

Loc4Plan: Locating Before Planning for Outdoor Vision and Language Navigation

Huilin Tian

School of Computer Science and Engineering,
Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou, China
tianhlin@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Jingke Meng*

School of Computer Science and Engineering,
Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou, China
mengjke@gmail.com

Wei-Shi Zheng

School of Computer Science and Engineering,
Sun Yat-sen University
Key Laboratory of Machine Intelligence and
Advanced Computing, Ministry of Education
Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of
Information Security Technology
Guangzhou, China
wszheng@ieee.org

Yuan-Ming Li

School of Computer Science and Engineering,
Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou, China
liym266@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Junkai Yan

School of Computer Science and Engineering,
Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou, China
yanjk3@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

Yunong Zhang

School of Computer Science and Engineering,
Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou, China
2755412521@qq.com

Abstract

Vision and Language Navigation (VLN) is a challenging task that requires agents to understand instructions and navigate to the destination in a visual environment. One of the key challenges in outdoor VLN is keeping track of which part of the instruction was completed. To alleviate this problem, previous works mainly focus on grounding the natural language to the visual input, but neglecting the crucial role of the agent's spatial position information in the grounding process. In this work, we first explore the substantial effect of spatial position locating on the grounding of outdoor VLN, drawing inspiration from human navigation. In real-world navigation scenarios, before planning a path to the destination, humans typically need to figure out their current location. This observation underscores the pivotal role of spatial localization in the navigation process. In this work, we introduce a novel framework, **Locating before Planning** (Loc4Plan), designed to incorporate spatial perception for action planning in outdoor VLN tasks. The main idea behind Loc4Plan is to perform the spatial localization before planning a decision action based on corresponding guidance, which comprises a block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module and a spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module. Specifically, to help the agent perceive its spatial location in the environment, we propose to learn a position predictor that measures how far the agent is from the next intersection for reflecting its position, which is achieved by the BAL module. After the locating process, we propose the SAP module to incorporate spatial information to ground the corresponding guidance and enhance the precision of action planning. Extensive

experiments on the Touchdown and map2seq datasets show that the proposed Loc4Plan outperforms the SOTA methods.

CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Planning and scheduling**; • **Information systems** → *Multimedia information systems*.

Keywords

Vision and Language Navigation, Spatial Localization, Visual-textual Grounding, Cross-modal Matching

ACM Reference Format:

Huilin Tian, Jingke Meng, Wei-Shi Zheng, Yuan-Ming Li, Junkai Yan, and Yunong Zhang. 2024. Loc4Plan: Locating Before Planning for Outdoor Vision and Language Navigation. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Multimedia (MM '24)*, October 28–November 1, 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3664647.3681518>

1 Introduction

Vision and Language Navigation (VLN) is a challenging task that requires agents to understand natural-language instructions and navigate to the destination in a visual environment. The agent is embodied in the environment and receives complete navigation instructions consisting of multiple sub-instructions to describe how to reach the destination step-by-step. Based on the instructions, the observed surroundings, and the current trajectory, the agent decides its next action. Executing this action changes the position and/or heading of the agent within the environment, and eventually, the agent follows the described route and stops at the desired goal location. Arguably, one of the key challenges in outdoor VLN is keeping track of which part of the instruction was completed. To alleviate this problem, various methods [26, 38, 41] have been proposed. These methods mainly focus on grounding the natural language to the visual input, while neglecting the crucial role of the agent's spatial position information in the grounding process.

In this work, we argue that it is crucial for an agent to first determine its spatial position within the visual environment before

*Corresponding author.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

MM '24, October 28–November 1, 2024, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 979-8-4007-0686-8/24/10

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3664647.3681518>




Figure 1: The illustration of navigation process of our locating before planning approach. During the locating phase, the agent locates its relative spatial position in the current block. In the planning phase, the agent associates the corresponding guidance to follow and makes an action decision to take (i.e., FORWARD).

grounding the appropriate guidance to follow in the outdoor VLN task. Consider a real-world navigation scenario for human, such as when a tourist seeks directions from a native in an unfamiliar area. The native typically begins by ascertaining the tourist’s current spatial position before offering a route to the desired destination. This observation underscores the pivotal role of spatial localization in the navigation process. Unfortunately, previous studies have overlooked the crucial importance of this spatial positioning stage, which significantly affects the agent’s ability to interpret and execute navigation instructions accurately. Although the work [26] encodes some topological information, such as junction-type embedding and heading delta, to enhance agent generalization, it does not extensively explore the crucial role of spatial localization.

Drawing inspiration from human navigation, we first explore the effect of spatial position locating on the textual grounding of the outdoor VLN task. Generally, in human navigation, spatial positioning relies on prior knowledge of the navigated region’s topology. However, outdoor VLN tasks usually require agents to navigate unseen environments, where the comprehensive environmental topology is unavailable during inference. Meanwhile, the visual observation perception of the agent is limited to a local region. To help the agent perceive its spatial location in the environment, we propose to learn a spatial predictor that measures how far the agent is from the next intersection for reflecting its position, which is achieved by a block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module. In our modeling, a "block" is defined as the area between adjacent intersections, as shown in Figure 1. In other words, each block represents a straight street segmented by two adjacent intersections. The BAL

module enables the agent to determine its position at a finer granularity (block-level) rather than an intricate global-level, thereby facilitating the subsequent planning process.

