*

2001

Fig. 2. The evolution of lane topology reasoning research from 2001 to 2024, illustrating the field's methodological progression and technological transitions. The timeline tracks three distinct approaches: procedural modeling-based methods (blue arrows), aerial imagery-based methods (green arrows), and onboard sensors-based methods (orange arrows). The distribution of arrows reveals the field's transformation from early procedural modeling techniques to modern vision-based approaches, with a notable acceleration in research activity post-2020. This visualization highlights the parallel development of different methodologies and the increasing focus on onboard sensors-based solutions in recent years.

Fig. 3.   Schematic diagram of lane topology at an intersection.

II. REVIEW ON METHODOLOGY

This section reviews representative lane topology reasoning methods published through 2024. As illustrated in Fig. 2, these methods are categorized into three groups based on their developmental paradigms. Procedural modeling dominated before 2017, and aerial imagery-based approaches gained prominence from 2017 to 2022. Since 2023, onboard sensors-based solutions have become increasingly prevalent.

A. Procedural Modeling-Based Methods

Early explorations in lane topology reasoning predominantly employed computer modeling techniques to simulate urban road networks, and the high ability to amplify data is the main merit. The workflow of these methods is depicted in Fig. 4. After inputting 2D image maps of the city (e.g., geographical maps and statistical maps), these approaches generated virtual urban maps that incorporated buildings, road networks, and other urban features. Interactive parameter tuning enabled users to refine the outcomes according to specific requirements.

Parish et al. [9] presented pioneering work by applying the L-system to generate urban road networks, this concept was further extended in subsequent studies [10]. [11], [12], [13] summarized some basic templates to generate road networks by overlaying different templates. Meanwhile, Chen et al. [14] introduced tensor field representations to model road geometries. Later advancements incorporated additional constraints and functionalities. Terrain-aware approaches [15], [16], [17] ensured geographical consistency, while intelligent simulation techniques [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23] enhanced the realism of traffic modeling. Furthermore, sketch-based methods [24], [25] enabled intuitive user interactions, and example-driven approaches [26], [27], [28] leveraged pre-existing data to expedite road network generation. Traffic-related factors, such as road occupancy, travel time, and emission impacts, were explicitly addressed in [29].

B. Aerial Imagery-Based Methods

While procedural modeling-based methods were foundational in this field, these methods still had limited controllability and relied heavily on artificially designed rules. In addition, evaluating the influence of these rules and parameters on the final output is inherently challenging, requiring extensive iterative experimentation to achieve satisfactory results. Consequently, these methods lack flexibility. In contrast, the advent of deep learning has revolutionized HD mapping by enabling the direct extraction of road topology from aerial imagery. Leveraging neural networks, these approaches minimize manual intervention and streamline the mapping process. The general workflow of these methods is illustrated in Fig. 5.

Several methods [30], [31], [32], [33], [34], [35], [36], [37], [38], [39], [40] leverage semantic segmentation networks to identify road areas in aerial imagery, followed by morphological post-processing to extract road topology. Alternative approaches involve iterative graph construction [41], [42], [43], [44], [45], [46] and graph growth [47], [48] methods. Iterative graph construction methods are initiated by identifying several vertices from the road network and progressively expanding the graph by iteratively adding new vertices and edges based on predefined decision functions. In contrast, graph generation methods are more direct. These approaches employ the vector field encoding strategy, wherein aerial imagery is first encoded into latent representations. Neural networks are subsequently used to predict graph vertices, followed by decoding processes predicting the adjacency matrix and reconstructing the road network.

