

# ParaEQsA: Parallel and Asynchronous Embodied Questions Scheduling and Answering

Haisheng Wang<sup>1</sup>

Weiming Zhi<sup>2,3,4</sup>

**Abstract**—This paper formulates the Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA) problem, introduces a corresponding benchmark, and proposes a system to tackle the problem. Classical Embodied Question Answering (EQA) is typically formulated as answering *one single* question by actively exploring a 3D environment. Real deployments, however, often demand handling *multiple* questions that may arrive asynchronously and carry different urgencies. We formalize this setting as Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA) and present ParaEQsA, a framework for *parallel, urgency-aware* scheduling and answering. ParaEQsA leverages a group memory module shared among questions to reduce redundant exploration, and a priority-planning module to dynamically schedule questions. To evaluate this setting, we contribute the Parallel Asynchronous Embodied Questions (PAEQs) benchmark containing 40 indoor scenes and five questions per scene (200 in total), featuring asynchronous follow-up questions and urgency labels. We further propose metrics for EQsA performance: Direct Answer Rate (DAR), and Normalized Urgency-Weighted Latency (NUWL), which jointly measure efficiency and responsiveness of this system. ParaEQsA consistently outperforms strong sequential baselines adapted from recent EQA systems, while reducing exploration and delay. Empirical evaluations investigate the relative contributions of priority, urgency modeling, spatial scope, reward estimation, and dependency reasoning within our framework. Together, these results demonstrate that urgency-aware, parallel scheduling is key to making embodied agents responsive and efficient under realistic, multi-question workloads.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Embodied agents, such as household assistants and service robots, are increasingly expected to operate effectively in complex, human-centric environments. Embodied Question Answering (EQA) is a fundamental precursor for integrating these agents into complex and interactive environments. Here, an agent must actively explore its surroundings to find the answer to a user’s question. This task serves as a crucial benchmark for an agent’s ability to perceive, navigate, and reason within a physical space.

However, existing EQA paradigms often oversimplify the nature of human-robot interaction by focusing on answering a single, isolated question at a time. In reality, interactions are much more dynamic and complex: several users might pose initial questions and then follow up with subsequent related questions. These questions can arrive asynchronously and possess varying degrees of urgency. For instance, a rescue

robot entering a disaster scene may be asked to locate the main staircase, and then receive a high-priority follow-up question about the presence of trapped civilians while exploring. Similarly, a factory assistant may need to simultaneously monitor sensor data, check inventory levels, and respond to urgent safety alerts. Current EQA frameworks are ill-equipped to handle such multifaceted scenarios, limiting their applicability in the real world.

To bridge this gap, we introduce and formulate a novel problem setting: Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA). As shown in Figure 1, an agent is presented with an initial set of questions and must handle additional follow-up queries that arise later. This setting requires an agent not only to answer individual questions but also to manage a dynamic task list and strategically plan its exploration to gather information for concurrent objectives.

We propose **Parallel Embodied Questions Answering (ParaEQsA)**, a novel framework designed specifically to tackle the EQsA problem. ParaEQsA integrates a priority-planning module to dynamically schedule questions, and a group memory module shared among questions to reduce repeated exploration. It parallelizes exploration by considering the urgency, dependencies, and informational overlap between questions, enabling the agent to operate more efficiently and responsively in complex, dynamic scenarios.

Furthermore, to facilitate research and evaluation in this domain, we introduce the **Parallel Asynchronous Embodied Questions (PAEQs)** dataset, the first benchmark designed for the EQsA task. PAEQs is developed based on the Habitat-Matterport 3D Research Dataset (HM3D) with photo-realistic and diverse indoor 3D scans [1]. It features complex scenarios with multiple interdependent and asynchronous questions. To complement this dataset, we also propose novel evaluation metrics to capture successful attempts for EQsA, including the **Direct Answer Rate (DAR)** and **Normalized Urgency-Weighted Latency (NUWL)**, balancing answer accuracy with the punctuality to urgent queries.

In summary, our primary contributions are threefold:

- We introduce and formulate EQsA, a novel problem setting that requires an agent to answer a set of initial questions and asynchronous follow-up questions in parallel, reflecting realistic human-robot interactions.
- We propose ParaEQsA, a practical framework engineered to solve the EQsA problem, featuring a novel priority planning and question scheduling mechanism.
- We develop the PAEQs dataset, the first benchmark for the EQsA task, and introduce a suite of new metrics, including DAR and NUWL, for a comprehensive and

email: 10235101559@stu.ecnu.edu.cn; weiming.zhi@sydney.edu.au.

Project page: <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/para-eqsa>

<sup>1</sup> Software Engineering Institute, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China

<sup>2</sup> School of Computer Science, The University of Sydney, Australia.

<sup>3</sup> College of Connected Computing, Vanderbilt University, TN, USA.

