

# Ensemble of Pre-Trained Models for Long-Tailed Trajectory Prediction

Divya Thuremella<sup>1</sup>, Yi Yang<sup>2,3</sup>, Simon Wanna<sup>2</sup>, Lars Kunze<sup>1,4</sup>, Daniele De Martini<sup>1</sup>

**Abstract**—This work explores the application of ensemble modeling to the multidimensional regression problem of trajectory prediction for vehicles in urban environments. As newer and bigger state-of-the-art prediction models for autonomous driving continue to emerge, an important open challenge is the problem of how to combine the strengths of these big models without the need for costly re-training. We show how, perhaps surprisingly, combining state-of-the-art deep learning models out-of-the-box (without retraining or fine-tuning) with a simple confidence-weighted average method can enhance the overall prediction. Indeed, while combining trajectory prediction models is not straightforward, this simple approach enhances performance by 10% over the best prediction model, especially in the long-tailed metrics. We show that this performance improvement holds on both the NuScenes and Argoverse datasets, and that these improvements are made across the dataset distribution. The code <sup>1</sup> for our work is open source.

## I. INTRODUCTION

A large number of trajectory prediction models are developed every year [1], and, in many cases, published models are expensive to retrain (e.g. [2], [3]) or lack published training code (e.g. [4], [5], [6]). This work proposes a straightforward approach to achieve an empirical 10% improvement in performance with no retraining by running multiple state-of-the-art models and combining their outputs through a confidence-weighted average.

Since one history sequence could yield multiple plausible paths (e.g. a vehicle approaching an intersection could go straight or right), of which the ground truth represents only one out of many potentially likely paths, most vehicle trajectory-prediction methods are multimodal and evaluate their models using the multimodal evaluation metric ‘Best-of- $N$ ’. This metric measures how, among  $N$  most likely predicted paths, the closest to ground truth resembles the latter [7]. However, this easily becomes impractical, especially for many real-world tasks like path planning and decision-making in autonomous vehicles, since they require precise and convergent trajectory predictions to enable the route planners to avoid potential collision and decide an optimal path [8]. Furthermore, we argue that the ‘Best-of- $N$ ’ by itself is not a fair metric, since it allows high scores to be achieved by lucky ‘shotgun’ predictions (evenly spread uninformed guesses) [8], [9]. Therefore, many works are evaluated using

<sup>1</sup>Authors are with the Oxford Robotics Institute, Department of Engineering Science, University of Oxford, UK.

<sup>2</sup>Authors are with the Division of Robotics, Perception, and Learning (RPL), KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm 114 28, Sweden.

<sup>3</sup>Authors are with Scania CV AB, Södertälje 151 87, Sweden.

<sup>4</sup>Authors are with the Bristol Robotics Laboratory (BRL), University of the West of England, UK.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/dthuremella/Ensemble-of-Pretrained-Models>




Fig. 1: Example of trajectories as predicted by state-of-the-art methods – AutoBot, Wayformer and MTR – and our proposed approach. Our approach returns a confidence-weighted average of the three models and outperforms them, as shown here qualitatively.

a single prediction, the ‘most-likely’ prediction, and its associated confidence, as this is most easily digestible by downstream tasks in autonomous vehicle systems.

In the scenario of the ‘most likely’ prediction, we show that combining the trajectory outputs of different models improves prediction over the best of the models in the ensemble. In particular, we achieve a 10% performance boost on both the NuScenes [10] and Argoverse [11] datasets by combining the trajectory outputs of an ensemble out of 3 previously state-of-the-art transformer-based models, Autobot [12], Wayformer [13], and MTR [14]. These three models differ especially in architecture size – ranging from 1.5M to 60M parameters – and training strategies, achieving different performances individually on the prediction task; regardless, the result of the ensemble outperforms the best of the three, even if this entails combining it with models that, on paper, perform worse.

Using this rather simple approach, we see enhancements not only in the overall metrics, but especially in the long-tail metrics – crucial in safety-critical operations and with imbalanced datasets like those common in trajectory prediction. Indeed, looking at the errors of the top 1-10% most difficult examples, we see a consistent improvement across the distribution.