C. Onboard Sensors-Based Methods

Even though aerial imagery-based methods have introduced novel approaches to this field, they are limited to extracting coarse, road-level networks. Furthermore, occlusions caused by buildings and trees often render road areas incomplete in aerial imagery, affecting the accuracy of results. Therefore, these methods are unsuitable for the automatic construction of HD maps or action planning of autonomous vehicles. To address these limitations, onboard sensors-based methods have emerged, utilizing unimodal or multimodal data captured from vehicle-mounted sensors to construct detailed lane topology around the ego-vehicle. These methods represent a significant shift in HD mapping, offering enhanced accuracy and applicability. A typical pipeline for onboard sensors-based methods is illustrated in Fig. 6, including the backbone, perspective transformation, lane decoder, and topology decoder. The backbone is usually composed of feature extraction networks such as ResNet [6] and Swin Transformer [7]. Perspective transformation then converts these features into a bird's-eye view (BEV) format. After obtaining the BEV features, a lane centerline decoder is usually designed using the transformer-based architecture to output the lane centerline features based on the information requirements. In this part, a set of learned query vectors is generally used for mapping different centerline instances. The function of the topology decoder is to establish a

Fig. 4. The pipeline of procedural modeling-based methods.

Fig. 5. The pipeline of aerial imagery-based methods.

connection between these lane centerline instances, normally using GNNs, MLPs, and language models. In addition to onboard camera images, some approaches augment input features with supplementary data sources, including SD maps [49], [50], [51], LiDAR point clouds [52], [53], [54], and traffic elements (e.g., traffic lights and traffic boards) [55], [56], [57], [58], thereby improving performance.

Can et al. [59] proposed one of the first works, using a single image from a front-facing camera as input and employing a transformer-based architecture, which is similar to DETR [60], to predict centerline instances. This method employs additional MLPs to output the connectivity of centerline instances. Likewise, these methods [61], [57], [58], [50], [62] also use a set of MLPs to predict the topology relationship. Expanding upon [59], Can et al. [63] introduced the concept of the minimal ring and coverage accurately estimates lane connectivity in intersection areas. LaneGAP [64] further refined topology estimation by employing the Path2Graph algorithm to recover the topology relationships. HDMapGen [65] autoregressively generates lane topology using only graph-based models. Some solutions [52], [51], [55], [56], [54] first detect lane centerlines and map each lane centerline to a vertex, then update the lane topology using a

graph-based model. Additionally, methods such as [66], [67] serialize lane centerline features and use language models to establish topology relationships.

D. Other Methods

Although this survey focuses on the three method types described above, other notable approaches exist. For example, Jia et al. [62] generated lane topology from lane lines and road boundaries in existing HD maps, and He et al. [68] and Stanojevic et al. [69] extracted lane topology from GPS trajectories. While valuable, these methods fall outside the scope of this review.

III. DATASETS AND BENCHMARKS

In this section, we list datasets that are commonly employed in the methods discussed above. Additionally, we examine different evaluation metrics used in the field and compare the performance of various approaches on benchmark datasets. Due to space constraints, the selection is not exhaustive.

A. Datasets

Relevant datasets can be categorized into 2D datasets and 3D datasets. These datasets, summarized in Table I, play a

Fig. 6. The pipeline of onboard sensors-based methods. Although some methods used multimodal input data, almost all contained images from onboard cameras. Therefore, for simplicity, the input data presented in the figure contains only onboard camera images.

critical role in advancing road topology extraction and lane topology reasoning by offering diverse and high-quality data tailored to specific research needs.

1) 2D Datasets: To extract road topology from aerial images, several 2D datasets have been utilized, including SpaceNet [70], DeepGlobe [71] and Topo-boundary [42]. SpaceNet is a large-scale dataset containing annotations for building footprints and road networks, widely used in urban topology extraction tasks. DeepGlobe focused on rural areas with diverse land cover types, this dataset offers high-density road network annotations, making it suitable for tasks requiring detailed mapping in non-urban environments. Topo-boundary is specifically designed for offline topological road-boundary detection, enabling the development of methods targeting precise boundary delineation. In addition, procedural modeling-based methods often utilize 2D image maps generated by plotting or scanning statistical and geographical maps of cities.

2) 3D Datasets: nuScenes [72], Argoverse2 [73] and OpenLane-V2 [5] are significant datasets to be utilized in onboard sensors-based methods. Both nuScenes and Argoverse2 are composed of data from high-resolution onboard sensors, including cameras and LiDAR. OpenLane-V2 is the unique 3D dataset specifically designed for lane topology reasoning tasks, and it is divided into two subsets: subset_A and subset_B, which are derived from Argoverse2 and nuScenes, respectively. These subsets ensure comprehensive coverage of scenarios relevant to lane topology reasoning.