The self-awareness of location ability developed in the BAL is beneficial for textual grounding, thereby facilitating further action planning. Therefore, we introduce the spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module, which incorporates the spatial locating information to associate the corresponding guidance and enhance the precision of action planning. In detail, we first identify the corresponding guidance that the agent needs to follow by associating spatial-aware state representation (obtained in BAL) with provided instructions in a hierarchical manner, ranging from sentence-level to token-level granularity. Specifically, the sentence-level association leverages the broader contextual understanding and richer semantics afforded by sentences. Subsequently, we devise a fine-grained mask derived from this sentence-level alignment to selectively filter out irrelevant information embedded in the token sequence. Compared to relying solely on word-level localization, our hierarchical semantic association provides a comprehensive understanding of the instructions, especially the extensive and intricate ones. Based on this identified corresponding guidance, the agent further incorporates spatial locating information into action decision planning.

Based on the above two modules, we construct a novel learning framework for addressing outdoor VLN tasks, named **Locating before Planning** (Loc4Plan), which enables agents to develop an ability of location-awareness like humans by first identifying the initial spatial localization before deciding where to go. Benefiting from the ahead localization to the agent’s position and comprehensive understanding of the provided instructions, our Loc4Plan achieves the new state-of-the-art for Touchdown and map2seq dataset on seen and unseen scenarios, which outperforms ORAR framework[26] 3.3% and 4.8% of TC in *test unseen* scenario on the Touchdown [4] and map2seq [26] datasets, respectively.

In summary, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

- We introduce a **Locating before Planning** (Loc4Plan) learning framework to address outdoor VLN tasks. Loc4Plan mimics the human navigation process by first determining the current location of the agent before making the next planning decision.
- To seek the location-awareness ability, we introduce the block concept in VLN tasks and propose a block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module to determine the agent’s position within the given block, forming positional modeling.
- We introduce a spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module, which incorporates the spatial locating information to associate the corresponding guidance and enhance the precision of action planning.

2 Related Works

2.1 Vision-and-Language Navigation

The Vision-and-Language Navigation (VLN) task requires the agent to navigate in a 3D simulated environment toward the goal location based on instructions and egocentric observations. Various work has conducted in the indoor VLN task [7, 23, 36, 39], including exploring feature representation [6, 11, 20, 22], modal interaction [1, 9, 30, 33], reinforcement learning [1, 35, 37], scenic map building




Figure 2: The overall framework of our proposed Loc4Plan. The image and text encoder extract features of visual observation and instructions, respectively. Initially, the block-aware spatial locating (BAL) serves to leverage the visual representation and spatial information (i.e. junction-type embedding, heading delta) of trajectory to locate the agent’s position relative to the current block. Then we identify the corresponding guidance that the agent needs to follow by associating spatial-aware state representation with provided instructions in a hierarchical manner, ranging from sentence-level to token-level granularity. Finally, the agent further incorporates spatial locating information into action decision planning.

[5, 8, 19, 27], etc. Compared with indoor VLN, outdoor VLN contains a larger vocabulary and longer navigation instructions [4], posing a greater challenge for agents to make cross-modal alignment between navigation state and long-span instruction. To solve this challenge, Most of prior works [3, 4, 21, 26, 38] directly encode the observation, trajectory, and instructions in an LSTM-based model. The L2STOP [38] method differentiates STOP and other actions to boost the localization of stop action. GA [3] uses gated attention to compute a fused representation of instructions and images to predict actions. ORAR [26] adds junction-type embedding and heading delta to improve agent’s generalization in unseen scenarios. Additionally, many works[2, 16, 41] adopt the Transformer architecture for navigation, where PM-VLN [2] introduces the pre-training of priority map to achieve the temporal sequence alignment.

However, previous studies have overlooked the crucial importance of spatial positioning in navigation which significantly affects the agent’s ability to interpret and execute navigation instructions accurately. In this study, we underscore the importance of initial spatial localization prior to planning decision actions. We introduce a novel framework called Locating before Planning (Loc4Plan) to tackle challenges in outdoor VLN tasks.

2.2 Textual Grounding in VLN

In vision-and-language navigation (VLN) tasks where the agent is provided with instructions detailing the entire navigation route, it

is crucial to ground the linguistic guidance to the relevant segments pertaining to the next action. Consequently, developing effective techniques for textual grounding of step-wise navigation guidance has emerged as a core challenge in VLN research. This challenge is not unique to VLN and represents an important issue that needs to be addressed for other multimodal tasks as well, as explored by various works[15, 17, 18, 28]. To achieve textual grounding, a main line of research [26, 38, 41] employs cross-modal grounding over individual words between the instruction and the environmental scene. And some of works[31, 41] implicitly make multi-modal alignment in an attention-based transformer. Other works [2, 14, 16, 20, 33] focus on improving the representations of vision and language modalities, proposing auxiliary tasks to enhance grounding.

However, we find that relying solely on word-level localization for planning is insufficient, particularly when instructions are extensive. In this work, we align the observation and the instruction in a hierarchical manner, ranging from coarse to fine granularity.

3 Locating Before Planning

3.1 Preliminary

Problem Formulation. Given a natural language instruction, a Vision-and-Language Navigation (VLN) agent is tasked with navigating from the starting position to the destination by following the guidance provided in the instruction. All navigation paths are

instantiated on the directed graph environment $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$ with nodes $v \in V$ and labeled edges $(u, v) \in E$. Each node is associated with a 360° panorama image and each edge is labeled with an angle $\alpha_{u,v}$. At each timestep t , the agent's state $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$ is defined by $s_t = (v_t, \alpha_{(v_{t-1}, v_t)})$, where v_t is the node at timestep t , and $\alpha_{(v_{t-1}, v_t)}$ is the heading angle from previous state's node v_{t-1} to the current state's node v_t . Given the current navigation state s_t , the agent receives the corresponding visual observation from the environment. Based on the instruction information \mathbf{I} and observed visual information \mathbf{x}_t , the agent infers the action a_t from the candidate actions list of $[FORWARD, LEFT, RIGHT, STOP]$, and then executes the chosen action to update the next state s_{t+1} . The agent must produce a sequence of state-action pairs $[(s_1, a_1), (s_2, a_2), \dots, (s_n, a_n)]$, where $a_n = STOP$, to reach the goal location.

