

# dVLM-AD: Enhance Diffusion Vision-Language-Model for Driving via Controllable Reasoning

Yingzi Ma<sup>1</sup>, Yulong Cao<sup>2</sup>, Wenhao Ding<sup>2</sup>, Shuibai Zhang<sup>1</sup>, Yan Wang<sup>2</sup>,  
Boris Ivanovic<sup>2</sup>, Ming Jiang<sup>1</sup>, Marco Pavone<sup>2,3</sup>, Chaowei Xiao<sup>2,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Wisconsin-Madison <sup>2</sup>NVIDIA <sup>3</sup>Stanford University <sup>4</sup>Johns Hopkins University  
<https://dvlm-ad.github.io>

## Abstract

The autonomous driving community is increasingly focused on addressing the challenges posed by out-of-distribution (OOD) driving scenarios. A dominant research trend seeks to enhance end-to-end (E2E) driving systems by integrating vision-language models (VLMs), leveraging their rich world knowledge and reasoning abilities to improve generalization across diverse environments. However, most existing VLMs or vision-language agents (VLAs) are built upon autoregressive (AR) models. In this paper, we observe that existing AR-based VLMs—limited by causal attention and sequential token generation—often fail to maintain consistency and controllability between high-level reasoning and low-level planning. In contrast, recent discrete diffusion VLMs equipped with bidirectional attention exhibit superior controllability and reliability through iterative denoising. Building on these observations, we introduce dVLM-AD, a diffusion-based vision-language model that unifies perception, structured reasoning, and low-level planning for end-to-end driving. Evaluated on nuScenes and WOD-E2E, dVLM-AD yields more consistent reasoning-action pairs and achieves planning performance comparable to existing driving VLM/VLA systems despite a modest backbone, outperforming ARM-based baselines with a 9% improvement in behavior-trajectory consistency and a 6% increase in RFS on long-tail WOD-E2E scenarios. These results suggest a controllable and reliable pathway for scalable end-to-end driving.

## 1. Introduction

End-to-end (E2E) autonomous driving systems have achieved remarkable progress by unifying perception, prediction, and planning within a single framework [14, 23]. Building on this trend, increasing attention has been devoted to enhancing the robustness of E2E systems in long-tail and out-of-distribution scenarios [18, 50, 51, 63]. Moti-




Figure 1. Comparison of end-to-end autonomous driving paradigms. (a) Autoregressive VLMs sequentially decode reasoning and textual action tokens, where each prediction depends on previous outputs, leading to accumulated exposure bias and limited global consistency. (b) VLAs introduce latent action tokens and a separate decoder to produce trajectories, but reasoning-action coupling remains implicit. (c) Our dVLM reformulate driving as an iterative denoising process that jointly refines reasoning and action representations under sensor and ego-state conditioning. This diffusion formulation eliminates left-to-right dependencies, enhances stability, and achieves stronger reasoning-action alignment within the end-to-end autonomous driving system.

vated by this goal, recent efforts explore the integration of vision-language-action (VLA) models [5, 6, 19, 24], which leverage rich world knowledge and strong reasoning capabilities to advance driving intelligence [2, 9, 22, 71, 73]. This integration not only enables driving systems to reason over open-vocabulary visual cues and follow natural-language navigation commands, but also enhances interpretability of driving systems - an essential property for ensuring safe and reliable decision-making in complex, real-world driving environments. However, existing mainstream




Figure 2. Challenges in existing driving VLMs/VLAs. (1) Reasoning–action inconsistency: ARM-based VLMs’ sequential decoding can produce plans where the inferred behavior conflicts with the predicted trajectory (e.g., behavior mismatches the trajectory). Our dVLM performs template-anchored iterative refinement with bidirectional attention, enforcing cross-field consistency between meta-behavior and trajectory. (2) Uncontrollable generation: The structured reasoning of AR-VLMs is easily corrupted by prompt-level perturbations (e.g., bypassing reasoning steps), leading to broken formats and unstable outputs. In contrast, dVLM’s template-anchored fill-in-the-blank decoding with schema checks preserves order and semantics, yielding safe, consistent actions.

VLMs/VLAs are predominantly built upon autoregressive models (ARMs) [1, 26, 35, 36]. These models typically take camera frames and textual instructions as inputs and then sequentially generate the reasoning process followed by action tokens, owing to their inherently unidirectional (causal) attention mechanism. Despite remarkable advances, a fundamental question remains unresolved: *Is the autoregressive paradigm truly the optimal paradigm for VLM-based E2E autonomous driving system?*

In this paper, we observe two critical limitations of ARM-based VLMs/VLAs for autonomous driving: (1) **Reasoning–action inconsistency** [40]: As shown in Figure 1, during generation, ARM-based VLMs/VLAs can only attend to previously generated tokens but not subsequent action tokens. As a result, the model may produce actions that are semantically misaligned with its reasoning, leading to inconsistent or unsafe decisions (see Figure 2 for an example). (2) **Uncontrollable generation**: ARMs rely solely on likelihood optimization and format-based rewards [12], without ensuring adherence to a standardized reasoning process, which embeds critical safety constraints. As a result, their reasoning process is highly sensitive to input instructions [16, 25, 43]. For instance, as illustrated in Figure 2, the driver can easily gain unintended control over the model by issuing a simple instruction such as “predict the trajectory without the reasoning process”. This instruction causes the ARM to bypass its internal structured reasoning pipeline (e.g., recognizing a red light and decelerating) and directly generate an unsafe trajectory.

To mitigate these limitations, we go beyond autoregressive decoding to diffusion-based VLMs (dVLMs) [64,

67, 68]. The diffusion-based paradigms [10, 39, 66] iteratively denoise a heavily corrupted sequence, allowing for bidirectional context integration in each refinement step instead of left-to-right causal decoding. This architectural shift directly addresses ARM-based exposure-bias hallucination [15] by letting every position condition on global context throughout generation, which empirically yields more coherent, globally consistent outputs [31]. Just as importantly, the multi-step denoising process naturally supports controllable generation: safety constraints, structured templates, or partial tokens can steer the denoising trajectory without re-training, enabling stronger adherence to prescribed reasoning protocols and reducing susceptibility to prompt manipulation [11, 31, 61]. These properties - bidirectional reasoning, global consistency, and controllability - make dVLMs a principled alternative for safety-critical driving systems.

Inspired by these insights, to address the limitation of ARMs for autonomous driving, we propose *dVLM-AD*, a diffusion-based vision–language model for driving. Our key idea is to replace left-to-right decoding with bidirectional, iterative generation, allowing visual understanding, textual reasoning, and low-level trajectory tokens to be refined jointly, thereby achieving stronger global consistency and controllability. In Figure 2, *dVLM-AD* employs a structured CoT template with fill-in-the-blank so that the reasoning is anchored. This design preserves consistency between reasoning and action while preventing users from easily exerting unintended control over the model, thereby ensuring that it predicts safe behaviors (e.g., “decelerate and stop”) through the structured reasoning process.