B. Evaluation Metrics

Three pixel-level metrics (*Precision*, *Recall*, and *F1* score) [42] and two topology-level metrics (*APLS* score and *TLTS* score) [48] are commonly used road-level measures in aerial imagery-based methods. Additionally, lane-level metrics, such as perception metrics (DET_l score) and reasoning

metrics (TOP_{ll} score) [5] with a wide range of applications for topology between lane centerlines in onboard sensors-based methods. Consistent evaluation metrics for procedural modeling-based methods are lacking, so we do not discuss them here.

Pixel-level metrics are defined as follows:

$$Precision = \frac{|\{p|d(p,Q) < \tau, \forall p \in P\}|}{|P|} \quad (1)$$

$$Recall = \frac{|\{q|d(q,P) < \tau, \forall q \in Q\}|}{|Q|} \quad (2)$$

$$F1\ Score = \frac{2 \times Precision \times Recall}{Precision + Recall} \quad (3)$$

where $P = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^{N_p}$ and $Q = \{q_j\}_{j=1}^{N_q}$ represent foreground pixels and ground-truth road-boundary graph in the rasterized prediction results, respectively. $|\cdot|$ indicated the number of all elements within the set. $d(e,S)$ denoted as the shortest Euclidean distance between element e and a set S. Relax ratio is τ, which reflects the level of error tolerance, generally setting to 2.0, 5.0, and 10.0.

The *APLS* score is defined as follows:

$$APLS = 1 - min\left(1, \frac{|l(g_1,g_2) - l(p_1,p_2)|}{l(g_1,g_2)}\right) \quad (4)$$

where g_1 and g_2 represent two vertices randomly selected in the ground-truth graph, calculate the shortest path between these two vertices, denoted as $l(g_1,g_2)$. In the same way, $l(p_1,p_2)$ represents the shortest path between two vertices p_1 and p_2 randomly selected in the predicted graph. The final *APLS* score is the average of the *APLS* of all selected vertex pairs.

The *TLTS* score indicates the proportion of vertex pairs that are not *too long or too short* among all vertex pairs.

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF CURRENT RELEVANT DATASETS.

Dataset	Type	Area (km^2)	Length (km)	RGB Images	Resolution	Region	Year
SpaceNet [70]	2D	5555	8676.6	24k	650×650	Worldwide	2018
DeepGlobe [71]	2D	2220	-	8k	650×650	Worldwide	2018
Topo-boundary [42]	2D	-	-	25k	1000×1000	USA	2021
nuScenes [72]	3D	-	242	1.4M	1600×900	Worldwide	2020
Argoverse2 [73]	3D	-	2220	-	$2048 \times 1550, 1550 \times 2048$	USA	2023
OpenLane-V2 [5]	3D	-	-	466k	$1600 \times 900, 2048 \times 1550, 1550 \times 2048$	Worldwide	2024

TABLE II
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF STATE-OF-THE-ART AERIAL IMAGERY-BASED METHODS ON TOPO-BOUNDARY [42] DATASET.

Method	Precision			Recall			F1 Score			APLS	TLTS
	2.0	5.0	10.0	2.0	5.0	10.0	2.0	5.0	10.0		
OrientationRefine [34]	0.517	0.816	0.868	0.352	0.551	0.589	0.408	0.637	0.678	0.235	0.219
Enhanced-iCurb [42]	0.412	0.695	0.785	0.412	0.671	0.749	0.410	0.678	0.760	0.299	0.279
Sat2Graph [47]	0.460	0.484	0.604	0.128	0.240	0.293	0.159	0.304	0.374	0.037	0.030
csBoundary [48]	0.309	0.659	0.830	0.291	0.600	0.738	0.297	0.652	0.772	0.376	0.343

For all the metrics, larger values indicate better performance.