Block Definition. We define a "block" as the region within the environment graph bounded by adjacent intersections, where traversal is constrained to a single path without the possibility of intersection crossings. An example of a block is shown in Figure.1.

3.2 Model Overview

Figure 2 provides an overview of our Locating before Planning (Loc4Plan) framework. Inspired by previous work [26], the model adopts a sequence-to-sequence architecture, which takes observational images and navigation instructions as input and outputs a sequence of agent actions. The Loc4Plan framework comprises a block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module and a spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module. Specifically, the BAL module localizes the spatial position on the block level, which enables the agent to be aware of its relative location position within the current block. After this locating process, the SAP module leverages the spatial information (obtained in the BAL module) to identify the corresponding guidance that the agent needs to follow and make the action prediction. Details of our framework are presented below.

3.3 Block-Aware Spatial Locating

In human navigation, the initial stage entails identifying the user's current location before providing a routed path to the desired endpoint, which requires prior knowledge of the navigated region's topology. Drawing inspiration from human navigation, we integrate spatial localization into outdoor VLN tasks. However, navigating in outdoor VLN scenarios presents the challenge of maneuvering through unknown terrains where the complete environmental layout remains undisclosed. To address this, we introduce the block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module tailored for outdoor VLN, which establishes spatial positioning at a block-level granularity. We define blocks using intersections as demarcations, guaranteeing that the space between adjacent intersections pertains to the same block. Through the learning process facilitated by the BAL module, the agent gains an awareness of its current location, indicative of its relative position within the observation field at the block level.

Formally, consistent with the prior work [26], at timestep t on node v_t , we incorporate the action embedding $\bar{\mathbf{a}}_{t-1}$ at timestep $t-1$, visual representation \mathbf{x}_t of current observation, the turning angle of current node g_t^c , and the junction type embedding \mathbf{n}_t into a sequence modeling function to obtain the representation of current state. Besides, we introduce the long-term turning angle g_t^l as a

novel input feature to model the long-range direction information. The state representation of current node can be obtained by:

$$\mathbf{o}_t = \phi_1(\mathbf{o}_{t-1}, \bar{\mathbf{a}}_{t-1}, [\mathbf{x}_t \oplus g_t^c \oplus g_t^l \oplus \mathbf{n}_t]), \quad (1)$$

where ϕ_1 is a feature encoder, \oplus denotes the concatenation operation, \mathbf{o}_{t-1} is the previous state of time step $t-1$, \mathbf{n}_t is the embedding indicating the number of outgoing edges of the node at timestep t , and $g_t^c = \text{Norm}(\alpha_{(v_{t-1}, v_t)})$ is a value in $(-1, 1]$ that encodes the turning angle relative to the previous timestep. The long-term turning angle g_t^l is computed by:

$$g_t^l = \sum_{k=0}^K g_{t-k}^c, \quad (2)$$

indicates the turning angle across consecutive steps, where K denotes the number of steps involved in this calculation. When the special case that $t-k < 0$ occurs, we set $g_{t-k}^c = 0$. The concept of the long-term turning angle is introduced to aggregate turning angles across multiple consecutive steps, recognizing the process of turning left or right typically spans several individual actions.

The obtained node state presentation \mathbf{o}_t has encoded information of previous states and observation visual and topological (e.g. junction-type embedding and heading delta) information of the current timestep. Further, we expect the agent can be aware of the spatial position where they have achieved. To address this, we locate the relative position of the agent with the observation field under the block level. Specifically, we first obtain the spatial-aware state representation of the node v_t by:

$$\mathbf{o}_t^p = \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_b^\top \mathbf{o}_t), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_b \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a linear layer, and \top indicates the transpose operation. We assume that the \mathbf{o}_t^p accumulates relevant information beneficial for spatial localization.

Optimization of BAL. To ensure that spatial perception representation \mathbf{o}_t^p can be aware of the information related to navigation progress within a block, we feed forward \mathbf{o}_t^p to the spatial predictor to predict a navigation process score within current block by:

$$e_t^p = \text{Sigmoid}(\mathbf{W}_p^\top \mathbf{o}_t^p), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_p \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ is a linear layer. $e_t^p \in [0, 1)$ indicates the agent's spatial position relative to the current block, where 0 indicates the start node of the block and 1 indicates the end. Block process score e_t^p is supervised by the MSE loss:

$$L_{BAL} = \sum_t^T (e_t^p - \tilde{e}_t^p)^2, \quad (5)$$

where T is the timestep to complete the entire navigation. And \tilde{e}_t^p is the ground-truth block progress score at timestep t , which is calculated based on the number of nodes within the current block:

$$\tilde{e}_t^p = \frac{N_t^{step}}{N_t^{all}}. \quad (6)$$

where N_t^{step} indicates the number of steps to "forward" to the next intersection node. And N_t^{all} indicates the number of nodes in the current block (excluding the starting node). For example, when the agent is at the position shown in Figure 1, $N_t^{step} = 3$ and $N_t^{all} = 5$.

3.4 Spatial-Aware Action Planning

The self-awareness of location ability developed in the BAL is beneficial for textual grounding, thereby facilitating further action planning. Therefore, we introduce the spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module, which incorporates spatial locating information (i.e., the spatial-aware state representation obtained in the BAL module) to associate the corresponding guidance and enhance the precision of action planning. In detail, we first propose a hierarchical semantic association (HSA) submodule to identify the corresponding guidance that the agent needs to follow by associating spatial-aware state representation with provided instructions in a hierarchical manner, ranging from sentence-level to token-level granularity. We have found that relying solely on word-level localization is inadequate, especially when instructions are intricate and extensive. Consequently, we initially align spatial perception observations with instructions at the sentence level, leveraging the broader contextual understanding and richer semantics afforded by sentences. Subsequently, we devise a fine-grained mask derived from this sentence-level alignment to selectively filter out irrelevant information within the instructions, thereby identifying the corresponding guidance for the current step. Based on this, the agent further incorporates spatial locating information into action decision planning.