<sup>4</sup> Robotics Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.




Fig. 1: An overview of our proposed Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA) problem. The system processes both initial questions and asynchronous follow-up questions with various urgency levels. A group memory module aggregates contextual information shared among questions. This setup enables strategic prioritization, significantly enhancing the efficiency and responsiveness of the question-answering.

nanced evaluation of agent performance.

## II. RELATED WORK

**Embodied Question Answering:** Embodied Question Answering (EQA) was introduced by Das et al. [2] as a task where an agent must navigate a 3D environment to answer a given question, combining navigation, perception, and language understanding. Subsequent work [3], [4], [5], [6] extends EQA in various directions. Yu et al. [7] studied multi-target EQA, where an agent may need to find multiple objects to answer a query, and Tan et al. [8] introduced Knowledge-based EQA (K-EQA), in which external commonsense knowledge and a scene graph are used to answer compositional queries. Recent efforts include open-vocabulary and foundation-model based approaches: Majumdar et al. [9] proposed OpenEQA with open-vocabulary, human-generated questions in real environments, and Patel et al. [10] leverage multiple large language models to coordinate in EQA. Dorbala et al. [11] tackle situational queries (S-EQA) requiring consensus over object states. Ren et al. [12] focus on efficient exploration for single-question EQA. However, all these prior works only consider one question per episode. In contrast, ParaEQsA addresses groups of related questions (EQsA), requiring multi-question planning and persistent reasoning across queries.

**Memory Mechanisms for Embodied Agents:** Memory plays a critical role in embodied tasks. Classical memory-augmented neural networks (e.g., End-to-End Memory Networks [13], Differentiable Neural Computer [14], LSTM-based memory [15], [16]) enable agents to store and recall information. In embodied navigation and QA, structured spatial memory has been explicitly studied: Parisotto and Salakhutdinov [17] proposed Neural Map, a learned 2D spatial memory for navigation, and Chaplot et al. [18] developed Active Neural SLAM to build and use a learned map during exploration. Zhai et al. [19] introduced a memory-centric

EQA architecture (MemoryEQA) that maintains hierarchical memory interacting with all model components. Tan et al. [8] similarly emphasize episodic scene-graph memory in K-EQA, showing that maintaining memory across turns dramatically reduces navigation effort. ParaEQsA extends these ideas by enabling group-level memory across an entire set of questions, thereby allowing information gathered for one question to be reused for others and reducing redundancy.

**Priority-Driven Task Planning:** Planning under multiple objectives or tasks [20], [21], [22], [23], [24] often requires prioritization. In multi-robot systems, decoupled planning with priority ordering has been studied: for instance, Bennewitz et al. [25] optimize priority schemes to minimize joint path lengths, illustrating how task priorities influence planning success. In robotic control, hierarchical task stacks enforce high-priority (e.g., safety) tasks before normal tasks [26]. The task-level planning can then be used to guide the sequencing of primitive-level learning [27], [28]. In reinforcement learning, multi-task curricula can be set by difficulty or priority: Cho et al. [29] propose dynamically scheduling harder tasks first to improve learning efficiency. These works motivate the need for task weighting. ParaEQsA incorporates a weighted prioritization mechanism for answering multiple questions and extends prior planning approaches by explicitly integrating question-level importance into EQsA task scheduling.

## III. THE EMBODIED QUESTIONS ANSWERING PROBLEM

We formalize a novel, challenging task, Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA), where an embodied agent must schedule and answer a dynamic group of questions within a 3D environment. This contrasts with Embodied Question Answering (EQA), which focuses on a single question.

**Distribution of Scenarios for EQsA:** We define a *scenario* as a tuple  $\xi := (e, T, g^0, Q_{init}, Q_{follow})$ , where:

- $e$  is a simulated or real 3D scene.

- $T$  is the maximum number of time steps allowed for exploration.
- $g^0$  is the agent’s initial pose (2D position and orientation at time  $t = 0$ ).
- $\mathcal{Q}_{init}$  is a set of initial questions given to the agent at the start of the scenario.
- $\mathcal{Q}_{follow}$  is a set of follow-up questions that are asynchronously introduced during the exploration process.

Each question  $q_i$  is a tuple  $(s_i, u_i, y_i, t_i)$ , where  $s_i$  is the question text,  $u_i \in (0, 1)$  is its urgency value,  $y_i$  is the ground truth answer, and  $t_i \geq 0$  is its arrival time. For each question  $q_j$  in the initial set  $\mathcal{Q}_{init}$ , its arrival time is  $t_j = 0$ . We will use a subscript to indicate the scenario (e.g.,  $T_\xi$ ) and a superscript for time steps (e.g.,  $g^t$ ).