TABLE III
PERFORMANCE COMPARISON OF STATE-OF-THE-ART ONBOARD SENSORS-BASED METHODS ON OPENLANE-V2 [5] DATASET.

Method	Subset_A		Subset_B	
	DET_l	TOP_{ll}	DET_l	TOP_{ll}
TopoNet [55]	28.5	4.1	24.3	2.5
TopoMLP [57]	28.3	7.2	26.6	7.6
TSTGT [56]	29.0	12.1	27.5	13.7
SMERF [49]	33.4	7.5	-	-
LaneSegNet [61]	31.8	7.6	-	-
TopoLogic [51]	34.4	23.4	25.9	15.1
Topo2D [58]	29.1	22.3	-	-
RoadPainter [50]	36.9	12.7	28.7	8.5

For all the metrics, larger values indicate better performance. Among all the methods, the feature extraction network adopted ResNet-50 [6], and the model is trained for 24 epochs.

Specifically, an error tolerance threshold ϕ is defined (default value is 0.05), and the vertex pair is considered *too long or too short* if they satisfy the following conditions:

$$|l(g_1, g_2) - l(p_1, p_2)| > l(g_1, g_2) \cdot \phi \qquad (5)$$

The DET_l score is defined as follows:

$$DET_l = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{t \in T} AP_t \qquad (6)$$

where match thresholds $T = \{1.0, 2.0, 3.0\}$, which is based on the Fréchet distance [74]. The final DET_l score is the mean of DET_l of all three match thresholds.

Finally, the TOP_{ll} score is:

$$TOP_{ll} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} \frac{\sum_{\hat{n}' \in \hat{N}'(v)} P(\hat{n}') \mathbf{1}(\hat{n}' \in N(v))}{|N(v)|} \qquad (7)$$

where $N(v)$ is a list in which every element is a neighbor of vertex v, ordered by confidence. $P(v)$ is the precision of i-th vertex v in the list $N(v)$.

C. Comparison Results

Table II shows the quantitative results of the three types (segmentation-based, iterative graph construction, and graph growth) of aerial imagery-based methods on Topo-boundary [42] dataset, and the quantitative results for onboard sensors-based methods on OpenLane-V2 [5] dataset are presented in Table III.

IV. CHALLENGES

Despite the significant progress achieved in lane topology reasoning for HD mapping, several challenges remain to be addressed: (1) The construction of datasets dedicated to lane topology reasoning is hindered by high production costs, limiting the availability of large-scale, high-quality datasets. This scarcity restricts the diversity and generalizability of models trained for this task. More research efforts are required to develop accessible and robust datasets tailored to lane topology reasoning. (2) Although onboard sensors-based methods represent the state of the art, they typically involve models with substantial parameter sizes. This limits their direct deployment on autonomous vehicles or edge devices, which have stringent computational and energy constraints. Thus, it is crucial to develop lightweight models capable of real-time HD map construction. (3) Roadside and onboard camera data fusion for lane topology reasoning remain underexplored. Unlike onboard cameras, roadside sensors (e.g., road video surveillance) offer a complementary perspective for HD mapping, mitigating the problem of occlusion by surrounding vehicles and improving accuracy. However, limited literature exists on this line of research, signaling a need for further investigation.

V. Conclusions

Lane topology reasoning techniques have emerged as a critical component in HD mapping and autonomous driving applications, experiencing rapid evolution from early stages of procedural modeling to modern onboard sensors-based approaches. This survey has presented a comprehensive analysis of this progression, highlighting the significant advances achieved while identifying remaining challenges and opportunities for future research. Contemporary techniques have demonstrated superior performance in capturing complex lane topologies. The integration of various data sources - including camera imagery, LiDAR point clouds, and existing SD maps - has further enhanced the robustness and accuracy of these systems. However, several critical challenges persist. The limited availability of large-scale, high-quality datasets continues to constrain model development and validation. Additionally, the computational demands of current architectures pose challenges for real-time applications in resource-constrained environments. For future research in the field, a promising direction is to create lane topology by adopting roadside infrastructure-assisted vehicle perception techniques.