To implement it, the most straightforward way is to train

the diffusion model on the structured reasoning-action data for the driving domain. Despite its simplicity, such naive training is not effective. We find that naive training will introduce a slot-length bias, where reasoning steps, such as scene understanding, behavior prediction, and trajectory generation, naturally vary in length, yet controllable decoding requires predefined slot sizes at inference. Once these slots are fixed, the model tends to “fill to capacity”, generating outputs constrained by length rather than semantics. For example, when a window size of three tokens is reserved for meta-behavior prediction, the model may incorrectly produce `right-lane-change` instead of the correct `keep-lane`, simply because the longer phrase fits the allocated token window. To address this challenge, we introduce a dynamic denoising strategy that allows variable-length infilling within a fixed mask window. Built upon this decoding strategy, *dVLM-AD* is adapted to the autonomous driving domain based on the LLaDA-V [67] through a two-stage training pipeline: (i) large-scale alignment using 145k driving-related QA pairs curated from open-source datasets [2, 9, 13, 47, 54] to ground the model’s multimodal understanding in the driving domain; and (ii) supervised fine-tuning with 53k *structured reasoning-action* annotations for driving. After training, *dVLM-AD* preserves the controllability of diffusion-based decoding while mitigating slot-length bias, leading to reasoning and planning outputs that are semantically grounded and behaviorally consistent for autonomous driving domain.

We evaluate the effectiveness of *dVLM-AD* on the Waymo Open Dataset (WOD-E2E) and nuScenes [7, 57]. To assess reasoning–action consistency, we compare *dVLM-AD* against an autoregressive (ARM)-based vision–language agent (VLA) under identical training settings. Our method demonstrates a significant improvement over ARM-based counterparts. In terms of driving performance, when trained on the same data, our diffusion-based approach surpasses ARM-based baselines with a 6% improvement in long-tail scenarios on WOD-E2E. Despite being built upon LLaDA-V, a relatively modest backbone compared to Qwen2.5-VL and Gemini, *dVLM-AD* can also achieve comparable driving performance to these VLM/VLA systems that are built on stronger base models such as the Qwen and Gemini family [49]. Furthermore, we analyze the effectiveness of the proposed dynamic denoising strategy and perform instruction perturbation experiments to validate its critical role in maintaining controllable reasoning and ensuring safe, reliable planning behaviors.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. Vision-Language-Action (VLA) Models.

Recent progress in Vision–Language–Action (VLA) models has unified perception, reasoning, and control

within a single multimodal framework. Most existing VLAs are autoregressive, representing actions as discrete tokens decoded sequentially by large language models. Systems such as RT-2 [6], OpenVLA [24], and their driving counterparts—OpenDriveVLA [72], Impromptu-VLA [8], and AutoVLA [74]—show that leveraging language-driven reasoning improves trajectory prediction, particularly in long-tail scenarios. More recently, diffusion- or flow-based VLAs (e.g., Octo [48],  $\pi_0$  [5],  $\pi_{0.5}$  [19], DiffVLA [21]) generate continuous trajectories through iterative denoising or flow matching, enhancing open-world robustness. Other efforts such as LoHoVLA [65], ChatVLA-2 [75], CogVLA [30], and NORA [17] focus on long-horizon reasoning and efficiency. While these approaches advance generalization and capability, challenges remain in ensuring reasoning–action consistency and safe, controllable decision-making—gaps that motivate our diffusion-based formulation in autonomous driving.

### 2.2. Diffusion Large Language Models (dLLMs).

Discrete diffusion modeling has advanced rapidly in both theory and practice. Early works such as D3PMs formalized noise and transition designs [3], while Diffusion-LM showed controllable text generation beyond the autoregressive paradigm [31]. Subsequent studies refined discrete objectives and simplified masked diffusion for better stability and efficiency [37, 45, 46]. Building on these foundations, dLLMs have scaled to large language model regimes: the LLaDA series [39] and Dream 7B [66] match autoregressive performance via large-scale masked diffusion training and careful scheduling [39], while post-training methods such as LLaDA 1.5 and TraceRL use preference optimization and trajectory-aware RL to better align with human feedback and reasoning goals [56, 76]. Closer to our multimodal setting, MMaDA [64] proposes a unified, modality-agnostic diffusion architecture with chain-of-thought alignment and unified RL post-training; LLaDA-V [67] and Dimple [68] integrate visual instruction tuning into masked diffusion LMs and report competitive multimodal performance; and some recent works [28, 34, 58, 59] extend diffusion VLMs to vision–language–action for embodied AI systems. Along this path, to the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to introduce a reasoning-based dVLM for autonomous driving.

## 3. Preliminaries

### 3.1. CoT-based Planning in Autonomous Driving

In autonomous driving, reasoning-based planning aims to generate interpretable motion conditioned on perception and intention [32, 38, 44, 69, 70]. Given past multi-camera frames  $v_{T-K+1:T}$ , historical ego states  $e_{T-K+1:T}$ , and a navigation command  $g$ , the planner outputs a Chain-of-Thought (CoT) reasoning process  $R$  and a sequence of future waypoints  $\tau = \{(x^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^K$ . Formally, the reasoning plan-




Figure 3. The overview of *dVLM-AD* framework.

ner can be represented as

$$(R, \tau) = \text{Planner}(v_{T-K+1:T}, e_{T-K+1:T}, g), \quad (1)$$

where  $R$  captures the intermediate reasoning steps that bridge perception and decision, and  $\tau$  defines the ego-centric trajectory to be executed. This formulation unifies perception, reasoning, and motion generation within an interpretable framework, enabling safer and more transparent planning in complex driving environments.

### 3.2. Discrete Diffusion Vision Language Models

**Forward and Reverse Process.** Let  $\mathbf{x}_0 = (x_1, \dots, x_L)$  be the target token sequence and  $\mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{p})$  the conditioning context (visual features and text prompt). A discrete diffusion VLM follows a *mask-denoise* cycle governed by a noise schedule  $\{\lambda_t\}_{t=1}^T$ . At step  $t$ , a subset  $\mathcal{M}_t \subseteq \{1:L\}$  is masked according to  $\lambda_t$ , yielding a corrupted sequence  $\mathbf{x}_t$ . The reverse process applies a denoising policy  $\pi_\theta$  that, given  $(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{c}, t)$ , predicts replacements only for indices in  $\mathcal{M}_t$  while keeping visible tokens fixed; iterating  $t=T \rightarrow 0$  recovers a clean sequence. This view matches absorbing-state discrete diffusion with categorical transitions and naturally supports bidirectional conditioning on  $\mathbf{c}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_t$ .

**Discrete Diffusion Modeling.** Modeling operates directly in token space with a special [MASK] state. Training samples  $t$  and masked sets  $\mathcal{M}_t$ , then optimizes  $\theta$  so that  $\pi_\theta$  (equivalently the denoiser  $p_\theta$ ) predicts ground-truth tokens  $\{x_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t}$  conditioned on  $(\mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{c})$ ; the loss is computed only on masked positions:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t, \mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_t} \left[ -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_t|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t} \log p_\theta(x_0^i | \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{c}) \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_t$  is obtained by masking  $\mathbf{x}_0$  at step  $t$  and  $\mathcal{M}_t = \{i : x_t^i = [\text{MASK}]\}$ .