In this work, we consider four-option multiple-choice questions. Thus, the set of possible labels for any question is  $\mathcal{Y} := \{‘A’, ‘B’, ‘C’, ‘D’\}$ . We assume no prior knowledge of the distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , but we can sample a finite dataset of independent and identically distributed scenarios from it.

**Agent-Environment Interaction:** In any given scenario  $\xi \in \mathcal{D}$ , an autonomous agent is initialized at pose  $g^0$  with no prior knowledge of the 3D scene  $e$ . At each time step  $t$ , the agent navigates to a new pose  $g^t$  using a collision-free planner and captures an RGB image  $I_c^t \in \mathbb{R}^{H_I \times W_I \times 3}$  along with a depth image  $I_d^t$ . This visual information is used to construct the agent’s memory, which is then leveraged by pre-trained Vision-Language Models (VLMs) to answer active questions.

**Efficient and Urgency-Aware Questions Scheduling and Exploration:** In an EQsA task, the agent must take all available questions into account, find an appropriate sequence to answer them, explore the environment to gather necessary information, and provide final answers. Our goal is to optimize the trade-off between overall exploration efficiency (minimizing total time steps) and the latency of individual questions, weighted by their urgency  $u_i$ .

#### IV. PARAEQSA

In this section, we present the methodology of our proposed framework, Parallel Embodied Questions Answering (ParaEQsA). We first provide an overview of the system architecture and its key components, detailing the roles of and interactions between its constituent modules. Subsequently, we elaborate on the priority planning and question scheduling mechanism. Finally, we briefly describe the targeted exploration strategy employed by the agent.

##### A. Framework Components

The ParaEQsA framework is designed as a distributed, microservice-based system to robustly and efficiently address Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA) tasks in parallel. As illustrated in Figure 2, several specialized modules work asynchronously: Questions undergo semantic parsing and an initial answering attempt. Unsolved questions are then sent to the Question Pool and prioritized. The highest-priority question is selected, explored, and answered.




Fig. 2: An overview of the ParaEQsA workflow. Incoming questions are first parsed to extract semantic metadata (e.g., urgency, scope). The Finishing Module attempts to answer them directly using the Group Memory. If unsuccessful, questions are sent to a central Question Pool, from which the Planner selects the highest-priority question for targeted, VLM-guided exploration. Finally, the answering module generates the response, completing the cycle.

**Generator:** This module loads question groups from files, initializes scenes, and sends initial questions and follow-up questions according to a temporal schedule.

**Parser:** Upon receiving a raw question, the Parser utilizes an LLM to analyze its content and enrich it with semantic metadata: *urgency* (e.g., safety-related questions are more urgent) and *scope type* (distinguishing between questions requiring local observation versus global exploration). These attributes are intrinsic to the question, so they are computed only once.

**Finishing Module:** When a parsed question is received, this module queries the Group Memory to retrieve relevant information, based on which it calculates a confidence score. Then the question is either routed to the Answering Module or forwarded to the Question Pool for scheduled exploration.

**Question Pool:** As shown in Figure 3, the Questions Pool maintains a buffer of all questions. The Updater dynamically calculates a priority score for each question based on a weighted combination of its urgency, scope, estimated reward, and status. The status is determined by its dependencies on other questions, which are stored as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG).

**Planner:** The Planner selects the highest-priority question from the Question Pool, and navigates the environment to gather necessary visual information to answer the question.

**Stopping Module:** During exploration, the Stopping Module responds to periodic requests from the Planner regarding whether sufficient information has been gathered and the exploration should stop.

**Answering Module:** This module leverages a VLM and the context provided by the Group Memory to generate final answers to questions from either the Finishing Module (for direct answers) or the Stopping Module (after sufficient exploration).

**Group Memory:** This module maintains a knowledge base of the environment, storing textual and visual information gathered during exploration. A retrieval-based approach is used to handle search requests from other modules. Since the memory is cleared only at the end of each scenario,




Fig. 3: Architecture of the Question Pool. Whenever a question is added to or selected from the Buffer, the Updater processes all buffered questions. Dependencies between questions are resolved and are maintained as a Directed Acyclic Graph (DAG). Then, a priority score  $P$  is calculated for each question based on its urgency, scope, estimated reward, and status.

different questions within the same group can share their knowledge.

These modules communicate asynchronously, primarily through a Redis stream-based messaging queue, allowing ParaEQsA to process multiple questions concurrently and schedule tasks dynamically in a robust manner.

### B. Priority Planning and Questions Scheduling

A core innovation of ParaEQsA is its question scheduling mechanism, managed by the Question Pool (Figure 3). Moving beyond simple first-in-first-out (FIFO) processing, this system employs a priority-based approach to intelligently determine the optimal order for addressing questions.