VI. Acknowledgements

References

[1] Z. Bao, S. Hossain, H. Lang, and X. Lin, "A review of high-definition map creation methods for autonomous driving," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 122, p. 106125, 2023.

[2] L. Chen, Y. Li, C. Huang, B. Li, Y. Xing, D. Tian, L. Li, Z. Hu, X. Na, Z. Li, *et al.*, "Milestones in autonomous driving and intelligent vehicles: Survey of surveys," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1046–1056, 2022.

[3] M. Fan, Y. Yao, J. Zhang, X. Song, and D. Wu, "Neural hd map generation from multiple vectorized tiles locally produced by autonomous vehicles," in *Spatial Data and Intelligence: 5th China Conference, SpatialDI 2024, Nanjing, China, April 25–27, 2024, Proceedings*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2024, p. 307–318.

[4] G. Elghazaly, R. Frank, S. Harvey, and S. Safko, "High-definition maps: Comprehensive survey, challenges and future perspectives," *IEEE Open Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2023.

[5] H. Wang, T. Li, Y. Li, L. Chen, C. Sima, Z. Liu, B. Wang, P. Jia, Y. Wang, S. Jiang, *et al.*, "Openlane-v2: A topology reasoning benchmark for unified 3d hd mapping," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.

[6] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.

[7] Z. Liu, Y. Lin, Y. Cao, H. Hu, Y. Wei, Z. Zhang, S. Lin, and B. Guo, "Swin transformer: Hierarchical vision transformer using shifted windows," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021, pp. 10012–10022.

[8] M. Fan, J. Huang, and H. Wang, "Dumapper: Towards automatic verification of large-scale pois with street views at baidu maps," in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, ser. CIKM '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 3063–3071.

[9] Y. I. Parish and P. Müller, "Procedural modeling of cities," in *Proceedings of the 28th annual conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques*, 2001, pp. 301–308.

[10] A. Coelho, M. Bessa, A. A. Sousa, and F. N. Ferreira, "Expeditious modelling of virtual urban environments with geospatial l-systems," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 26, no. 4. Wiley Online Library, 2007, pp. 769–782.

[11] J. Sun, X. Yu, G. Baciu, and M. Green, "Template-based generation of road networks for virtual city modeling," in *Proceedings of the ACM symposium on Virtual reality software and technology*, 2002, pp. 33–40.

[12] S. Greuter, J. Parker, N. Stewart, and G. Leach, "Real-time procedural generation ofpseudo infinite'cities," in *Proceedings of the 1st international conference on Computer graphics and interactive techniques in Australasia and South East Asia*, 2003, pp. 87–ff.

[13] J. Sun, G. Baciu, X. Yu, and M. Green, "Image-based template generation of road networks for virtual maps," *International Journal of Image and Graphics*, vol. 4, no. 04, pp. 701–720, 2004.

[14] G. Chen, G. Esch, P. Wonka, P. Müller, and E. Zhang, "Interactive procedural street modeling," in *ACM SIGGRAPH 2008 papers*, 2008, pp. 1–10.

[15] E. Galin, A. Peytavie, N. Maréchal, and E. Guérin, "Procedural generation of roads," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 29, no. 2. Wiley Online Library, 2010, pp. 429–438.

[16] J. Beneš, A. Wilkie, and J. Křivánek, "Procedural modelling of urban road networks," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 33, no. 6. Wiley Online Library, 2014, pp. 132–142.

[17] E. Galin, A. Peytavie, E. Guérin, and B. Beneš, "Authoring hierarchical road networks," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 30, no. 7. Wiley Online Library, 2011, pp. 2021–2030.

[18] L. Krecklau, C. Manthei, and L. Kobbelt, "Procedural interpolation of historical city maps," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 31, no. 2pt3. Wiley Online Library, 2012, pp. 691–700.