Hierarchical Semantic Association. We first identify the corresponding guidance that the agent needs to follow by associating spatial-aware state representation with provided instructions in a hierarchical manner, ranging from coarse to fine granularity.

We start with associating the visual and textual in a sentence level. Specifically, given natural-language instructions $\mathbf{I} = \{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_L\}$ with L words, we use a period delimiter to split the instruction into multiple sentences and obtain the sentence-level embeddings $\mathbf{I}^s = \{\mathbf{s}_0, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{N_s}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_s \times d_i}$ by average pooling the token embedding of each sentence, where N_s is the number of sentences. The sentence-level embedding \mathbf{I}^s is then queried by the spatial-aware state representation \mathbf{o}_t^p to model the sentence-level contextual feature $\hat{\mathbf{I}}^s \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by adopting multi-head cross-attention [34], which can be denoted as follows:

$$\hat{\mathbf{I}}^s = \text{MultiHeadAttention}(\mathbf{o}_t^p, \mathbf{I}^s), \quad (7)$$

where \mathbf{o}_t^p serves as the *query* and \mathbf{I}^s is utilized to calculate the *keys* and *values*. The sentence-level contextual feature contains coarsely-grained guidance relevant to the current state. Then, we utilize the sentence-level contextual feature $\hat{\mathbf{I}}^s$ as long as the sentence features \mathbf{I}^s to calculate the relevance scores between the sentences and the current state in the relevance predictor:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_t^s &= \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_s^\top \hat{\mathbf{I}}^s), \mathbf{r}_t^s = \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{W}_s^\top \mathbf{I}^s), \\ \mathbf{r}_t &= \text{Sigmoid}(\mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{r}_t^s \odot \mathbf{r}_t^s)), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$, $\mathbf{W}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d}$, $\mathbf{W}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i \times d}$, and \odot denotes the Hadamard production. The relevance scores $\mathbf{r}_t = [r_{t,1}, \dots, r_{t,N_s}] \in \mathbb{R}^{N_s}$ represents the possibility of each sentence being attended at timestep t .

Subsequently, we devise a fine-grained mask derived from this coarsely-grained relevance scores, which is utilized to filter out irrelevant information in the token embedding for fine-grained

instruction attention. Specifically, for the i -th sentence, we obtain its corresponding token level mask $\mathbf{m}_{t,i} = [r_{t,i}, \dots, r_{t,i}]$ by repeating the sentence-level relevance score $r_{t,i}$ with L_i^s times, where L_i^s denotes the length of the i -th sentence. Then the complete mask of the instruction can be denoted as $\mathbf{M}_t = [\mathbf{m}_{t,1}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{t,N_s}]$. We utilize the token mask \mathbf{M}_t to filter out the irrelevant information in the instruction by:

$$\mathbf{I}_t^m = \mathbf{I} \odot \mathbf{M}_t, \quad (9)$$

Then the masked instruction \mathbf{I}_t^m is used to obtain the attended instruction feature with the spatial-aware state representation \mathbf{o}_t^p as query:

$$\mathbf{I}_t^{\text{attn}} = \text{MultiHeadAttention}(\mathbf{o}_t^p, \mathbf{I}_t^m). \quad (10)$$

Then we use the $\mathbf{I}_t^{\text{attn}}$ as query to obtain the attended visual feature:

$$\mathbf{x}_t^{\text{attn}} = \text{MultiHeadAttention}(\mathbf{I}_t^{\text{attn}}, \mathbf{x}_t), \quad (11)$$

Action Planning. With the attended visual representation $\mathbf{x}_t^{\text{attn}}$, attended textual representation $\mathbf{I}_t^{\text{attn}}$, state representation \mathbf{o}_t , as long as spatial-aware state representation \mathbf{o}_t^p , we feed-forward the concatenation of these representations to the action decoder $\phi_2(\cdot)$ to obtain the final representation for the action decision:

$$\mathbf{z}_t = \phi_2(\mathbf{z}_{t-1}, [\mathbf{x}_t^{\text{attn}} \oplus \mathbf{I}_t^{\text{attn}} \oplus \mathbf{o}_t \oplus \mathbf{o}_t^p \oplus \bar{\mathbf{t}}]), \quad (12)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{t}}$ is the embedded timestep t . \mathbf{z}_t contains cross-modal information for action planning, which is then integrated with turning angles g_t^a of each action to predict action scores for the next step:

$$\mathbf{c}_t^a = \mathbf{W}_a^\top [\mathbf{z}_t \oplus g_t^a], \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{W}_a \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times 1}$ is a linear layer. We define g_t^a to represent the turning angles obtained if the agent executes action $action \in [FORWARD, LEFT, RIGHT, STOP]$ at timestep t . After the calculation of action scores for all candidate actions, the agent will execute the corresponding action of the maximum score and update the navigation state.

Optimization of SAP. The optimization of SAP comprises the learning of the hierarchical semantic association and the action planning loss. For the hierarchical semantic association, the sentence level relevance score \mathbf{r}_t (Eq. (8)) is learned under the supervision of the sentence-level corresponding labels, which indicates the alignment of the sentences and nodes along the trajectory. Specifically, by referring to the multi-label classification method [32], a binary cross-entropy loss is used to supervise each sentence:

$$L_{HSA} = -\gamma_b \sum_t \sum_i (\tilde{r}_{t,i} \log(r_{t,i}) + (1 - \tilde{r}_{t,i}) \log(1 - r_{t,i})), \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{r}_{t,i}$ is a binary label indicating whether the agent needs to attend to the i -th sentence when navigating to the node v_t . This label is generated from an economy-efficient method of template matching [13, 40]. γ_b is the weight related to the confidence of the corresponding pseudo-label, which is used to control the influence of L_{HSA} on training. More details can be found in Supplementary.