## 4. Method

In this section, we introduce *dVLM-AD*, a diffusion-based vision-language model for end-to-end autonomous driving that unifies visual perception, object detection, high-level prediction, and low-level planning within a single reasoning pipeline. We first present our framework, then formalize controllable reasoning for driving and instantiate it with a dynamic denoise strategy that progressively reveals masked targets during denoising (§ 4.1). Finally, we describe dataset construction, detailing data sources and the annotation protocol that supervises each reasoning stage (§ 4.2).

### 4.1. The *dVLM-AD* Framework

**Model Architecture.** The overall architecture of *dVLM-AD* is illustrated in Figure 3. *dVLM-AD* is initialized from LLaDA-V [67], a diffusion vision language model whose multimodal understanding is comparable to open-source autoregressive VLMs [4, 26, 53]. The *dVLM-AD* comprises three components: (i) a LLM backbone, (ii) a vision encoder, and (iii) a multimodal projector. We adopt LLaDA-8B-Instruct [39] as the language backbone, SigLIP2-so400m-patch14-384 [52] as the vision encoder, and a lightweight MLP as the projector.

*dVLM-AD* consumes camera inputs  $\mathcal{V}$ , high-level navigation instructions  $g$ , and ego-state signals  $e$ , and produces scene reasoning and a planned trajectory. We tailor  $\mathcal{V}$  to each dataset: for **nuScenes** [7], we use the *front* view from



the past one second,

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{nuScenes}} = [c_{\text{front}}^{t-1s}, c_{\text{front}}^{t-0.5s}, c_{\text{front}}^t],$$

providing short-term temporal context; for **Waymo Open Dataset End-to-End** [62], we use three synchronized views at the current time step,

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{Waymo}} = \{c_{\text{front-left}}^t, c_{\text{front}}^t, c_{\text{front-right}}^t\}.$$

The navigation  $g$  (e.g., *Turn Left*, *Go Straight*) specifies the intended maneuver. The ego state  $e$  aggregates signals over the past 3 s at 0.5 s intervals (2 Hz), including current velocity, acceleration, and a short history of recent waypoints. Given these inputs, *dVLM-AD* first generates a structured, controllable reasoning trace and then predicts the vehicle’s future behaviors at 2 Hz.

**Action Representation.** There are two prevailing action representations for VLM-based planning: textual waypoints and discrete action tokens. Textual waypoints serialize the future path as a schema-constrained string (e.g., JSON coordinates) [9, 44, 51], while action-token methods emit discrete action/trajectory tokens that an expert head dequantizes into waypoints [71, 73]. Across standard benchmarks, both families deliver comparable planning quality. Action tokens are appealing for their lower decoding latency and for easing the enforcement of physical/dynamics priors via dequantization and expert decoders. Nevertheless, we still adopt textual waypoints for two reasons: (1) a unified language interface—perception, prediction, and coordinates in one channel; and (2) diffusion language-model fine-tuning is notably unstable in practice [67], and introducing extra action vocabularies/decoder heads tends to amplify this instability and data demand in our setting. Specifically, *dVLM-AD* predicts  $\tau = \{(x^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^K$  at 2 Hz. Notably, unlike autoregressive models (ARMs), *dVLM-AD* can dynamically adjust the number  $K$  of generated waypoints at inference by setting the number of mask tokens, and is therefore not constrained by the fixed trajectory length used during training.

**Controllable Reasoning for Driving.** Recent studies emphasize that the reasoning process in autonomous driving should be *structured*, reflecting the inherently sequential pipeline of driving: perception, prediction, and planning [47, 51]. However, existing ARM-based LLMs exhibit unreliability when required to generate structured output. Inspired by prior work [61], we pioneer the use of diffusion vision–language models to produce *structured, controllable* reasoning and actions in autonomous driving. Our key idea is to recast free-form generation as *constrained infilling*: we first construct a structured reasoning template  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T$ , as shown in Figure 3. Unlike standard dVLM decoding that begins from a fully masked sequence  $\mathbf{x}_T$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{M}_T = \{1:L\}$ ), we initialize the reverse chain with  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T$  so that only a subset of slots is masked,  $\mathcal{M}_T \subsetneq \{1:L\}$ . The visible anchors in




Figure 4. Dynamic denoise strategy for controllable reasoning.

$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T$  act as hard constraints and guidance, and the denoising policy  $\pi_\theta$  fills the remaining slots in a controlled, template-consistent manner. Formally, our *structured* objective conditions on a template with visible anchors. Let  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_T$  be the template,  $\mathcal{A} = \{i : \hat{x}_T^i \neq [\text{MASK}]\}$  the anchor set, and  $\mathcal{E} = \{1:L\} \setminus \mathcal{A}$  the editable indices. At step  $t$ , we mask only editable slots  $\mathcal{M}_t \subseteq \mathcal{E}$  and keep anchors fixed in  $\mathbf{x}_t$ . The training loss is:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{t, \mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_t, \mathcal{M}_t \subseteq \mathcal{E}} \left[ -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}_t|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{M}_t} \log p_\theta(x_0^i | \mathbf{x}_t, \mathbf{c}) \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_t$  is obtained by masking  $\mathbf{x}_0$  only on  $\mathcal{M}_t$  and clamping  $x_t^i = \hat{x}_T^i$  for all  $i \in \mathcal{A}$ .

**Dynamic Denoise Strategy.** As discussed in Section 3.2, diffusion-based LLMs require specifying a fixed-length masked token sequence before the reverse denoising process. Although several recent studies have attempted to relax this constraint by enabling variable-length masking [27, 29], the problem remains unresolved. Specifically, while structured templates offer a means of enforcing controllable reasoning, their dependence on fixed-length slots remains inherently restrictive. Owing to lexical variability, tokenized phrases exhibit inconsistent lengths—for example, “left turn” may consist of only two subword tokens, whereas “right lane change” typically requires three or more. A naive strategy is to allocate slots according to the maximum span length, yet this introduces a *length-matching bias*: the model is implicitly incentivized to generate content whose length merely fits the available blanks rather than content that is semantically appropriate (e.g., “three blanks  $\Rightarrow$  three-token phrase”). Therefore, we propose a **dynamic denoise strategy** for controllable reasoning, as illustrated in Figure 4. The key idea is to introduce a special *reduce token* that allows the masked span to be adaptively shortened during the reverse denoising process. At initialization, all non-templated positions between two structural anchors are fully masked. During each denoising step, the model predicts token distributions over these masked slots. Once the confidence of placing a reduce token at a specific position exceeds a predefined threshold, that position is *fixed* as a reduce token, and all masked tokens following it—up to the next templated token—are immediately pruned from the sequence. This reduction is only valid under a structural constraint: every token between the re-

Table 1. Evaluation of Object $\leftrightarrow$ Explanation consistency and Behavior $\leftrightarrow$ Trajectory alignment on nuScenes and WOD-E2E validation sets. **Col./RFS** denotes the average **Collision Rate (Col.)**—lower is better—and the **Rater Feedback Score (RFS)**—higher is better.