[19] T. Lechner, B. Watson, U. Wilensky, and M. Felsen, "Procedural city modeling," in *1st Midwestern Graphics Conference*, vol. 4, 2003, pp. 1–6.

[20] T. Lechner, P. Ren, B. Watson, C. Brozefski, and U. Wilenski, "Procedural modeling of urban land use," in *ACM SIGGRAPH 2006 Research posters*, 2006, pp. 135–es.

[21] T. Feng, L.-F. Yu, S.-K. Yeung, K. Yin, and K. Zhou, "Crowd-driven mid-scale layout design." *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 132–1, 2016.

[22] C.-H. Peng, Y.-L. Yang, F. Bao, D. Fink, D.-M. Yan, P. Wonka, and N. J. Mitra, "Computational network design from functional specifications," *ACM Transactions on Graphics (TOG)*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 1–12, 2016.

[23] C. A. Vanegas, D. G. Aliaga, B. Benes, and P. A. Waddell, "Interactive design of urban spaces using geometrical and behavioral modeling," *ACM transactions on graphics (TOG)*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1–10, 2009.

[24] M. de Villiers and N. Naicker, "A sketching interface for procedural city generation," University of Cape Town, Tech. Rep., 2006.

[25] J. P. McCrae and K. Singh, *Sketch-based path design*. University of Toronto, 2008.

[26] D. G. Aliaga, C. A. Vanegas, and B. Benes, "Interactive example-based urban layout synthesis," *ACM transactions on graphics (TOG)*, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 1–10, 2008.

[27] A. Emilien, U. Vimont, M.-P. Cani, P. Poulin, and B. Benes, "Worldbrush: interactive example-based synthesis of procedural virtual worlds." *ACM Trans. Graph.*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 106–1, 2015.

[28] G. Nishida, I. Garcia-Dorado, and D. G. Aliaga, "Example-driven procedural urban roads," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 35, no. 6. Wiley Online Library, 2016, pp. 5–17.

[29] I. Garcia-Dorado, D. G. Aliaga, and S. V. Ukkusuri, "Designing large-scale interactive traffic animations for urban modeling," in *Computer Graphics Forum*, vol. 33, no. 2. Wiley Online Library, 2014, pp. 411–420.

[30] G. Máttyus, W. Luo, and R. Urtasun, "Deeproadmapper: Extracting road topology from aerial images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2017, pp. 3438–3446.

[31] G. Cheng, Y. Wang, S. Xu, H. Wang, S. Xiang, and C. Pan, "Automatic road detection and centerline extraction via cascaded end-to-end convolutional neural network," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 3322–3337, 2017.

[32] A. Mosinska, P. Marquez-Neila, M. Koziński, and P. Fua, "Beyond the pixel-wise loss for topology-aware delineation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 3136–3145.

[33] G. Máttyus and R. Urtasun, "Matching adversarial networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018, pp. 8024–8032.

[34] A. Batra, S. Singh, G. Pang, S. Basu, C. Jawahar, and M. Paluri, "Improved road connectivity by joint learning of orientation and segmentation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019, pp. 10385–10393.

[35] H. Ghandorh, W. Boulila, S. Masood, A. Koubaa, F. Ahmed, and J. Ahmad, "Semantic segmentation and edge detection—approach to road detection in very high resolution satellite images," *Remote Sensing*, vol. 14, no. 3, p. 613, 2022.

[36] J. D. Wegner, J. A. Montoya-Zegarra, and K. Schindler, "Road networks as collections of minimum cost paths," *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, vol. 108, pp. 128–137, 2015.

[37] A. V. Etten, "City-scale road extraction from satellite imagery v2: Road speeds and travel times," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, 2020, pp. 1786–1795.

[38] X. Yang, X. Li, Y. Ye, R. Y. Lau, X. Zhang, and X. Huang, "Road detection and centerline extraction via deep recurrent convolutional neural network u-net," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 57, no. 9, pp. 7209–7220, 2019.

[39] J. Wang, Q. Qin, Z. Gao, J. Zhao, and X. Ye, "A new approach to urban road extraction using high-resolution aerial image," *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, vol. 5, no. 7, p. 114, 2016.