To summarize, in this work, we 1) analyze differences in state-of-the-art trajectory prediction networks and the types of examples they struggle with, and 2) propose a flexible and modular method to combine them into an ensemble to achieve boosted general and long-tail performance at a computational cost.

## II. RELATED WORK

### A. Motion Prediction

Motion prediction has rapidly advanced with deep learning and large-scale open datasets [15], [16], [17], [18]. Early

raster-based methods utilize convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to extract scene context from bird’s-eye-view images [19], [20], [21]. To improve efficiency, recent vector-based approaches represent agents and map elements as structured vectors, leveraging networks such as GNNs [22], [23], [24] and transformers [25], [26], [27], [28], [12] to model traffic interactions. Separately, query-based decoding strategies inspired by DETR [29] have been widely adopted to enhance multimodal trajectory generation through flexible, learnable motion queries [30], [31]. In addition, refinement-based methods that first generate coarse trajectory proposals and then refine them have become increasingly popular for improving prediction accuracy [32], [33], [31], [30], [34], [35], [36]. More recent works further boost performance by incorporating pre-training strategies with self-supervised learning with improved robustness [37], [38], [39], [40]. To unify research efforts, Unitraj [41] proposes a framework that integrates multiple models and datasets into a single pipeline, facilitating research in this area. Our work builds upon the Unitraj pipeline. While new state-of-the-art models continue to emerge, it’s important to understand how to effectively combine their strengths.

### B. Ensemble Modeling in Trajectory Prediction

Both homogeneous ensemble modeling (where multiple copies of the same architecture are trained in ensemble) and heterogeneous ensemble modeling (where each model in the ensemble has a different architecture) have proven effective in trajectory prediction. [42] use ensembling at the decoder stage by training a homogenous ensemble of predictor heads. Meanwhile, [43] and [44] take advantage of the deep ensemble method developed by [45], which showed that using an ensemble of homogeneous neural networks trained in parallel on the entire training set gave smooth predictions and lower error in the task of object detection. [43] show that deep ensembles are effective in trajectory prediction by using a homogeneous ensemble of neural networks to improve accuracy and uncertainty estimation, while [44] compare homogeneous deep ensemble configurations to heterogeneous deep ensemble configurations (using 3 heterogenous models: a transformer model [46], a graph neural network model [47], and an LSTM-based model [48]) to show that heterogenous ensembles have better model diversity and more accurate predictions and confidences. While [43] and [44] aggregate ensemble model predictions by creating a multimodal Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) out of the combination of all predictions from the ensemble, and sample this distribution to produce predictions, [49] aggregate their homogeneous ensemble models’ predictions through a combination of averaging and majority voting. Finally, [50], the most similar work to ours, also uses a heterogeneous ensemble (made up of a physics-based kalman filter model, a Gauss-Markov process based model, and a deep learning model) and aggregate predictions with a combination of weighted averaging and thresholding.

### C. Long-Tailed Trajectory Prediction

To improve long-tailed performance within trajectory prediction, [51] and [52] use ensemble modeling, while [53] [4] and [54] use regularization techniques. [4] and [53] use contrastive loss on implicit classes of trajectories, while [54] re-weight the loss according to how rare the trajectory using dataset statistics to determine the measure of rareness. Combining ensemble modeling and long-tailed learning in trajectory prediction, [51] and [52] use a two-stage prediction scheme from which ensemble modeling can be done based on the results of the first stage. [51], the state of the art, uses a contrastive autoencoder network to separate the dataset into clusters, which are then separated into well-performing and poorly-performing groups, each of which are fed to a different ensemble model. [52] does not beat the state of the art, but provides a two-stage framework as well from which ensemble modeling can be done no matter the underlying architecture.

To measure long-tailed performance, [4], [53], [51] use a ‘difficulty scoring’ (based on how easy it is for a Kalman filter [4] or the baseline model [53], [51] to predict the future trajectory) to get the ADE/FDE of the most ‘difficult’ 1, 2, 3, etc. percent of examples. Following them, our ‘difficulty score’ is based on each model’s own error distribution instead of that of the baseline model, since we have more than one baseline model to compare to. For more details, see Section V-B.