Method	Decoding Strategy	Backbone	Object↔Explanation			Behavior↔Trajectory			Col./RFS
			O → E	E → O	Avg.	longitudinal	lateral	Avg.	
nuScenes validation set									
OpenEMMA* [60]	AR	InternVL3.5	89.5	84.8	87.2	67.6	79.6	73.6	—
LightEMMA* [42]	AR	Qwen3-VL	87.7	85.8	86.7	76.1	87.2	81.7	—
VLM-AD (ours)	AR	LLaVA-OV	93.2	96.3	94.7	85.3	85.7	85.5	0.35
dVLM-AD (ours)	Diff.	LLaDA-V	98.2	98.9	98.6	87.1	88.5	87.8	0.32
WOD-E2E validation set									
OpenEMMA* [60]	AR	InternVL3.5	89.4	85.1	87.3	44.2	39.6	41.9	5.158
LightEMMA* [42]	AR	Qwen3-VL	87.8	86.0	86.9	71.3	71.6	71.5	6.517
VLM-AD (ours)	AR	LLaVA-OV	91.8	93.7	92.8	59.7	85.9	72.8	7.215
dVLM-AD (ours)	Diff.	LLaDA-V	98.1	98.3	98.2	74.4	85.7	80.1	7.633

duced token and the nearest subsequent templated token must still be masked at the moment of reduction. If any of these positions have already been filled with non-masked content, the reduction is rejected to preserve alignment with the template. In this way, the model is permitted to terminate generation early only when the remaining span is semantically redundant, rather than being forced to fill a pre-allocated slot length. Notably, we observe in practice that the model tends to assign the reduce token prematurely. To avoid this, we employ a brief *warm-up* phase during which the *reduce token* is not fixed, allowing the model to first decode meaningful content before reduction is activated.

## 4.2. Dataset Construction

Unlike contemporary state-of-the-art VLMs (e.g., Qwen3-VL [49], InternVL 3.5 [55]), our foundation dVLM, LLaDA-V, has not been extensively pre-trained on massive multimodal corpora. As a result, its world knowledge—particularly for driving—lags behind mainstream ARM-based VLMs. To align LLaDA-V with driving-specific knowledge, we curate and process data from existing driving datasets, focusing on supervision signals that emphasize scene understanding, high-level prediction, and planning. Concretely, we collect and filter examples from *ImpromptuVLA* [9], *DriveAction* [13], *DriveLM* [47], *DriveLMMoI* [20], and *CoVLA* [2] and obtain approximately **145k** driving-related QA pairs for alignment, providing targeted supervision that strengthens LLaDA-V’s perception and prediction capabilities. Details can be found in Appendix A. Moreover, high-quality reasoning signals are essential for linking scene semantics to the ego vehicle’s future motion [40, 73]. We therefore build a structured annotation pipeline tailored to trajectory prediction. Specifically, we construct reasoning annotations tailored to trajectory prediction by employing GPT-4.1 [41] as an automatic annotator conditioned on the same signals available to the predictor—multi-frame front-view images, past ego state, a navigation command, and the ego’s future waypoints—and

by overlaying 2D bounding boxes on the current frame to strengthen object grounding. Inspired by Poutine [44], we structure the output into four fields where `object detection` lists salient agents and traffic elements, `explanation` provides a concise causal rationale linking those cues to the upcoming motion, `future behavior` specifies high-level longitudinal and lateral intentions consistent with the scene, and `trajectory` encodes the target future path as waypoints. At inference time, the dVLM treats these four fields as templated slots and fills the corresponding values. Finally, we annotate **23k** and **30k** reasoning data for nuScenes and WOD-E2E datasets, respectively.

## 5. Experiment

### 5.1. Experimental Setup

**Datasets.** We evaluate VLM-AD and dVLM-AD in nuScenes [7] and WOD-E2E [62] benchmarks in open-loop settings. **nuScenes** contains 1,000 urban driving scenes (20 s each) captured in Boston and Singapore with a full AV sensor suite (6 cameras, 5 radars, 1 lidar). The official split is 700/150/150 scenes for train/val/test. Camera frames are high-resolution  $1600 \times 900$  JPEGs recorded at  $\sim 12$  Hz, while annotated keyframes are sampled at 2 Hz. **Waymo Open Dataset End-to-End (WOD-E2E)** comprises 4,021 long-tail driving segments of 20 s each, split into 2,037/479/1,505 for train/val/test. Each segment includes eight-camera surround-views ( $1920 \times 1280$ ) video at 10 Hz along with routing inputs and ego state. For evaluation, only the first 12 s of each test segment are provided; the subsequent 8 s future is hidden and predictions must be generated using information available up to the last frame of the 12 s context.

**Implementation Details.** For a fair comparison, we train both VLM-AD and dVLM-AD with the same two-stage recipe: in Stage I, we optimize 145k alignment samples with Eq. 2 for 1 epoch; in Stage II, we finetune the models with Eq. 3 for 3 epochs on nuScenes (23k) and WOD-E2E (30k).

Table 2. Comparison of different methods on WOD-E2E test set. \* indicates models evaluated in a zero-shot setting (without fine-tuning).

Method	Backbone	# Trajectories	RFS↑	ADE (5s)↓	ADE (3s)↓
OpenEMMA* [60]	-	zero-shot	5.158	12.476	6.684
LightEMMA* [42]	-	zero-shot	6.517	3.740	1.705
Open-LLaMA [57]	LLaMA-Vision	—	7.429	3.217	<u>1.314</u>
NaiveEMMA [57]	Gemini	—	7.528	3.018	1.320
AutoVLA [73]	Qwen2.5-VL	52.8k	<u>7.557</u>	<b>2.558</b>	1.351
dVLM-AD	LLaDA-V	29.3k	<b>7.633</b>	3.022	<b>1.285</b>

Table 3. Comparison of driving-related models on L2 Error (m) across different horizons on nuScenes validation dataset. \* indicates models evaluated in a zero-shot setting (without fine-tuning).

Method	L2 Error (m) ↓			
	1s	2s	3s	Avg.
<i>Training-based Driving Policy</i>				
UniAD [14]	0.20	0.42	0.75	0.46
VAD-Base [23]	0.17	0.34	0.60	0.37
BEV-Planner [33]	0.16	0.32	0.57	0.35
Ego-MLP [33]	0.15	0.32	0.59	0.35
<i>VLMs or VLAs with Reasoning</i>				
OpenEMMA* [9]	1.45	3.21	3.76	2.81
Gemini-2.5-Pro* [9]	0.37	1.35	2.96	1.56
Claude-3.7-Sonnet* [9]	0.28	0.94	2.04	1.09
GPT-4o* [9]	0.28	0.93	2.02	1.07
DriveVLM [51]	0.18	<b>0.34</b>	<u>0.68</u>	<b>0.40</b>
AutoVLA (w/ CoT) [73]	0.25	0.46	0.73	0.48
<b>dVLM-AD (ours)</b>	<b>0.15</b>	<u>0.40</u>	<b>0.68</b>	<u>0.41</u>

Details are provided in the appendix.