Whenever a new question arrives, the Updater inside the Question Pool is triggered. The Updater is responsible for calculating a priority score for every question in the pool, which is determined by a weighted formula that considers multiple factors:

$$P(q_i) = w_u \cdot Urgency(q_i) + w_s \cdot Scope(q_i) + w_r \cdot Reward(q_i) + w_d \cdot Dependency(q_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $w_u$ ,  $w_s$ ,  $w_r$ , and  $w_d$  are weighting coefficients. Each component is defined as follows:

- **Urgency** ( $Urgency(q_i)$ ): This component reflects the intrinsic priority of the question. To better distinguish between high-urgency questions, we use a non-linear transformation of the raw urgency value  $u_i$ :

$$Urgency(q_i) = -\ln(1 - u_i) \quad (2)$$

- **Scope** ( $Scope(q_i)$ ): This factor prioritizes questions that can be answered with localized observations over those requiring global exploration, encouraging the agent to address more straightforward questions first. We define  $Scope(q_i)$  as a binary value based on the question's




Fig. 4: Pipeline of the targeted exploration. Before it is answered, the selected question goes through an iterative loop: the agent gets observations, updates the group memory and the semantic map, moves to the next position, searches for relevant group memory, and queries the Stopping Module on whether to stop.

scope type:

$$Scope(q_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if scope is local} \\ 0, & \text{if scope is global} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

- **Reward** ( $Reward(q_i)$ ): The reward value for each question is determined by the number of questions that refer to the same or nearby locations or objects, indicating the expected benefit of answering a question.
- **Dependency** ( $Dependency(q_i)$ ): This factor represents the status of each question. An unexplored question will be marked `ready` unless it has dependencies on other questions. For example, "Is there any dirt on my shirt?" is dependent on "Where can you find my shirt?". The former will be marked `pending` until its dependencies are resolved. Thus,  $Dependency(q_i)$  can be defined as:

$$Dependency(q_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if status is ready} \\ 0, & \text{if status is pending} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Whenever a question is added to or selected from the Question Pool, the reward and dependencies are re-evaluated by LLMs. Having calculated the priority score for each question, the highest-score question in the Question Pool is selected for exploration.

### C. Targeted Exploration

In order to gather information needed for the selected question, ParaEQsA employs a targeted exploration strategy (Figure 4) that aligns with Explore-EQA [12]. At its core, the




Fig. 5: General questions, functional questions and safety-related questions receive low, medium, and high urgency, respectively.

strategy relies on frontier-based exploration, where the agent navigates towards the boundaries of explored space. Specifically, a semantic map, which overlays spatial information with object labels, is constructed. As the agent explores, a VLM analyzes the observation to identify regions and objects relevant to the current question, and assigns them a "semantic value". These values are then used to weight the exploration frontiers, guiding the agent towards regions that are most likely to contain the answer. The entire exploration process is an iterative loop: the agent searches for relevant group memory, acquires observations, updates the semantic map and group memory, and queries the Stopping Module on whether to stop.

Notably, the exploration for a new question  $q_i$  commences from the agent's final pose at the exploration for the preceding question  $q_{i-1}$ . Only for the very first question in a scenario does the agent begin at the initial pose  $g^0$  specified in the dataset. This setup is designed to closely mimic real-world conditions.

## V. CONTRIBUTED BENCHMARK

### A. Parallel Asynchronous Embodied Questions Dataset

While existing EQA datasets predominantly focus on scenarios involving a single, static question, we introduce the Parallel Asynchronous Embodied Questions (PAEQs) dataset to evaluate an agent's ability to schedule, explore, and answer multiple questions that arrive asynchronously and possess varying degrees of urgency.

As shown in Figure 6, the PAEQs dataset is constructed using 40 high-quality, photo-realistic residential scenes selected from the Habitat-Matterport 3D (HM3D) [1] Research Dataset. For each scene, we prepare a set of 5 questions, which are partitioned into two types: 3 initial questions presented at the start of a scenario, and 2 follow-up questions, each with a 120-second delay after the previous question. To ensure a fair and unbiased evaluation, the five questions for each scene are randomly assigned to the initial or follow-up category, ensuring each question has an equal probability of serving in either role. All 200 questions in PAEQs dataset were manually authored and refined through multiple rounds of review to ensure clarity, relevance, and correctness. The corresponding ground-truth answers were also meticulously verified. A key feature of the PAEQs dataset is the urgency field associated with each question. This score, a floating-point value between 0 and 1, was systematically generated

for each question using the open-source `gpt-oss-20b`. To ensure deterministic and consistent outputs, we employed a few-shot prompting strategy with the model's temperature set to 0.

We categorize urgency scores into three levels: low ( $[0, 0.3)$ ), medium ( $[0.3, 0.7)$ ), and high ( $[0.7, 1.0]$ ), which constitute 57.5%, 26.5%, and 16.0% of the dataset, respectively. The urgency of a question is largely correlated with its semantic content. As shown in Figure 5, questions pertaining to general information, functionality, and safety are assigned low, medium, and high urgency, respectively.