## III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Given  $N$  agents and  $T_{\text{history}}$  observed timesteps, the historical trajectories are denoted as  $A_{\text{history}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T_{\text{history}} \times D_{\text{agent}}}$ .  $D_{\text{agent}}$  denotes feature dimension, which may include, depending on the dataset, attributes such as position, velocity, and yaw angle. Let Map  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times P \times D_{\text{road}}}$  be the surrounding road topology, where  $S$  denotes the number of road segments,  $P$  the number of points per segment, and  $D_{\text{road}}$  the semantic feature dimension. The goal is to predict the future trajectory features  $A_{\text{pred}} \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T_{\text{future}} \times D_{\text{agent}}}$ , where  $T_{\text{future}}$  is the number of future timesteps. The predicted agent 2D positions are denoted as  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T_{\text{future}} \times 2}$ . Modern motion prediction models typically output a set of  $K$  candidate future trajectories  $\{y^k\}_{k=1}^K$ , each with an associated confidence score  $c^k$ , reflecting the model’s certainty for each candidate.

## IV. METHODOLOGY

We use the UniTraj framework [41], which standardizes dataset formats and model training pipelines, facilitating training and evaluation of 3 state-of-the-art models, AutoBot [12], Wayformer [13], and MTR [14], on different datasets such as NuScenes [10] and Argoverse [11]. We run the pre-trained models as an ensemble and aggregate their predictions using a confidence-weighted average.

### A. Base Models

Autobot [12], Wayformer [13], and MTR [14] have similar transformer-based encoder and decoder architectures and predict a gaussian mixture model (GMM) probability

distribution for each future timestep, but differ in size – AutoBot, the smallest, uses only 1.5M parameters, Wayformer uses 16.5M parameters, and MTR uses 60.1M parameters – and employ different loss strategies. Here, we briefly describe the models included in the ensemble (AutoBot, Wayformer, and MTR) in more detail.

1) *AutoBot*: Autobot [12] is a transformer-based model that learns equivariant representations by modeling the joint distribution of agent trajectories. At each timestep, AutoBot predicts the parameters of a bivariate Gaussian distribution — means  $(\mu_x, \mu_y)$ , standard deviations  $(\sigma_x, \sigma_y)$ , and correlation coefficient  $\rho$  — for the future position of each agent. The model is trained by minimizing the negative log-likelihood (NLL) of the ground-truth future positions under the predicted distribution:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}} = - \sum_{t=1}^T \log p(y_x^t, y_y^t | \mu_x^t, \mu_y^t, \sigma_x^t, \sigma_y^t, \rho^t), \quad (1)$$

where  $p(\cdot)$  is the probability density function of a bivariate Gaussian.

2) *Wayformer*: Wayformer [13] extends transformer architectures with factorized attention and learnable latent queries, followed by an early fusion of multimodal inputs. At each layer, the input representations  $\mathbf{z}$  are updated based on agent tokens, lane tokens, and waypoint tokens separately before fusion using attention mechanism via:

$$\mathbf{z}' = \text{Fusion}(\text{Attn}_{\text{agent}}(\mathbf{z}), \text{Attn}_{\text{lane}}(\mathbf{z}), \text{Attn}_{\text{wp}}(\mathbf{z})), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{z}$  denotes the input features and  $\mathbf{z}'$  the updated features after multi-axis attention and fusion.

Wayformer predicts future trajectories by outputting a multi-modal gaussian (GMM) probability distribution, and trains by using an NLL loss which maximizes the likelihood of the gaussian mode closest to the ground truth under the predicted distribution, as well as a classification loss on mode selection which encourages the model to choose the most accurate mode.

3) *MTR*: MTR (Motion Transformer Refinement) [14] extends the transformer architecture by using a set of learnable motion query pairs, where the first element in the pair learns spatially distributed intention points to direct coarse intention prediction for a specific mode of the output, and the other produces trajectory refinements for those points. Furthermore, they introduce an auxiliary task of predicting future interactions between agents to guide the training.