**Evaluation Metrics.** For nuScenes, we report the L2 distance error computed on the official 2 Hz keyframes. For WOD-E2E, we report ADE and RFS. ADE is the mean Euclidean distance over the prediction horizon,  $\frac{1}{H} \sum_{t=1}^H \|\hat{y}_t - y_t\|_2$ , averaged over samples. RFS (Rater Feedback Score) [62] evaluates a single predicted ego trajectory against multiple human-rated reference trajectories using trust regions. For each rater trajectory, rectangular trust regions are defined around the reference path with distinct lateral and longitudinal thresholds; if the prediction lies within a region at an evaluation time, it receives that rater’s high score, otherwise the score decays with lateral/longitudinal deviations. Furthermore, we add two consistency metrics. Object↔Explanation Consistency uses an LLM judge to compare entities in detection versus those referenced in the explanation, reporting two directional errors—**O** → **E** (detected but not mentioned) and **E** → **O** (mentioned but not detected)—with higher values indicating better agreement. Behavior↔Trajectory Consistency converts the predicted trajectory to a meta action via rules and measures its agreement with the predicted behavior; to discourage trivial “keep lane/keep speed,” we compute a weighted accuracy using ADE weights.

## 5.2. Main Results

**Consistency Analysis.** As shown in Table 1, dVLM-AD achieves superior overall consistency compared to autoregressive baselines, highlighting the inherent advantages of diffusion-based reasoning in driving tasks. Across both datasets, *Object*↔*Explanation* alignment remains high, with dVLM-AD approaching 99% accuracy and improving upon the strongest AR baseline by roughly 5%. This indicates that the diffusion model generates explanations that are more faithful to visual evidence and perceived traffic elements. For *Behavior*↔*Trajectory*, there is a noticeable asymmetry between longitudinal and lateral alignment. Longitudinal reasoning proves more challenging due to AR-based VLMs’ tendency to produce inconsistent velocity plans—such as declaring a *stop* or *slow down* while actually accelerating (Fig. 5)—whereas lateral behaviors, typically governed by navigation commands, remain more stable. Moreover, nuScenes yields higher overall consistency than WOD-E2E, as its simpler traffic conditions often involve straightforward maneuvers like *go straight* or *keep speed*. Finally, under identical model capacity and training data, the diffusion-based dVLM-AD surpasses its autoregressive counterpart (VLM-AD) on planning metrics, reducing collision rate by about 9% and increasing human-rated RFS by 6%. These results collectively validate that diffusion VLMs serve as a more reliable backbone for achieving semantically consistent and safe autonomous driving plans.

**WOD-E2E Results.** Table 2 presents performance comparisons on the WOD-E2E test set, which specifically targets long-tail driving scenarios. Our dVLM-AD obtains the highest RFS (7.633) despite using fewer trajectories (29.3k) and a weaker backbone (LLaDA-V) than the leading AR-based method AutoVLA (RFS 7.557) with 52.8k trajectories and backbone Qwen2.5-VL. Note that the zero-shot models OpenEMMA and LightEMMA achieve substantially lower RFS (5.158 and 6.517 respectively) and much higher ADE@5s, underscoring the difficulty of the benchmark for methods without fine-tuned planning. The superior RFS and lowest ADE@3s achieved by our model indicate that diffusion-based VLMs are not only more human-aligned but also more accurate in short-horizon trajectory forecasting under rare and complex driving conditions.






Figure 5. Examples of our *dVLM-AD* demonstrate stronger consistency between reasoning and action than autoregressive VLMs.

**nuScenes Results.** We evaluate *dVLM-AD* on the nuScenes validation set, as shown in Table 3. For a fair comparison, baselines are restricted to traditional training-based driving policies and VLM/VLA systems that jointly output both reasoning and trajectory. Under this protocol, *dVLM-AD* achieves trajectory accuracy comparable to the strongest VLM/VLA while simultaneously providing coupled reasoning–trajectory outputs. Zero-shot VLM/VLA baselines exhibit noticeably larger errors, underscoring the value of structured planning supervision, whereas traditional policies remain competitive on L2 but do not yield explicit reasoning.

### 5.3. Ablation Studies

**Denoise Strategies.** As mentioned in Section 4.1, we compare a naive fixed-slot denoising scheme with our dynamic denoise strategy under identical backbones, training data, and prompts; only the decoding policy differs. As shown in Table 4, the naive strategy yields substantially lower accuracy on both longitudinal (46.30) and lateral (26.50) behaviors, averaging 36.40. A diagnostic of the lateral predictions reveals a pronounced length-matching bias: because the template reserves five masked tokens for the lateral slot, the model disproportionately outputs *right\_lane\_change*—the longest behavior phrase in our meta behavior set—with 43% of lateral predictions collapsing to this single class. In contrast, our method introduces a dynamic denoise policy with a sentinel *reduce token* and a short warm-up, allowing spans to terminate early once sufficient evidence is formed rather than filling all reserved blanks.

**Prompt Perturbation.** We inject harmful prompts directly into the user navigation command, considering two perturbations, *Order Perturbation (OP)* and *Trajectory Omission (TO)*, that explicitly target the decoding pipeline. OP dis-

Table 4. Comparison of different denoise strategies.

Method	longitudinal	lateral	Avg.
Naive	46.30	26.50	36.40
Ours	74.40 (+28.10)	85.70 (+59.20)	80.05 (+43.65)

Table 5. Comparison between VLM-AD and *dVLM-AD* under different prompt perturbations. *OP* corresponds to **Order Perturbation**, and *TO* corresponds to **Trajectory Omission**. Values in (red) denote the relative degradation compared to the vanilla setting.

Model	Strategy	RFS↑	ADE (5s)↓	Cons.↑	SR (%)↓
VLM-AD	Vanilla	7.42	2.34	71.50	—
	OP	7.16 (-0.26)	3.17 (+0.83)	68.55 (-2.95)	100.0%
	TO	5.39 (-2.03)	11.41 (+9.07)	40.65 (-30.85)	94.89%
<i>dVLM-AD</i>	Vanilla	7.66	2.51	80.05	—
	OP	7.58 (-0.08)	2.60 (+0.09)	79.80 (-0.25)	0.00%
	TO	7.49 (-0.17)	2.59 (+0.08)	76.55 (-3.50)	0.00%

rupts the mandated step order (e.g., forcing trajectory generation before perception/objects), while *TO* coerces the model to continue emitting reasoning until the output budget is exhausted, preventing trajectory emission; implementation details are provided in the appendix. As shown in Table 5, AR-based VLM-AD exhibits pronounced degradation under both perturbations, whereas the diffusion, template-anchored *dVLM-AD* maintains planning quality and consistency under any perturbation. These results indicate that schedule- and budget-level prompt manipulations can severely compromise autoregressive planners, while schema-constrained infilling confers robustness in our setting.

## 6. Conclusion

We present *dVLM-AD*, a diffusion-based vision–language model addressing two central challenges in driving VLMs: (i) *reasoning–action inconsistency* and (ii) *uncontrollable generation*. By anchoring generation to a schema and refin-



ing bidirectionally, *dVLM-AD* tightly couples the reasoning trace with predicted actions while constraining decoding to the prescribed structure. Empirically, this delivers more reliable reasoning–action consistency and greater robustness to prompt perturbations on nuScenes and WOD-E2E under matched training settings. Despite employing a relatively weak backbone and textual waypoints, *dVLM-AD* achieves planning performance comparable to existing driving VLMs/VLAs. Our future work will focus on accelerating runtime of dVLMs and adopting action-centric decoders that embed physics priors to further improve reliability.