[40] Y. Liu, J. Yao, X. Lu, M. Xia, X. Wang, and Y. Liu, "Roadnet: Learning to comprehensively analyze road networks in complex urban scenes from high-resolution remotely sensed images," *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 2043–2056, 2018.

[41] F. Bastani, S. He, S. Abbar, M. Alizadeh, H. Balakrishnan, S. Chawla, S. Madden, and D. DeWitt, "Roadtracer: Automatic extraction of road networks from aerial images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018, pp. 4720–4728.

[42] Z. Xu, Y. Sun, and M. Liu, "Topo-boundary: A benchmark dataset on topological road-boundary detection using aerial images for autonomous driving," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 7248–7255, 2021.

[43] H. Chu, D. Li, D. Acuna, A. Kar, M. Shugrina, X. Wei, M.-Y. Liu, A. Torralba, and S. Fidler, "Neural turtle graphics for modeling city road layouts," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 4522–4530.

[44] Z. Li, J. D. Wegner, and A. Lucchi, "Topological map extraction from overhead images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019, pp. 1715–1724.

[45] Y.-Q. Tan, S.-H. Gao, X.-Y. Li, M.-M. Cheng, and B. Ren, "Vecroad: Point-based iterative graph exploration for road graphs extraction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 8910–8918.

[46] Z. Xu, Y. Sun, and M. Liu, "icurb: Imitation learning-based detection of road curbs using aerial images for autonomous driving," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 1097–1104, 2021.

[47] S. He, F. Bastani, S. Jagwani, M. Alizadeh, H. Balakrishnan, S. Chawla, M. M. Elshrif, S. Madden, and M. A. Sadeghi, "Sat2graph: Road graph extraction through graph-tensor encoding," in *Computer Vision–ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXIV 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 51–67.

[48] Z. Xu, Y. Liu, L. Gan, X. Hu, Y. Sun, M. Liu, and L. Wang, "csboundary: City-scale road-boundary detection in aerial images for high-definition maps," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 5063–5070, 2022.

[49] K. Z. Luo, X. Weng, Y. Wang, S. Wu, J. Li, K. Q. Weinberger, Y. Wang, and M. Pavone, "Augmenting lane perception and topology understanding with standard definition navigation maps," in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 4029–4035.

[50] Z. Ma, S. Liang, Y. Wen, W. Lu, and G. Wan, "Roadpainter: Points are ideal navigators for topology transformer," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 179–195.

[51] Y. Fu, W. Liao, X. Liu, Y. Ma, F. Dai, Y. Zhang, *et al.*, "Topologic: An interpretable pipeline for lane topology reasoning on driving scenes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14747*, 2024.

[52] Z. Xu, Y. Liu, Y. Sun, M. Liu, and L. Wang, "Centerlinedet: Centerline graph detection for road lanes with vehicle-mounted sensors by transformer for hd map generation," in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3553–3559.

[53] N. E. Ranganatha, H. Zhang, S. Venkatramani, J.-Y. Liao, and H. I. Christensen, "Semvecnet: Generalizable vector map generation for arbitrary sensor configurations," in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, 2024, pp. 2820–2827.

[54] B. Liao, S. Chen, Y. Zhang, B. Jiang, Q. Zhang, W. Liu, C. Huang, and X. Wang, "Maptrv2: An end-to-end framework for online vectorized hd map construction," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pp. 1–23, 2024.

[55] T. Li, L. Chen, H. Wang, Y. Li, J. Yang, X. Geng, S. Jiang, Y. Wang, H. Xu, C. Xu, *et al.*, "Graph-based topology reasoning for driving scenes," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05277*, 2023.

[56] F. Rong, W. Peng, M. Lan, Q. Zhang, and L. Zhang, "Driving scene understanding with traffic scene-assisted topology graph transformer," in *ACM Multimedia 2024*, 2024.

[57] D. Wu, J. Chang, F. Jia, Y. Liu, T. Wang, and J. Shen, "Topomlp: An simple yet strong pipeline for driving topology reasoning," *ICLR*, 2024.