The action planning loss L_{AP} is a regular cross-entropy loss:

$$L_{AP} = - \sum_t \sum_i \tilde{c}_t^{a_i} \log(c_t^{a_i}), \quad (15)$$

Table 1: Comparisons with state-of-the-arts on the Touchdown and map2seq datasets for the seen and unseen scenario. The * indicates that the agent requires extra ground truth path traverses during inference.

Model	Seen								Unseen							
	Touchdown				map2seq				Touchdown				map2seq			
	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test	dev	test		
TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	TC↑	SPD↓	
GA[3, 4]	9.9	21.4	9.7	21.5	8.1	39.1	7.3	40.7	2.5	30.1	1.8	30.2	1.1	45.4	0.5	45.6
RCONCAT[4, 21]	11.1	19.9	9.7	21.7	11.0	38.2	7.3	39.5	3.6	29.1	2.4	29.1	1.5	44.7	0.6	45.6
ARC+L2STOP[38]	19.5	17.1	16.7	18.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VLN Transformer[41]	14.0	21.5	14.9	21.2	18.6	18.6	17.0	19.0	2.3	29.5	3.1	29.6	3.6	-	3.5	-
ORAR[26]	29.9	11.1	29.1	11.7	43.4	7.2	41.7	7.6	15.4	20.0	14.9	20.7	27.6	11.9	30.3	12.7
PM-VLN*[2]	33.0	23.6	33.4	23.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ours	34.5	10.5	32.9	11.5	48.0	7.0	45.3	7.2	20.6	20.0	18.2	19.9	32.8	10.0	35.1	10.5

where $\tilde{c}_t^{a_i}$ denotes the binary ground-truth label indicating whether execute action a_i at time step t , and i indicates the action index of [FORWARD, LEFT, RIGHT, STOP].

3.5 The Overall Training

As mentioned above, our proposed Loc4Plan is optimized with three losses, i.e., L_{AP} , L_{BAL} , and L_{HSA} . The overall loss function can be written as:

$$L = L_{AP} + L_{BAL} + L_{HSA}. \quad (16)$$

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Datasets. We conduct experiments on two popular outdoor VLN datasets, i.e., the Touchdown [4] and the map2seq [25] datasets. The Touchdown dataset [4] is built based on Google Street View in real urban environments of New York City, whose environment graph includes 29,641 panoramas and 61,319 edges. It contains 9,326 paired samples of English instructions and trajectory descriptions, where the samples in train and test sets are mixed in terms of their geographic locations (i.e. seen scenarios). The unseen scenarios are then conducted by [26] that makes geographic separation of the training and testing area. The map2seq dataset [25] was created for the task of navigation instructions generation and introduced in outdoor VLN [26]. It is also constructed in New York environment, containing 7,672 samples with both seen and unseen scenarios.

Evaluation Metrics. Following [2, 4, 16], we adopt Task Completion (TC), Shortest-path Distance (SPD), and Success weighted by Edit Distance (SED) to evaluate the models. Specifically, TC represents the percentage of successful agent navigation. SPD measures the shortest path distance from the node the agent stopped to the goal node within the environment graph. SED represents the task completion weighted by the Levenshtein edit distance between prediction and ground-truth trajectories.

Implementation Details. We use a bidirectional LSTM [10] as the text encoder to extract token-level embedding. A ResNet pretrained on ImageNet [24] is utilized as image encoder to extract visual representation x_t . Following [26, 29, 38], we implement $\phi_1(\cdot)$ and $\phi_2(\cdot)$ as LSTMs [12]. We set the dimension of token embedding $d_t = 512$ and the hidden dimension of model $d = 256$. The dimension of timestep embedding is 32, and the size of action embedding and junction type embedding is 16. For the specific process of generating




Figure 3: Performance comparison with different instruction lengths and trajectory complexity.

sentence-level label $\tilde{r}_{t,i}$ (Eq. (14)) and other training details, please refer to the Supplementary.

4.2 Comparisons with SOTA VLN Methods

In this section, we compare our proposed locating before planning (Loc4Plan) framework with previous state-of-the-art (SOTA) approaches [2–4, 21, 26, 41]. Except for ORAR [26], these methods only report results for the seen scenario on Touchdown. To enable a comprehensive comparison, we evaluate methods with published code, supplementing results on the map2seq dataset and the unseen scenario of Touchdown. The results, as illustrated in Table 1, indicate that our method exhibits superior performance on both Touchdown and map2seq datasets. Remarkably, on the challenging *test unseen* split, our model showcases significant improvements over ORAR [26] by 3.3% on the Touchdown dataset and 4.8% on the map2seq dataset. This demonstrates the effectiveness of our Loc4Plan framework. In the *test seen* split of Touchdown, our Loc4Plan achieves performance comparable to that of PM-VLN, despite PM-VLN relying on additional ground-truth trajectory information for trajectory planning, which is not necessary for our Loc4Plan. Furthermore, our agent significantly enhances the SPD score by 12.3% compared to PM-VLN, underscoring its superior ability to adhere to instructions while navigating accurately.

Furthermore, we investigate the performance of different agents under varying trajectory complexities and instruction lengths, as illustrated in Figure 3. Specifically, we utilize the SED score to evaluate the navigation capabilities of these agents on the test set of the Touchdown dataset. Trajectory complexity is quantified by the number of intersections, while instruction length serves as a proxy for the level of difficulty in comprehension. As depicted, the Loc4Plan agent exhibits significant improvements, particularly

Table 2: Ablation study of overall design on the test set in seen scenario.