## References

- [1] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:23716–23736, 2022. 2
- [2] Hidehisa Arai, Keita Miwa, Kento Sasaki, Kohei Watanabe, Yu Yamaguchi, Shunsuke Aoki, and Issei Yamamoto. Covla: Comprehensive vision-language-action dataset for autonomous driving. In *2025 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 1933–1943. IEEE, 2025. 1, 3, 6
- [3] Jacob Austin, Daniel D. Johnson, Jonathan Ho, Daniel Tarlow, and Rianne van den Berg. Structured denoising diffusion models in discrete state-spaces. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. 3
- [4] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 4
- [5] Kevin Black, Noah Brown, Danny Driess, Adnan Esmail, Michael Equi, Chelsea Finn, Niccolo Fusai, Lachy Groom, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Szymon Jakubczak, Tim Jones, Liyiming Ke, Sergey Levine, Adrian Li-Bell, Mohith Mothukuri, Suraj Nair, Karl Pertsch, Lucy Xiaoyang Shi, James Tanner, Quan Vuong, Anna Walling, Haohuan Wang, and Ury Zhilinsky.  $\pi_0$ : A vision-language-action flow model for general robot control, 2024. 1, 3
- [6] Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Xi Chen, Krzysztof Choromanski, Tianli Ding, Danny Driess, Avinava Dubey, Chelsea Finn, Pete Florence, Chuyuan Fu, Montse Gonzalez Arenas, Keerthana Gopalakrishnan, Kehang Han, Karol Hausman, Alexander Herzog, Jasmine Hsu, Brian Ichter, Alex Irpan, Nikhil Joshi, Ryan Julian, Dmitry Kalashnikov, Yuheng Kuang, Isabel Leal, Lisa Lee, Tsang-Wei Edward Lee, Sergey Levine, Yao Lu, Henryk Michalewski, Igor Mordatch, Karl Pertsch, Kanishka Rao, Krista Reymann, Michael Ryoo, Grecia Salazar, Panag Sanketi, Pierre Sermanet, Jaspiar Singh, Anikait Singh, Radu Soricut, Huong Tran, Vincent Vanhoucke, Quan Vuong, Ayzaan Wahid, Stefan Welker, Paul Wohlhart, Jialin Wu, Fei Xia, Ted Xiao, Peng Xu, Sichun Xu, Tianhe Yu, and Brianna Zitkovich. Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control, 2023. 1, 3
- [7] Holger Caesar, Varun Bankiti, Alex H Lang, Sourabh Vora, Venice Erin Liong, Qiang Xu, Anush Krishnan, Yu Pan, Giancarlo Baldan, and Oscar Beijbom. nuscenes: A multi-modal dataset for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 11621–11631, 2020. 3, 4, 6
- [8] Haohan Chi, Huan ang Gao, Ziming Liu, Jianing Liu, Chenyu Liu, Jinwei Li, Kaisen Yang, Yangcheng Yu, Zeda Wang, Wenyi Li, Leichen Wang, Xingtao Hu, Hao Sun, Hang Zhao, and Hao Zhao. Impromptu v1a: Open weights and open data for driving vision-language-action models, 2025. 3
- [9] Haohan Chi, Huan-ang Gao, Ziming Liu, Jianing Liu, Chenyu Liu, Jinwei Li, Kaisen Yang, Yangcheng Yu, Zeda Wang, Wenyi Li, et al. Impromptu v1a: Open weights and open data for driving vision-language-action models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23757*, 2025. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7
- [10] DeepMind. Gemini diffusion: Our state-of-the-art, experimental text diffusion model. <https://deepmind.google/models/gemini-diffusion/>, 2025. Accessed: 2025-11-06. 2
- [11] Ishaan Gulrajani and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Likelihood-based diffusion language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:16693–16715, 2023. 2
- [12] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025. 2
- [13] Yuhao Hao, Zhengning Li, Lei Sun, Weilong Wang, Naixin Yi, Sheng Song, Caihong Qin, Mofan Zhou, Yifei Zhan, and Xianpeng Lang. Driveaction: A benchmark for exploring human-like driving decisions in v1a models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.05667*, 2025. 3, 6
- [14] Yihan Hu, Jiazhi Yang, Li Chen, Keyu Li, Chonghao Sima, Xizhou Zhu, Siqi Chai, Senyao Du, Tianwei Lin, Wenhao Wang, et al. Planning-oriented autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 17853–17862, 2023. 1, 7
- [15] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 43(2):1–55, 2025. 2
- [16] Yuyi Huang, Runzhe Zhan, Lidia S. Chao, Ailin Tao, and Derek F. Wong. Path drift in large reasoning models: how first-person commitments override safety, 2025. 2
- [17] Chia-Yu Hung, Qi Sun, Pengfei Hong, Amir Zadeh, Chuan Li, U-Xuan Tan, Navonil Majumder, and Soujanya Poria. Nora: A small open-sourced generalist vision language action model for embodied tasks, 2025. 3
- [18] Jyh-Jing Hwang, Runsheng Xu, Hubert Lin, Wei-Chih Hung, Jingwei Ji, Kristy Choi, Di Huang, Tong He, Paul Covington, Benjamin Sapp, et al. Emma: End-to-end multimodal model for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.23262*, 2024. 1
- [19] Physical Intelligence, Kevin Black, Noah Brown, James Darpinian, Karan Dhabalia, Danny Driess, Adnan Esmail, Michael Equi, Chelsea Finn, Niccolo Fusai, Manuel Y. Galkner, Dibya Ghosh, Lachy Groom, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, Szymon Jakubczak, Tim Jones, Liyiming Ke, Devin LeBlanc, Sergey Levine, Adrian Li-Bell, Mohith Mothukuri, Suraj Nair, Karl Pertsch, Allen Z. Ren, Lucy Xiaoyang Shi, Laura Smith, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Kyle Stachowicz, James Tanner, Quan Vuong, Homer Walke, Anna Walling, Haohuan Wang, Lili Yu, and Ury Zhilinsky.  $\pi_{0.5}$ : a vision-language-action model with open-world generalization, 2025. 1, 3
- [20] Ayesha Ishaq, Jean Lahoud, Ketan More, Omkar Thawakar, Ritesh Thawkar, Dinura Dissanayake, Noor Ahsan, Yuhao