[58] H. Li, Z. Huang, Z. Wang, W. Rong, N. Wang, and S. Liu, "Enhancing 3d lane detection and topology reasoning with 2d lane priors," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.03105*, 2024.

[59] Y. B. Can, A. Liniger, D. P. Paudel, and L. Van Gool, "Structured bird's-eye-view traffic scene understanding from onboard images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 15 661–15 670.

[60] N. Carion, F. Massa, G. Synnaeve, N. Usunier, A. Kirillov, and S. Zagoruyko, "End-to-end object detection with transformers," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 213–229.

[61] T. Li, P. Jia, B. Wang, L. Chen, K. Jiang, J. Yan, and H. Li, "Lanesegnet: Map learning with lane segment perception for autonomous driving," in *ICLR*, 2024.

[62] P. Jia, T. Wen, Z. Luo, Z. Fu, J. Liao, H. Chen, K. Jiang, M. Yang, and D. Yang, "Lanedag: Automatic hd map topology generator based on geometry and attention fusion mechanism," in *2024 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 1015–1021.

[63] Y. B. Can, A. Liniger, D. P. Paudel, and L. Van Gool, "Topology preserving local road network estimation from single onboard camera image," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 17 263–17 272.

[64] B. Liao, S. Chen, B. Jiang, T. Cheng, Q. Zhang, W. Liu, C. Huang, and X. Wang, "Lane graph as path: Continuity-preserving path-wise modeling for online lane graph construction," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 334–351.

[65] L. Mi, H. Zhao, C. Nash, X. Jin, J. Gao, C. Sun, C. Schmid, N. Shavit, Y. Chai, and D. Anguelov, "Hdmapgen: A hierarchical graph generative model of high definition maps," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 4227–4236.

[66] J. Lu, R. Peng, X. Cai, H. Xu, H. Li, F. Wen, W. Zhang, and L. Zhang, "Translating images to road network: A non-autoregressive sequence-to-sequence approach," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 23–33.

[67] R. Peng, X. Cai, H. Xu, J. Lu, F. Wen, W. Zhang, and L. Zhang, "Lanegraph2seq: Lane topology extraction with language model via vertex-edge encoding and connectivity enhancement," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 38, no. 5, 2024, pp. 4497–4505.

[68] S. He, F. Bastani, S. Abbar, M. Alizadeh, H. Balakrishnan, S. Chawla, and S. Madden, "Roadrunner: improving the precision of road network inference from gps trajectories," in *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGSPATIAL international conference on advances in geographic information systems*, 2018, pp. 3–12.

[69] R. Stanojevic, S. Abbar, S. Thirumuruganathan, S. Chawla, F. Filali, and A. Aleimat, "Robust road map inference through network alignment of trajectories," in *Proceedings of the 2018 SIAM international conference on data mining*. SIAM, 2018, pp. 135–143.

[70] A. Van Etten, D. Lindenbaum, and T. M. Bacastow, "Spacenet: A remote sensing dataset and challenge series," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.01232*, 2018.

[71] I. Demir, K. Koperski, D. Lindenbaum, G. Pang, J. Huang, S. Basu, F. Hughes, D. Tuia, and R. Raskar, "Deepglobe 2018: A challenge to parse the earth through satellite images," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, 2018, pp. 172–181.

[72] H. Caesar, V. Bankiti, A. H. Lang, S. Vora, V. E. Liong, Q. Xu, A. Krishnan, Y. Pan, G. Baldan, and O. Beijbom, "nuscenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 621–11 631.

[73] B. Wilson, W. Qi, T. Agarwal, J. Lambert, J. Singh, S. Khandelwal, B. Pan, R. Kumar, A. Hartnett, J. K. Pontes, *et al.*, "Argoverse 2: Next generation datasets for self-driving perception and forecasting,"

in *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2).*

[74] T. Eiter and H. Mannila, "Computing discrete fréchet distance," 1994.