ID	Models	Touchdown			map2seq		
		TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑	TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑
1	Baseline	22.6	12.3	22.1	34.6	10.0	33.8
2	With BAL	30.3	11.0	29.6	39.0	8.7	38.4
3	With SAP	29.7	11.5	29.0	39.0	7.5	38.2
4	Full model	32.9	11.5	32.1	45.3	7.2	44.3

Table 3: Ablation studies of detailed design of the block-aware spatial locating on test set in seen scenario..

ID	g_t^l	g_t^c	L_{BAL}	L_{GAL}	Touchdown			map2seq		
					TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑	TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑
1		√	√		30.0	11.7	29.3	41.8	7.0	41.1
2	√			√	30.3	11.6	29.6	42.0	7.3	41.1
3	√	√			30.3	11.6	29.7	41.0	7.8	40.2
4	√	√		√	30.7	11.0	30.1	41.1	7.5	40.2
5	√	√	√		32.9	11.5	32.1	45.3	7.2	44.3

in scenarios involving longer instructions and complex trajectories, demonstrating our ability to handle challenging long-term navigation tasks.

4.3 Ablation Studies

In this section, we conduct detailed ablation experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of each component proposed in our Loc4Plan, including the block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module and spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module.

Effectiveness of the BAL and SAP module. We first investigate the effectiveness of our overall design in Table 2. Row #1 presents the performance derived from our baseline approach. In this configuration, the agent’s state representation relies exclusively on factors such as junction type, current heading angle, and visual cues. Instruction representation is attained through the average pooling of token embeddings. The results presented in Table 2 indicate that both the BAL and SAP modules contribute significantly to performance improvement. Specifically, the results delineated in rows #1 and #2 exhibit a promising enhancement in performance with the integration of the BAL module compared to the baseline. Furthermore, the inclusion of the SAP module, as evidenced in rows #1 and #3, yields notable improvements, enhancing the TC metric by 6.3% and 2.5% on map2seq and Touchdown, respectively.

Investigation of the BAL module. The BAL module is proposed to establish spatial positioning, which indicates its relative position within the observation field at the block level. Here, we investigate the components within the BAL module in Table 3. In addition to incorporating the current turning angle g_t^c , we innovatively introduced the long-term turning angle g_t^l (Eq. (1)) for spatial perception. By separately comparing #1, #2 with the full model (#5), we can find that adding both the current and long-term turning angles results in improvements, validating their effectiveness. By comparing the results without supervision of the block process score (Eq. (4)) (#3) and with supervision (#5), we find that the inclusion of this supervision leads to a significant improvement of 4.3% and 2.6% in the TC metric on the map2seq and Touchdown datasets, respectively.

Table 4: Ablation study of the perception length of long-term turning angle on test set in seen scenario.. The entries marked in gray indicate the default setting.

ID	Value of K	Touchdown			map2seq		
		TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑	TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑
1	1	30.0	11.7	29.3	41.8	7.0	41.1
2	2	29.5	11.8	28.9	42.4	7.1	41.6
3	3	32.9	11.5	32.1	45.3	7.2	44.3
4	4	30.8	11.3	30.2	40.9	7.1	40.1
5	5	31.2	10.8	30.7	42.0	7.2	41.1

Table 5: Ablation study of the spatial information usage in spatial-aware action planning module on test seen scenario.

ID	Model	Touchdown			map2seq		
		TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑	TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑
1	W/o spatial info	32.4	11.4	31.7	42.3	7.3	41.4
2	Full model	32.9	11.5	32.1	45.3	7.2	44.3

Table 6: Ablation studies of the submodules of the hierarchical semantic association on test set in seen scenario.

ID	Token	Sentence	L_{HSA}	Touchdown			map2seq		
				TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑	TC↑	SPD↓	SED↑
1	√			30.4	11.6	29.6	42.1	7.6	41.3
2		√	√	28.7	12.2	27.5	41.4	7.5	40.6
3	√	√		31.6	11.1	30.9	44.4	7.2	43.6
4	√	√	√	32.9	11.5	32.1	45.3	7.2	44.3

Notably, in row #4, we replace the L_{BAL} with the global-level locating loss L_{GAL} , which leverages global position signals to guide the spatial locating learning process. Our findings indicate the superiority of the block-level locating, given the agent’s visual observation perception constrained within a localized region. To further investigate the effectiveness of perception length of long-term turning angle for the BAL module, we conducted experiments by varying the value of K (Eq. (2)) in our model, which are presented in Table 4. Specifically, $K = 0$ implies that the model only utilizes the turning angle of the current node, while increasing values of K expand the model’s perception range of turning angles. The result shows that the agent achieves optimal performance when $K = 3$. This phenomenon indicates that a proper perception length of long-term turning angle is mandatory to achieve better performance.

Investigation of the SAP module. To investigate the impact of spatial information obtained from the BAL module on the action planning stage, we first show the results without using spatial information in the SAP module in table 5. Specifically, "W/o spatial info" means using the state representation \mathbf{o}_t to replace the spatial-aware feature \mathbf{o}_t^p . Clearly, with the absence of spatial locating information, the agent’s performance decreases on both datasets.

Moreover, to investigate the impact of the components involved in hierarchical semantic association, we conducted a series of ablation experiments, with the results presented in Table 6. Specifically, the label "token" and "sentence" refer to the multi-head attention on token level (Eq. (10)) and sentence level (Eq. (7)). " L_{HSA} " denotes the supervision on the sentence relevance score (Eq. (10)).