- Li, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, Hisham Cholakkal, Ivan Laptev, Rao Muhammad Anwer, and Salman Khan. Drivelm-o1: A step-by-step reasoning dataset and large multimodal model for driving scenario understanding, 2025. 6
- [21] Anqing Jiang, Yu Gao, Zhigang Sun, Yiru Wang, Jijun Wang, Jinghao Chai, Qian Cao, Yuwen Heng, Hao Jiang, Yunda Dong, et al. Diffvla: Vision-language guided diffusion planning for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.19381*, 2025. 3
- [22] Anqing Jiang, Yu Gao, Yiru Wang, Zhigang Sun, Shuo Wang, Yuwen Heng, Hao Sun, Shichen Tang, Lijuan Zhu, Jinhao Chai, et al. Irl-vla: Training an vision-language-action policy via reward world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.06571*, 2025. 1
- [23] Bo Jiang, Shaoyu Chen, Qing Xu, Bencheng Liao, Jiajie Chen, Helong Zhou, Qian Zhang, Wenyu Liu, Chang Huang, and Xinggang Wang. Vad: Vectorized scene representation for efficient autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8340–8350, 2023. 1, 7
- [24] Moo Jin Kim, Karl Pertsch, Siddharth Karamcheti, Ted Xiao, Ashwin Balakrishna, Suraj Nair, Rafael Rafailov, Ethan Foster, Grace Lam, Pannag Sanketi, Quan Vuong, Thomas Kollar, Benjamin Burchfiel, Russ Tedrake, Dorsa Sadigh, Sergey Levine, Percy Liang, and Chelsea Finn. Openvla: An open-source vision-language-action model, 2024. 1, 3
- [25] Martin Kuo, Jianyi Zhang, Aolin Ding, Qinsi Wang, Louis Di-Valentin, Yujia Bao, Wei Wei, Hai Li, and Yiran Chen. H-cot: Hijacking the chain-of-thought safety reasoning mechanism to jailbreak large reasoning models, including openai o1/o3, deepseek-r1, and gemini 2.0 flash thinking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.12893*, 2025. 2
- [26] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Peiyuan Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, et al. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 2, 4
- [27] Jinsong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Jiaqi Wang, and Dahua Lin. Beyond fixed: Training-free variable-length denoising for diffusion large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.00819*, 2025. 5
- [28] Pengxiang Li, Yanan Zheng, Yue Wang, Huimin Wang, Hang Zhao, Jingjing Liu, Xianyu Zhan, Kun Zhan, and Xianpeng Lang. Discrete diffusion for reflective vision-language-action models in autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.20109*, 2025. 3
- [29] Pengxiang Li, Yefan Zhou, Dilxat Muhtar, Lu Yin, Shilin Yan, Li Shen, Yi Liang, Soroush Vosoughi, and Shiwei Liu. Diffusion language models know the answer before decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.19982*, 2025. 5
- [30] Wei Li, Renshan Zhang, Rui Shao, Jie He, and Liqiang Nie. Cogvla: Cognition-aligned vision-language-action model via instruction-driven routing & sparsification, 2025. 3
- [31] Xiang Li, John Thickstun, Ishaan Gulrajani, Percy S Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Diffusion-lm improves controllable text generation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:4328–4343, 2022. 2, 3
- [32] Yongkang Li, Kaixin Xiong, Xiangyu Guo, Fang Li, Sixu Yan, Gangwei Xu, Lijun Zhou, Long Chen, Haiyang Sun, Bing Wang, et al. Recogdrive: A reinforced cognitive framework for end-to-end autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08052*, 2025. 3
- [33] Zhiqi Li, Zhiding Yu, Shiyi Lan, Jiahao Li, Jan Kautz, Tong Lu, and Jose M Alvarez. Is ego status all you need for open-loop end-to-end autonomous driving? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14864–14873, 2024. 7
- [34] Zhixuan Liang, Yizhuo Li, Tianshuo Yang, Chengyue Wu, Sitong Mao, Liua Pei, Xiaokang Yang, Jiangmiao Pang, Yao Mu, and Ping Luo. Discrete diffusion vla: Bringing discrete diffusion to action decoding in vision-language-action policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20072*, 2025. 3
- [35] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:34892–34916, 2023. 2
- [36] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 26296–26306, 2024. 2
- [37] Aaron Lou, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. Discrete diffusion modeling by estimating the ratios of the data distribution. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 3
- [38] Yuechen Luo, Fang Li, Shaoqing Xu, Zhiyi Lai, Lei Yang, Qimao Chen, Ziang Luo, Zixun Xie, Shengyin Jiang, Jiaxin Liu, et al. Adathinkdrive: Adaptive thinking via reinforcement learning for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.13769*, 2025. 3
- [39] Shen Nie, Fengqi Zhu, Zebin You, Xiaolu Zhang, Jingyang Ou, Jun Hu, Jun Zhou, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Chongxuan Li. Large language diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09992*, 2025. 2, 3, 4
- [40] NVIDIA, :, Yan Wang, Wenjie Luo, Junjie Bai, Yulong Cao, Tong Che, Ke Chen, Yuxiao Chen, Jenna Diamond, Yifan Ding, Wenhao Ding, Liang Feng, Greg Heinrich, Jack Huang, Peter Karkus, Boyi Li, Pinyi Li, Tsung-Yi Lin, Dongran Liu, Ming-Yu Liu, Langechuan Liu, Zhijian Liu, Jason Lu, Yunxiang Mao, Pavlo Molchanov, Lindsey Pavao, Zhenghao Peng, Mike Ranzinger, Ed Schmerling, Shida Shen, Yunfei Shi, Sarah Tariq, Ran Tian, Tilman Wekel, Xinshuo Weng, Tianjun Xiao, Eric Yang, Xiaodong Yang, Yurong You, Xiaohui Zeng, Wenyuan Zhang, Boris Ivanovic, and Marco Pavone. Alpamayo-r1: Bridging reasoning and action prediction for generalizable autonomous driving in the long tail, 2025. 2, 6
- [41] OpenAI. Introducing gpt-4.1 in the api, 2025. OpenAI. 6
- [42] Zhijie Qiao, Haowei Li, Zhong Cao, and Henry X Liu. Lightemma: Lightweight end-to-end multimodal model for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00284*, 2025. 6, 7
- [43] Alexander Robey, Zachary Ravichandran, Vijay Kumar, Hamed Hassani, and George J Pappas. Jailbreaking llm-controlled robots. In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 11948–11956. IEEE, 2025. 2
- [44] Luke Rowe, Rodrigue de Schaetzen, Roger Girgis, Christopher Pal, and Liam Paull. Poutine: Vision-language-trajectory