The training objective jointly optimizes the predicted GMM distribution and the auxiliary task:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{auxiliary}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}}, \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{auxiliary}} = \text{LI}(A_{\text{pred}}, A_{\text{gt}}) \quad (4)$$

Here,  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{NLL}}$  is the negative log-likelihood of the ground-truth under the chosen mode of the predicted GMM, calculated at each decoder layer and summed up;  $A_{\text{pred}}$  is the predicted future positions and velocities of the agents, while  $A_{\text{gt}}$  represents the corresponding ground truth values. By

combining coarse global intention with fine-grained local refinement query pairs, MTR achieves strong trajectory prediction performance.

## B. Confidence-Weighted Model Ensemble

We interpret model ensembling as a form of uncertainty-aware decision fusion. Given three trajectory prediction models—AutoBot (AB), Wayformer (WF), and MTR—we assume each model provides a future trajectory along with an internal confidence score that reflects its estimated certainty. For each sample, we extract the most confident trajectory  $\hat{y}_{\text{AB}}$ ,  $\hat{y}_{\text{WF}}$ , and  $\hat{y}_{\text{MTR}}$  from the three models, along with their associated confidence scores  $c_{\text{AB}}$ ,  $c_{\text{WF}}$ , and  $c_{\text{MTR}}$ . Since all models predict a GMM distribution of trajectories, assigning a confidence to each predicted trajectory mode and training these confidences using a form of the NLL loss, the confidences are comparable between models.

First, the confidence scores are normalized to sum to one:

$$\tilde{c}_i = \frac{c_i}{\sum_j c_j}, \quad i \in \{\text{AB}, \text{WF}, \text{MTR}\}, \quad (5)$$

The final predicted trajectory  $\hat{y}_{\text{final}}$  is then obtained as a weighted average over the three models:

$$\hat{y}_{\text{final}} = \sum_i \tilde{c}_i \cdot \hat{y}_i, \quad \text{for } i \in \{\text{AB}, \text{WF}, \text{MTR}\}. \quad (6)$$

This formulation can be viewed as minimizing the expected trajectory error under a model-uncertainty prior, where higher-confidence models are trusted more. It also mitigates the impact of failure cases in any individual model by adaptively redistributing trust across models, leading to more robust final predictions.

To calculate how confident the ensemble model is in its weighted-average prediction, we take inspiration from [43], [44], [45], and use the weighted variance across the three models as an inverse measure of confidence.

We first calculate the 2D covariance matrix of the ensemble’s prediction, given by:

$$\sigma_{\text{final}}^2 = \sum_i \tilde{c}_i ((\hat{y}_i - \hat{y}_{\text{final}})(\hat{y}_i - \hat{y}_{\text{final}})^T). \quad (7)$$

where the determinant of this covariance matrix,  $\det(\sigma_{\text{final}}^2)$ , captures the overall dispersion of the predictions in 2D space. A higher determinant indicates greater disagreement among models, while a lower determinant suggests more consistent predictions. To transform this measure into a confidence score  $c_{\text{final}}$ , we apply an inverse transformation defined as

$$c_{\text{final}} = \frac{1}{1 + \det(\sigma_{\text{final}}^2)}, \quad (8)$$

which ensures the confidence is bounded between 0 and 1.

## V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### A. Datasets

We show our results on two different datasets, NuScenes [10] and Argoverse2 [11]. While both datasets are in urban driving environments and taken from a moving vehicle,

NuScenes includes data from both left-side driving and right-side driving cities, and Argoverse2 covers more cities and contains more data.

1) *NuScenes*: The NuScenes dataset [10] consists of 1000 scenes with 5.5 hours of footage labeled at 2Hz. It has 32k trajectories taken from a moving vehicle in 4 neighborhoods within Boston and Singapore, and includes HD semantic maps with 11 annotated layers, including pedestrian crossings, walkways, stop lines, traffic lights, road dividers, lane dividers, and driveable areas [41], [55].

2) *Argoverse2*: The Argoverse 2 dataset [11], includes 6 million lidar frames across 20,000 scenes with 2k hours of footage. It has almost 180k trajectories taken in 6 cities of different sizes across the US: Miami, Pittsburgh, Austin, Washington DC, Dearborn, and Palo Alto [11], [41]. HD semantic maps in the Argoverse 2 dataset include lanes, lane boundaries (dashed white, dashed yellow, double yellow, etc), and crosswalks.