Figure 4: Qualitative results of block process score (Eq. (4)) prediction in the BAL module. The green polyline represents the ground-truth block process across the entire trajectory, while the purple polyline depicts the corresponding predictions made by our method. The red brackets divided the navigation into multiple stages, with each stage encompassing nodes that belong to a single block.




Figure 5: Visualization of the sentence relevance scores (Eq. (8)) in HSA module. ①-⑦ indicate the range of each sentence in the instruction. The heatmap shows the degree of attention of our model to each sentence at each step. The red arrows pointed out three key navigation step, whose corresponding node positions in the scene graph are labeled with white box.

The results reveal that using both sentence and token-level attention yields significantly better results than using either one alone, demonstrating their complementary roles in facilitating semantic association. Interestingly, the introduction of explicit supervision on sentence attention did not have as significant an impact as anticipated. Even without such supervision (#3), the model was able to achieve competitive navigation performance.

4.4 Visualization and Qualitative Analysis

To intuitively show the effect of our method in spatial locating, a qualitative result is shown in Figure 4 that visualizes an example of the block progress score. It can be seen that our agent can track the progress of navigation across different blocks, which proves the ability in spatial localization. Moreover, Figure 5 presents a visualization of the agent’s attention dynamics on the instruction sentences progress over multiple time steps. As shown in the heatmap of sentence relevance scores, our agent is able to focus on the relevant sentences within the instruction at different steps, especially exhibiting precise decision-making at several key steps.

5 Conclusion

In this work, drawing the inspiration from human navigation, we propose a “Locating before Planning (Loc4Plan)” framework. For the first time, this framework enables agents to locate their spatial position before planning a decision action based on corresponding guidance. The Loc4Plan framework comprises a block-aware spatial locating (BAL) module and a spatial-aware action planning (SAP) module. The BAL module is proposed to localize the spatial position on the block level, which enables the agent to be aware of its relative location position within the current block. The self-awareness of location ability developed in the BAL is beneficial for textual grounding, thereby facilitating further action planning. Therefore, we propose the SAP module for the planning process, which associates spatial-aware state representation with provided instructions in a hierarchical manner, promoting a comprehensive understanding of the provided instructions and make the action prediction. Benefiting from the ahead localization to the agent’s position and comprehensive understanding of the provided instructions, our Loc4Plan achieves the new state-of-the-art for Touchdown and map2seq dataset on both seen and unseen scenarios.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported partially by NSFC (No. 62206315), Guangdong NSF Project (No. 2023B1515040025, 2024A1515010101), Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Information Security Technology (No. 2023B1212060026), Guangzhou Basic and Applied Basic Research Scheme (No. 2024A04J4067).