- pre-training and reinforcement learning post-training enable robust end-to-end autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.11234*, 2025. 3, 5, 6
- [45] Subham Sekhar Sahoo, Marianne Arriola, Aaron Gokaslan, Edgar Mariano Marroquin, Alexander M Rush, Yair Schiff, Justin T Chiu, and Volodymyr Kuleshov. Simple and effective masked diffusion language models. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. 3
- [46] Jiaxin Shi, Kehang Han, Zhe Wang, Arnaud Doucet, and Michalis Titsias. Simplified and generalized masked diffusion for discrete data. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. 3
- [47] Chonghao Sima, Katrin Renz, Kashyap Chitta, Li Chen, Hanxue Zhang, Chengen Xie, Jens Beißwenger, Ping Luo, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. Drivelm: Driving with graph visual question answering. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 256–274. Springer, 2024. 3, 5, 6
- [48] Octo Model Team, Dibya Ghosh, Homer Walke, Karl Pertsch, Kevin Black, Oier Mees, Sudeep Dasari, Joey Hejna, Tobias Kreiman, Charles Xu, Jianlan Luo, You Liang Tan, Lawrence Yunliang Chen, Pannag Sanketi, Quan Vuong, Ted Xiao, Dorsa Sadigh, Chelsea Finn, and Sergey Levine. Octo: An open-source generalist robot policy, 2024. 3
- [49] Qwen Team. Qwen3 technical report, 2025. 3, 6
- [50] Ran Tian, Boyi Li, Xinshuo Weng, Yuxiao Chen, Edward Schmerling, Yue Wang, Boris Ivanovic, and Marco Pavone. Tokenize the world into object-level knowledge to address long-tail events in autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.00959*, 2024. 1
- [51] Xiaoyu Tian, Junru Gu, Bailin Li, Yicheng Liu, Yang Wang, Zhiyong Zhao, Kun Zhan, Peng Jia, Xianpeng Lang, and Hang Zhao. Drivevlm: The convergence of autonomous driving and large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12289*, 2024. 1, 5, 7
- [52] Michael Tschanen, Alexey Gritsenko, Xiao Wang, Muhammad Ferjad Naeem, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Nikhil Parthasarathy, Talfan Evans, Lucas Beyer, Ye Xia, Basil Mustafa, et al. Siglip 2: Multilingual vision-language encoders with improved semantic understanding, localization, and dense features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.14786*, 2025. 4
- [53] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 4
- [54] Tianqi Wang, Enze Xie, Ruihang Chu, Zhenguo Li, and Ping Luo. Drivecot: Integrating chain-of-thought reasoning with end-to-end driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.16996*, 2024. 3
- [55] Weiyun Wang, Zhangwei Gao, Lixin Gu, Hengjun Pu, Long Cui, Xingguang Wei, Zhaoyang Liu, Linglin Jing, Shenglong Ye, Jie Shao, et al. Internvl3. 5: Advancing open-source multimodal models in versatility, reasoning, and efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.18265*, 2025. 6
- [56] Yinjie Wang, Ling Yang, Bowen Li, Ye Tian, Ke Shen, and Mengdi Wang. Revolutionizing reinforcement learning framework for diffusion large language models, 2025. 3
- [57] Waymo LLC. Waymo open dataset: 2025 end-to-end driving challenge, 2025. Accessed: November 12, 2025. 3, 7
- [58] Junjie Wen, Minjie Zhu, Jiaming Liu, Zhiyuan Liu, Yicun Yang, Linfeng Zhang, Shanghang Zhang, Yichen Zhu, and Yi Xu. dvla: Diffusion vision-language-action model with multimodal chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25681*, 2025. 3
- [59] Yuqing Wen, Hebei Li, Kefan Gu, Yucheng Zhao, Tiancai Wang, and Xiaoyan Sun. Llada-vla: Vision language diffusion action models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.06932*, 2025. 3
- [60] Shuo Xing, Chengyuan Qian, Yuping Wang, Hongyuan Hua, Kexin Tian, Yang Zhou, and Zhengzhong Tu. Openemma: Open-source multimodal model for end-to-end autonomous driving, 2025. 6, 7
- [61] Zhen Xiong, Yujun Cai, Zhecheng Li, and Yiwei Wang. Unveiling the potential of diffusion large language model in controllable generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.04504*, 2025. 2, 5
- [62] Runsheng Xu, Hubert Lin, Wonseok Jeon, Hao Feng, Yuliang Zou, Liting Sun, John Gorman, Kate Tolstaya, Sarah Tang, Brandyn White, et al. Wod-e2e: Waymo open dataset for end-to-end driving in challenging long-tail scenarios. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.26125*, 2025. 5, 6, 7
- [63] Yi Xu, Yuxin Hu, Zaiwei Zhang, Gregory P Meyer, Siva Karthik Mustikovela, Siddhartha Srinivasa, Eric M Wolff, and Xin Huang. Vlm-ad: End-to-end autonomous driving through vision-language model supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.14446*, 2024. 1
- [64] Ling Yang, Ye Tian, Bowen Li, Xincheng Zhang, Ke Shen, Yunhai Tong, and Mengdi Wang. Mmada: Multimodal large diffusion language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15809*, 2025. 2, 3
- [65] Yi Yang, Jiaxuan Sun, Siqi Kou, Yihan Wang, and Zhijie Deng. Lohovla: A unified vision-language-action model for long-horizon embodied tasks, 2025. 3
- [66] Jiacheng Ye, Zhihui Xie, Lin Zheng, Jiahui Gao, Zirui Wu, Xin Jiang, Zhenguo Li, and Lingpeng Kong. Dream 7b: Diffusion large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.15487*, 2025. 2, 3
- [67] Zebin You, Shen Nie, Xiaolu Zhang, Jun Hu, Jun Zhou, Zhiwu Lu, Ji-Rong Wen, and Chongxuan Li. Llada-v: Large language diffusion models with visual instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16933*, 2025. 2, 3, 4, 5
- [68] Runpeng Yu, Xinyin Ma, and Xinchao Wang. Dimple: Discrete diffusion multimodal large language model with parallel decoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16990*, 2025. 2, 3
- [69] Zhenlong Yuan, Jing Tang, Jinguo Luo, Rui Chen, Chengxuan Qian, Lei Sun, Xiangxiang Chu, Yujun Cai, Dapeng Zhang, and Shuo Li. Autodrive-r<sup>2</sup>: Incentivizing reasoning and self-reflection capacity for vla model in autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.01944*, 2025. 3
- [70] Shuang Zeng, Xinyuan Chang, Mengwei Xie, Xinran Liu, Yifan Bai, Zheng Pan, Mu Xu, and Xing Wei. Futuresightdrive: Thinking visually with spatio-temporal cot for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17685*, 2025. 3



- [71] Xingcheng Zhou, Xuyuan Han, Feng Yang, Yunpu Ma, and Alois C Knoll. Opendrivevla: Towards end-to-end autonomous driving with large vision language action model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23463*, 2025. [1](#), [5](#)
- [72] Xingcheng Zhou, Xuyuan Han, Feng Yang, Yunpu Ma, and Alois C. Knoll. Opendrivevla: Towards end-to-end autonomous driving with large vision language action model, 2025. [3](#)
- [73] Zewei Zhou, Tianhui Cai, Seth Z Zhao, Yun Zhang, Zhiyu Huang, Bolei Zhou, and Jiaqi Ma. Autovla: A vision-language-action model for end-to-end autonomous driving with adaptive reasoning and reinforcement fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13757*, 2025. [1](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#)
- [74] Zewei Zhou, Tianhui Cai, Seth Z. Zhao, Yun Zhang, Zhiyu Huang, Bolei Zhou, and Jiaqi Ma. Autovla: A vision-language-action model for end-to-end autonomous driving with adaptive reasoning and reinforcement fine-tuning, 2025. [3](#)
- [75] Zhongyi Zhou, Yichen Zhu, Junjie Wen, Chaomin Shen, and Yi Xu. Chatvla-2: Vision-language-action model with open-world embodied reasoning from pretrained knowledge, 2025. [3](#)
- [76] Fengqi Zhu, Rongzhen Wang, Shen Nie, Xiaolu Zhang, Chunwei Wu, Jun Hu, Jun Zhou, Jianfei Chen, Yankai Lin, Ji-Rong Wen, and Chongxuan Li. Llada 1.5: Variance-reduced preference optimization for large language diffusion models, 2025. [3](#)