## B. Metrics

In this section we describe the metrics upon which we evaluate our ensemble. Specifically, we use the most-likely metric, as described below, and report our long-tailed performance. Although AutoBot [12], Wayformer [13] and MTR [14] report 'Best-of-N' metrics like minADE, minFDE, and miss rate, these metrics are specific to models that predict multiple possible trajectories for each example, and since our ensemble model only outputs one prediction, we cannot report these metrics.

1) *The Most-Likely Metric*: compares the average distance error (ADE) and final distance error (FDE) between the ground truth path and the single most likely prediction output by the model. Such methods allow applications to plan for only the most likely futures and are therefore more useful in practice.

2) *Long-Tailed Metrics*: We report long-tailed metrics that focus on a subset of difficult predictions to evaluate performance on challenging scenarios. Specifically, we compute the per-sample error for each model, sort the examples accordingly, and report the average error over the top  $K\%$  subset based on each model's own error distribution. Formally, let  $\mathcal{D} = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_N\}$  be the set of per-sample errors (ADE or FDE), and let  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-}K\%}$  be the subset with the highest  $K\%$  errors. We define the Top- $K\%$  error as:

$$\text{Top-}K\% \text{ Error} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-}K\%}|} \sum_{e_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{top-}K\%}} e_i \quad (9)$$

## VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Analysis of Base Models

To help motivate the analysis of our results, we first analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the 3 base models.

While MTR produces a set of trajectories that are low in variance, where the most likely trajectory is often very accurate, Wayformer produces a set of trajectories that are more widely distributed, where the most likely mode is not always the one closest to the ground truth. This may be




Fig. 2: This figure shows the extent to which the set of long-tail examples (Top 10% most challenging examples, i.e.  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-10\%}}$  for each model) overlap with each other on the NuScenes and Argoverse 2 datasets.

influenced by the fact that MTR is 4 times bigger than Wayformer, and its architecture is specifically suited to learn which mode to choose. While both MTR and Wayformer predict trajectories that stick to the lane lines on the map, AutoBot doesn't always follow lane markings; this means that while it's often less correct than the other models, it is better at predicting sharp turns and irregular trajectories that don't perfectly match the neat lane lines, as shown in Figures 3 and 4. Again, this may be because AutoBot is very small (10 times smaller than Wayformer) and unable to achieve the model capacity required to properly parse the map. However, there are many examples, especially in the Argoverse dataset, where AutoBot beats the other two models, as shown in the bottom left examples in Figure 4 and bottom right examples in Figure 3. Although AutoBot performs much worse than the others on the NuScenes dataset, and both AutoBot and Wayformer perform much worse than MTR on the Argoverse dataset, all three models are still important members of the ensemble and still help improve ensemble performance, as we show in our results.

Furthermore, in order to examine the long-tailed dataset differences between the three models, we analyze how much of the data which falls into the long tail (i.e. the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-10\%}}$ ) for each of the three models, is shared, as shown in Figure 2. We find that the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-10\%}}$  for each model shares only 15-18% of its examples with the set of long tail examples common to all three models, while around one third of the  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-10\%}}$  for each model is not common to that of either of the other two models. This shows that each model has different strengths and weaknesses, since, for example, AutoBot and Wayformer perform better on MTR's top 10% most difficult examples, and vice versa for each of the three models – on MTR's  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{top-10\%}}$ , AutoBot's ADE / FDE is 5.33 / 13.91 and Wayformer's is 4.90 / 13.77, which is much better than MTR's performance of 7.48 / 20.85. This analysis helps explain why even the lower performing models help make the weighted average ensemble performance better.