It is worth mentioning that the urgency scores in the dataset are only for evaluation purposes. The agent has no prior knowledge of these scores and must infer the urgency of each question based solely on its content.

The 200 questions in the PAEQs dataset are distributed across five semantic categories, reflecting a variety of tasks an embodied agent might encounter:

- **Existence (34.5%)**: Asking if an object is present, e.g., "Is there a bathtub in the bathroom?"
- **Counting (23.0%)**: Asking for the number of objects, e.g., "How many chairs are around the dining table?"
- **State (21.5%)**: Asking about the state of an object, e.g., "Is the TV in the living room turned on?"
- **Identification (14.5%)**: Asking to identify an object's attribute, e.g., "What is the long sofa in the living room made of?"
- **Location (6.5%)**: Asking for the location of an object, e.g., "Where can you find a woven basket?"

Our formulation Section III requires every question to have four multiple-choice answers. For consistency, if a question starts with fewer than four options, we add dummy choices like "D) (Do not choose this option)".

### B. Evaluation Metrics

To comprehensively evaluate the agent's performance in the EQsA task, we introduce a set of metrics that measure not only the correctness of the answers but also the efficiency and responsiveness of the agent's scheduling and exploration strategy. Let  $\mathcal{Q}$  be the set of all questions in a given scenario, where each question  $q_i \in \mathcal{Q}$  has an urgency value  $u_i$ .

1) *Accuracy (Acc)*: The accuracy is calculated as:

$$\text{Acc} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \sum_{q_i \in \mathcal{Q}} \mathbb{I}(\hat{y}_i = y_i) \quad (5)$$

where  $\hat{y}_i$  is the agent's predicted answer for question  $q_i$ ,  $y_i$  is the ground truth answer, and  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function, which is 1 if the condition is true and 0 otherwise.

2) *Direct Answer Rate (DAR)*: This metric quantifies the agent's ability to leverage its memory to answer questions without performing any physical exploration. A higher DAR suggests a more effective use of accumulated knowledge. It is calculated as:

$$\text{DAR} = \frac{|\mathcal{Q}_{\text{direct}}|}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{direct}}$  is the subset of questions that the agent answers from memory (i.e., with zero exploration steps).




Fig. 6: Illustration of the dataset of PAEQs benchmark. Left: dataset examples, including 5 categories of questions. Right: dataset statistics, detailing the distribution across categories and urgency levels.

3) *Normalized Steps (NS)*: For a given question  $q_i$ ,  $ns_i$  is defined as the ratio of  $used\_steps_i$  to  $max\_steps_i$ , where  $used\_steps_i$  is the number of exploration steps taken for question  $q_i$ , and  $max\_steps_i$  is the maximum step allocation for that question. A lower NS value indicates higher efficiency, and  $ns_i = 0$  indicates  $q_i$  is answered directly without exploration. The average value of all questions is then,

$$NS = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \sum_{q_i \in \mathcal{Q}} \frac{used\_steps_i}{max\_steps_i} \quad (7)$$

4) *Normalized Urgency-Weighted Latency (NUWL)*: This is a key metric designed to measure the agent’s ability to schedule questions effectively. It captures the total latency experienced by all questions, weighted by their respective urgency values. A lower NUWL score is desirable, as it indicates that high-urgency questions were answered with minimal delay. The NUWL is defined as:

$$NUWL = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Q}|} \sum_{q_i \in \mathcal{Q}} u_i \cdot \left( \sum_{q_j \in \mathcal{Q}, t_j^{start} < t_i^{req}} ns_j + ns_i \right) \quad (8)$$

where  $u_i$  is the urgency of question  $q_i$ ,  $ns_i$  is its normalized steps,  $t_i^{req}$  is the time when  $q_i$  was requested, and  $t_j^{start}$  is the time when question  $q_j$  is selected and processed.

## VI. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

In this section, we conduct a series of experiments to validate the effectiveness of our proposed ParaEQsA framework. Our evaluation is designed to answer two primary research questions:

- 1) How important is the group memory shared among a set of questions, and to what extent does a parallel problem-solving methodology outperform a sequential one?
- 2) How necessary is priority planning, and what is the relative importance of its key components?

To address these questions, we perform a main experiment comparing ParaEQsA against two baselines and a comprehensive ablation study to dissect the contributions of our priority planning mechanism.

### A. Implementation Details

To balance performance and cost, we utilize GPT5-mini [30] as the main VLM in most modules, and an effective LLM GPT-OSS-20B [31] for non-vision tasks. Semantic annotation tasks are accomplished by a YOLOv11 [32] model, and a lightweight VLM Qwen2.5-VL-7B [33]. For the simulated experiments, we run the selected scenarios from HM3D dataset [1] in the Habitat simulator on a Linux machine with a NVIDIA RTX 3080 Ti GPU. The ParaEQsA approach takes approximately 25 hours to complete all 40 scenarios and 200 questions in the PAEQs dataset.