References

- [1] Peter Anderson, Qi Wu, Damien Teney, Jake Bruce, Mark Johnson, Niko Sünderhauf, Ian Reid, Stephen Gould, and Anton Van Den Hengel. 2018. Vision-and-language navigation: Interpreting visually-grounded navigation instructions in real environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 3674–3683.
- [2] Jason Armitage, Leonardo Impett, and Rico Sennrich. 2023. A Priority Map for Vision-and-Language Navigation with Trajectory Plans and Feature-Location Cues. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*. 1094–1103.
- [3] Devendra Singh Chaplot, Kanthashree Mysore Sathyendra, Rama Kumar Psumarathi, Dheeraj Rajagopal, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2018. Gated-attention architectures for task-oriented language grounding. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*. 2819–2826.
- [4] Howard Chen, Alane Suhr, Dipendra Misra, Noah Snively, and Yoav Artzi. 2019. Touchdown: Natural language navigation and spatial reasoning in visual street environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 12538–12547.
- [5] Kevin Chen, Junshen K Chen, Jo Chuang, Marynel Vázquez, and Silvio Savarese. 2021. Topological planning with transformers for vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 11276–11286.
- [6] Shizhe Chen, Pierre-Louis Guhur, Cordelia Schmid, and Ivan Laptev. 2021. History aware multimodal transformer for vision-and-language navigation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 5834–5847.
- [7] Shizhe Chen, Pierre-Louis Guhur, Makarand Tapaswi, Cordelia Schmid, and Ivan Laptev. 2022. Learning from unlabeled 3d environments for vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 638–655.
- [8] Shizhe Chen, Pierre-Louis Guhur, Makarand Tapaswi, Cordelia Schmid, and Ivan Laptev. 2022. Think global, act local: Dual-scale graph transformer for vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 16537–16547.
- [9] Daniel Fried, Ronghang Hu, Volkan Cirik, Anna Rohrbach, Jacob Andreas, Louis-Philippe Morency, Taylor Berg-Kirkpatrick, Kate Saenko, Dan Klein, and Trevor Darrell. 2018. Speaker-follower models for vision-and-language navigation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 3318–3329.
- [10] Alex Graves, Santiago Fernández, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 2005. Bidirectional LSTM networks for improved phoneme classification and recognition. In *International Conference on Artificial Neural Networks (ICANN)*. 799–804.
- [11] Weituo Hao, Chunyuan Li, Xijun Li, Lawrence Carin, and Jianfeng Gao. 2020. Towards learning a generic agent for vision-and-language navigation via pre-training. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 13137–13146.
- [12] Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation* (1997), 1735–1780.
- [13] Yicong Hong, Cristian Rodriguez Opazo, Qi Wu, and Stephen Gould. 2020. Sub-Instruction Aware Vision-and-Language Navigation. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 3360–3376.
- [14] Ronghang Hu, Daniel Fried, Anna Rohrbach, Dan Klein, Trevor Darrell, and Kate Saenko. 2019. Are You Looking? Grounding to Multiple Modalities in Vision-and-Language Navigation. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. 6551–6557.
- [15] Tung Le, Khoa Pho, Thong Bui, Huy Tien Nguyen, and Minh Le Nguyen. 2022. Object-less Vision-language Model on Visual Question Classification for Blind People. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence (ICAART)*. 180–187.
- [16] Jialu Li, Aishwarya Padmakumar, Gaurav S. Sukhatme, and Mohit Bansal. 2024. VLN-Video: Utilizing Driving Videos for Outdoor Vision-and-Language Navigation. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*. 18517–18526.
- [17] Xijun Li, Xi Yin, Chunyuan Li, Pengchuan Zhang, Xiaowei Hu, Lei Zhang, Lijuan Wang, Houdong Hu, Li Dong, Furu Wei, et al. 2020. Oscar: Object-semantics aligned pre-training for vision-language tasks. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 121–137.
- [18] Yan-Bo Lin and Yu-Chiang Frank Wang. 2020. Audiovisual transformer with instance attention for audio-visual event localization. In *Proceedings of the Asian Conference on Computer Vision (ACCV)*. 274–290.
- [19] Rui Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Wenguan Wang, and Yi Yang. 2023. Bird’s-Eye-View Scene Graph for Vision-Language Navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 10968–10980.
- [20] Arjun Majumdar, Ayush Shrivastava, Stefan Lee, Peter Anderson, Devi Parikh, and Dhruv Batra. 2020. Improving vision-and-language navigation with image-text pairs from the web. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 259–274.
- [21] Piotr Mirowski, Matt Grimes, Mateusz Malinowski, Karl Moritz Hermann, Keith Anderson, Denis Teplyashin, Karen Simonyan, Andrew Zisserman, Raia Hadsell, et al. 2018. Learning to navigate in cities without a map. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 2424–2435.
- [22] Yanyuan Qiao, Yuankai Qi, Yicong Hong, Zheng Yu, Peng Wang, and Qi Wu. 2022. Hop: History-and-order aware pre-training for vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 15418–15427.
- [23] Niyati Rawal, Roberto Bigazzi, Lorenzo Baraldi, and Rita Cucchiara. 2024. AIGeN: An Adversarial Approach for Instruction Generation in VLN. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2070–2080.
- [24] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, et al. 2015. Imagenet large scale visual recognition challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)* (2015), 211–252.
- [25] Raphael Schumann and Stefan Riezler. 2021. Generating Landmark Navigation Instructions from Maps as a Graph-to-Text Problem. In *Proceedings of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL/IJCNLP)*. 489–502.
- [26] Raphael Schumann and Stefan Riezler. 2022. Analyzing Generalization of Vision and Language Navigation to Unseen Outdoor Areas. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. 7519–7532.
- [27] Kunal Pratap Singh, Jordi Salvador, Luca Weihs, and Aniruddha Kembhavi. 2023. Scene graph contrastive learning for embodied navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 10884–10894.
- [28] Alessandro Suglia, Qiaozhi Gao, Jesse Thomason, Govind Thattai, and Gaurav Sukhatme. 2021. Embodied bert: A transformer model for embodied, language-guided visual task completion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.04927* (2021).
- [29] Yanjun Sun, Yue Qiu, Yoshimitsu Aoki, and Hirokatsu Kataoka. 2023. Outdoor Vision-and-Language Navigation Needs Object-Level Alignment. *Sensors* (2023), 6028.
- [30] Hao Tan, Licheng Yu, and Mohit Bansal. 2019. Learning to Navigate Unseen Environments: Back Translation with Environmental Dropout. In *Proceedings of the Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (NAACL-HLT)*. 2610–2621.
- [31] Yao-Hung Hubert Tsai, Shaojie Bai, Paul Pu Liang, J Zico Kolter, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. 2019. Multimodal transformer for unaligned multimodal language sequences. In *Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. 6558–6569.
- [32] Grigorios Tsoumakas and Ioannis Katakis. 2007. Multi-label classification: An overview. *International Journal of Data Warehousing and Mining (IJDW)* (2007), 1–13.
- [33] Arun Balajee Vasudevan, Dengxin Dai, and Luc Van Gool. 2021. Talk2nav: Long-range vision-and-language navigation with dual attention and spatial memory. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)* (2021), 246–266.
- [34] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. 5998–6008.
- [35] Xin Wang, Qiuyuan Huang, Asli Celikyilmaz, Jianfeng Gao, Dinghan Shen, Yuanfang Wang, William Yang Wang, and Lei Zhang. 2019. Reinforced cross-modal matching and self-supervised imitation learning for vision-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 6629–6638.
- [36] Xiaohan Wang, Wenguan Wang, Jiayi Shao, and Yi Yang. 2023. Lana: A language-capable navigator for instruction following and generation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 19048–19058.
- [37] Xin Wang, Wenhan Xiong, Hongmin Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2018. Look before you leap: Bridging model-free and model-based reinforcement learning for planned-ahead vision-and-language navigation. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*. 37–53.
- [38] Jiannan Xiang, Xin Eric Wang, and William Yang Wang. 2020. Learning to stop: A simple yet effective approach to urban vision-language navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.13112* (2020).
- [39] Gengze Zhou, Yicong Hong, and Qi Wu. 2024. Navgpt: Explicit reasoning in vision-and-language navigation with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*. 7641–7649.
- [40] Wang Zhu, Hexiang Hu, Jiacheng Chen, Zhiwei Deng, Vihan Jain, Eugene Ie, and Fei Sha. 2020. Babywalk: Going farther in vision-and-language navigation by taking baby steps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.04625* (2020).

- [41] Wanrong Zhu, Xin Wang, Tsu-Jui Fu, An Yan, Pradyumna Narayana, Kazoo Sone, Sugato Basu, and William Yang Wang. 2021. Multimodal Text Style Transfer for Outdoor Vision-and-Language Navigation. In *Proceedings of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (EACL)*. 1207–1221.