### B. Baselines

We compare ParaEQsA against two strong baselines adapted for the multi-question EQsA task:

- **Explore-EQA**: This baseline [12] handles questions sequentially and has no group memory shared among questions. This is a strong and widely-used baseline in recent EQA works.
- **Memory-EQA**: This baseline [19] has achieved state-of-the-art (SOTA) accuracy in EQA tasks, which also processes questions in sequence and stores no group memory. Nevertheless, an extra knowledge base is utilized to retain detailed observations between question steps.

All methods are evaluated on the PAEQs dataset, and we report the average performance across all 40 scenarios using the metrics defined in Section V.

TABLE I: Main experiment results comparing ParaEQsA with strong sequential baselines. Our method demonstrates both greater performance and responsiveness.

Method	Acc $\uparrow$	DAR $\uparrow$	NS $\downarrow$	NUWL $\downarrow$
ParaEQsA (Ours)	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.321</b>	<b>0.204</b>
Explore-EQA [12]	0.62	0.00	0.472	0.551
Memory-EQA [19]	0.64	0.00	0.410	0.474

### C. Main Results: ParaEQsA vs. Sequential Baselines

The results, summarized in Table I, clearly demonstrate the comprehensive advantages of our proposed ParaEQsA framework over sequential baselines. Our method shows substantial gains in efficiency and responsiveness, while achieving a comparable accuracy to Memory-EQA, the current SOTA in EQA tasks.

1) *Superior Efficiency and Responsiveness:* The most striking improvements are observed in Normalized Steps (NS) and Normalized Urgency-Weighted Latency (NUWL). ParaEQsA reduces the NS to 0.321, a significant improvement over both Memory-EQA (0.410) and Explore-EQA (0.472). This highlights the effectiveness of the parallel processing architecture. By maintaining a shared group memory, ParaEQsA can often gather information pertinent to multiple questions during a single exploration trajectory, thus minimizing redundant navigation.

This efficiency directly translates into superior responsiveness, as measured by the NUWL metric. Our method achieves an NUWL of 0.204, which is a 57% reduction compared to Memory-EQA (0.474) and a 63% reduction compared to Explore-EQA (0.551). This dramatic improvement is a clear indicator that our priority planning mechanism (Section IV) successfully identifies and expedites high-urgency questions, preventing them from being delayed by less critical queries. The sequential nature of the baselines makes them inherently incapable of such dynamic re-prioritization, especially when it encounters follow-up questions, causing a linear accumulation of latency, which is heavily penalized by the NUWL metric.

2) *Effective Knowledge Reuse:* A key feature of our framework is the ability to answer questions without any exploration, quantified by the Direct Answer Rate (DAR). ParaEQsA achieves a DAR of 9.0%, while both baselines score 0%. This is because the baselines, by design, tackle each question with a new, isolated exploration phase. In contrast, our Finishing Module actively queries the shared group memory before initiating exploration. As the agent navigates the environment to answer one question, it continuously populates the memory with observations. This accumulated knowledge can then be sufficient to immediately answer subsequent or newly-arrived questions, particularly those whose scope falls within already-explored areas. This result strongly supports our problem formulation’s emphasis on treating a group of questions holistically rather than as a series of independent tasks.

In summary, the main experiment results robustly validate our approach. By shifting from a sequential to a parallel and asynchronous paradigm with shared memory and intelligent

TABLE II: Ablation study on the components of the priority planning mechanism. The results confirm that each component contributes to the overall performance, with ParaEQsA, with all its components intact producing the best performance.

Method	Acc $\uparrow$	DAR $\uparrow$	NS $\downarrow$	NUWL $\downarrow$
ParaEQsA	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.090</b>	<b>0.321</b>	<b>0.204</b>
w/o Priority	0.63	0.085	0.398	0.232
w/o Urgency	0.63	0.085	0.385	0.223
w/o Scope	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.090</b>	0.336	0.213
w/o Reward	0.64	0.085	0.374	0.226
w/o Dependency	0.64	0.085	0.341	0.218

priority scheduling, ParaEQsA demonstrates marked superiority in handling the complex, dynamic, and urgency-aware challenges presented by the PAEQs benchmark.

### D. Ablation Study: Priority Planning Components

1) *Experimental Setup:* To investigate the contribution of each component in our priority planning mechanism (Section IV), we conduct an ablation study where we systematically disable each factor from the priority score calculation:

- **w/o Priority:** Disables the entire priority planning module, reverting to a FIFO queue, while the group memory remains active.
- **w/o Urgency:** Removes the urgency component from the priority calculation.
- **w/o Scope:** Removes the scope component that distinguishes between local and global questions.
- **w/o Reward:** Removes the reward component that encourages the agent to explore places with multiple related questions.
- **w/o Dependency:** Removes the dependency-checking component.

2) *Results and Analysis:* The results of the ablation study are presented in Table II. As shown, removing any component of the priority planning system leads to a degradation in performance, particularly in Normalized Steps (NS) and Normalized Urgency-Weighted Latency (NUWL), confirming that each element plays a vital role. Disabling priority planning (w/o Priority) results in a significant performance drop compared to the full model, increasing NUWL by 13.7% and NS by 24.0%. This highlights the fundamental importance of intelligent scheduling over a FIFO approach.

The priority planning strategy comprises four components: *Urgency*, *Scope*, *Reward*, and *Dependency*. Removing *Urgency* leads to a notable increase in NUWL, confirming its importance in ensuring timely responses to critical questions. *Reward* and *Dependency* also prove valuable, as their removal increases both NS and NUWL. *Scope* has a smaller but still noticeable impact, suggesting that prioritizing locally-scoped questions is a useful approach.

In summary, these experiments validate our design choices. The parallel architecture with shared group memory provides a clear advantage over sequential methods, and our multi-faceted priority planning mechanism is crucial for achieving efficient and urgency-aware performance in the complex EQsA task.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we introduced Embodied Questions Answering (EQsA), a novel and more realistic problem setting where an agent must handle multiple, asynchronous questions with varying urgencies. To address this, we proposed ParaEQsA, a parallel framework featuring a shared group memory and a sophisticated priority-planning mechanism. Our experiments, conducted on the contributed PAEQs benchmark, demonstrate that ParaEQsA significantly outperforms strong classical sequential EQA baselines. It achieves superior efficiency in exploration (NS) and responsiveness to urgent queries (NUWL), while also effectively reusing knowledge to answer some questions directly (DAR). These results validate that a parallel, urgency-aware scheduling approach is crucial for developing more capable and practical embodied agents.

A major avenue for future effort lies in extending our framework to not only be *multi-question*, but also *multi-agent*. Under this setup, multiple agents collaboratively explore the environment to solve the EQsA task, potentially leading to even greater efficiency and responsiveness. This would introduce new challenges in decentralized coordination and task allocation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] S. K. Ramakrishnan, A. Gokaslan, E. Wijmans, O. Maksymets, A. Clegg, J. M. Turner, E. Undersander, W. Galuba, A. Westbury, A. X. Chang, M. Savva, Y. Zhao, and D. Batra, "Habitat-matterport 3d dataset (HM3d): 1000 large-scale 3d environments for embodied AI," in *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021.
- [2] A. Das, S. Datta, G. Gkioxari, S. Lee, D. Parikh, and D. Batra, "Embodied question answering," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 1–10, 2018.
- [3] C. Cangea, E. Belilovsky, and A. C. Courville, "Videonavqa: Bridging the gap between visual and embodied question answering," in *30th British Machine Vision Conference 2019, BMVC 2019, Cardiff, UK, September 9-12, 2019*, p. 280, BMVA Press, 2019.
- [4] A. Das, G. Gkioxari, S. Lee, D. Parikh, and D. Batra, "Neural modular control for embodied question answering," in *Conference on robot learning*, pp. 53–62, PMLR, 2018.
- [5] D. Gordon, A. Kembhavi, M. Rastegari, J. Redmon, D. Fox, and A. Farhadi, "Iqa: Visual question answering in interactive environments," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 4089–4098, 2018.
- [6] K. Cheng, Z. Li, X. Sun, B.-C. Min, A. S. Bedi, and A. Bera, "Efficienteqa: An efficient approach to open-vocabulary embodied question answering," 2025.
- [7] L. Yu, X. Chen, G. Gkioxari, M. Bansal, T. L. Berg, and D. Batra, "Multi-target embodied question answering," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 6309–6318, 2019.
- [8] S. Tan, M. Ge, D. Guo, H. Liu, and F. Sun, "Knowledge-based embodied question answering," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 11948–11960, 2023.
- [9] A. Majumdar, A. Ajay, X. Zhang, P. Putta, S. Yenamandra, M. Henaff, S. Silwal, P. Mcvay, O. Maksymets, S. Arnaud, et al., "Openeqa: Embodied question answering in the era of foundation models," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 16488–16498, 2024.
- [10] B. Patel, V. S. Dorbala, D. Manocha, and A. S. Bedi, "Embodied question answering via multi-llm systems," *CoRR*, 2024.
- [11] V. S. Dorbala, P. Goyal, R. Piramuthu, M. Johnston, D. Manocha, and R. Ghanadan, "S-eqa: Tackling situational queries in embodied question answering," *CoRR*, 2024.
- [12] A. Z. Ren, J. Clark, A. Dixit, M. Itkina, A. Majumdar, and D. Sadigh, "Explore until Confident: Efficient Exploration for Embodied Question Answering," in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems*, (Delft, Netherlands), July 2024.
- [13] S. Sukhbaatar, J. Weston, R. Fergus, et al., "End-to-end memory networks," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.
- [14] A. Graves, G. Wayne, M. Reynolds, T. Harley, I. Danihelka, A. Grabska-Barwińska, S. G. Colmenarejo, E. Grefenstette, T. Ramalho, J. Agapiou, et al., "Hybrid computing using a neural network with dynamic external memory," *Nature*, vol. 538, no. 7626, pp. 471–476, 2016.
- [15] A. Szot, A. Clegg, E. Undersander, E. Wijmans, Y. Zhao, J. Turner, N. Maestre, M. Mukadam, D. S. Chaplot, O. Maksymets, et al., "Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 251–266, 2021.
- [16] E. Wijmans, A. Kadian, A. Morcos, S. Lee, I. Essa, D. Parikh, M. Savva, and D. Batra, "Dd-ppo: Learning near-perfect pointgoal navigators from 2.5 billion frames," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [17] E. Parisotto and R. Salakhutdinov, "Neural map: Structured memory for deep reinforcement learning," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [18] D. S. Chaplot, D. Gandhi, S. Gupta, A. Gupta, and R. Salakhutdinov, "Learning to explore using active neural slam," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020.
- [19] M. Zhai, Z. Gao, Y. Wu, and Y. Jia, "Memory-centric embodied question answer," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.13948*, 2025.
- [20] C. F. Hayes, R. Rădulescu, E. Bargiacchi, J. Källström, M. Macfarlane, M. Reymond, T. Verstraeten, L. M. Zintgraf, R. Dazeley, F. Heintz, et al., "A practical guide to multi-objective reinforcement learning and planning," *Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems*, vol. 36, no. 1, p. 26, 2022.
- [21] A. KA and U. Subramaniam, "A systematic literature review on multi-robot task allocation," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 1–28, 2024.
- [22] Y. Yang, T. Zhou, M. Pechenizkiy, and M. Fang, "Preference controllable reinforcement learning with advanced multi-objective optimization," in *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2025.
- [23] J. Liang, J. K. Christopher, S. Koenig, and F. Fioretto, "Simultaneous multi-robot motion planning with projected diffusion models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03607*, 2025.
- [24] J.-K. Huang, Y. Tan, D. Lee, V. R. Desaraju, and J. W. Grizzle, "Informable multi-objective and multi-directional rrt\* system for robot path planning," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 5666–5673, IEEE, 2023.
- [25] M. Bennewitz, W. Burgard, and S. Thrun, "Optimizing schedules for prioritized path planning of multi-robot systems," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, vol. 1, pp. 271–276, IEEE, 2001.
- [26] G. Notomista, M. Selvaggio, M. Santos, S. Mayya, F. Pagano, V. Lippiello, and C. Secchi, "Beyond jacobian-based tasks: Extended set-based tasks for multi-task execution and prioritization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16189*, 2023.
- [27] W. Zhi, T. Lai, L. Ott, and F. Ramos, "Diffeomorphic transforms for generalised imitation learning," in *Annual Learning for Dynamics and Control Conference*, 2022.
- [28] W. Zhi, I. Akinola, K. Van Wyk, N. D. Ratliff, and F. Ramos, "Global and reactive motion generation with geometric fabric command sequences," in *IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2023.
- [29] M. Cho, J. Park, S. Lee, and Y. Sung, "Hard tasks first: Multi-task reinforcement learning through task scheduling," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [30] OpenAI, "Gpt-5 system card," system card, OpenAI, Aug. 2025. Published August 13, 2025.
- [31] S. Agarwal, L. Ahmad, J. Ai, S. Altman, A. Applebaum, E. Arbus, R. K. Arora, Y. Bai, B. Baker, H. Bao, et al., "gpt-oss-120b & gpt-oss-20b model card," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.10925*, 2025.
- [32] G. Jocher and J. Qiu, "Ultralytics yolo11," 2024.
- [33] S. Bai, K. Chen, X. Liu, J. Wang, W. Ge, S. Song, K. Dang, P. Wang, S. Wang, J. Tang, H. Zhong, Y. Zhu, M. Yang, Z. Li, J. Wan, P. Wang, W. Ding, Z. Fu, Y. Xu, J. Ye, X. Zhang, T. Xie, Z. Cheng, H. Zhang, Z. Yang, H. Xu, and J. Lin, "Qwen2.5-vl technical report," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025.