### B. Performance of Weighted Ensemble

As shown in Tables I and II, our method, though simple, improves the metrics across the board when the outputs of multiple models are combined. When using an ensemble of

Method	Top 1%	Top 2%	Top 3%	Top 4%	Top 5%	Top 10%	Overall
AutoBot (AB) [12]	15.49 / 38.22	13.64 / 34.02	12.62 / 31.58	11.90 / 29.82	11.32 / 28.41	9.47 / 23.91	3.23 / 8.08
Wayformer (WF) [13]	13.47 / 36.58	11.87 / 32.35	10.88 / 29.71	10.14 / 27.87	9.56 / 26.42	7.80 / 21.72	2.49 / 6.77
MTR [14]	13.03 / 35.30	11.45 / 31.18	10.52 / 28.73	9.84 / 26.94	9.30 / 25.48	7.67 / 20.85	2.55 / 6.59
<i>Ensemble (Weighted) w.</i>							
AB + WF	12.69 / 33.12	11.08 / 29.31	10.12 / 27.02	9.49 / 25.40	9.01 / 24.13	7.51 / 20.20	2.50 / 6.57
AB + MTR	11.64 / 30.80	10.31 / 27.48	9.48 / 25.33	8.89 / 23.79	8.43 / 22.58	7.00 / 18.81	2.40 / 6.20
WF + MTR	11.70 / 31.91	10.20 / 28.07	9.32 / 25.61	8.69 / 23.87	8.22 / 22.56	6.78 / 18.60	2.27 / 5.98
AB + WF + MTR	11.27 / 30.30	9.89 / 26.80	9.04 / 24.56	8.46 / 22.98	8.02 / 21.77	6.68 / 18.10	2.25 / 5.91

TABLE I: Most-likely ADE / FDE performance using the NuScenes dataset on the long tail (the Top 1-10% most difficult examples) as well as over all the data.

Method	Top 1%	Top 2%	Top 3%	Top 4%	Top 5%	Top 10%	Overall
AutoBot (AB) [12]	14.60 / 36.85	12.74 / 32.63	11.62 / 29.97	10.83 / 28.09	10.22 / 26.57	8.31 / 21.75	2.46 / 6.27
Wayformer (WF) [13]	15.10 / 38.31	13.21 / 33.94	12.11 / 31.25	11.31 / 29.26	10.67 / 27.72	8.67 / 22.64	2.50 / 6.36
MTR [14]	13.20 / 34.66	11.25 / 29.70	10.11 / 26.78	9.30 / 24.67	8.68 / 23.04	6.82 / 18.01	1.94 / 4.75
<i>Ensemble (Weighted) w.</i>							
AB + WF	13.75 / 34.78	12.04 / 30.86	11.00 / 28.44	10.26 / 26.65	9.69 / 25.24	7.88 / 20.63	2.33 / 5.94
AB + MTR	12.07 / 31.78	10.29 / 27.24	9.26 / 24.52	8.55 / 22.63	8.01 / 21.20	6.36 / 16.78	1.86 / 4.62
WF + MTR	12.01 / 31.69	10.21 / 27.11	9.18 / 24.40	8.48 / 22.51	7.94 / 21.07	6.32 / 16.74	1.86 / 4.63
AB + WF + MTR	11.73 / 30.86	10.01 / 26.43	9.05 / 23.91	8.38 / 22.16	7.87 / 20.80	6.31 / 16.68	1.87 / 4.69

TABLE II: Most-likely ADE / FDE performance using the Argoverse 2 dataset on the long tail (the Top 1-10% most difficult examples) as well as over all the data.



Fig. 3: Qualitative Results on NuScenes dataset: the top row contains examples that show improvement while the bottom row demonstrates different types of failure cases. Failure modes with high variance between models are marked as low confidence, as discussed in Section VI-C. The figures show the ground truth, the most-likely prediction for each of the three models (AutoBot, Wayformer, and MTR), and the weighted average of these three predictions.

two models, the performance shows consistent improvements across both datasets over the top mode performances of the individual models used. On the NuScenes dataset, the combined Autobot and Wayformer ensemble (16.5M parameters) even shows better performance than the pre-trained MTR model (60.1M parameters), which is almost 4 times bigger than the Autobot and Wayformer models combined, showing that on some datasets, ensembling can achieve better performance with fewer parameters.

As expected, the biggest improvements on NuScenes are

made by the combination of all three models together. Even though AutoBot performs much worse than the other models on NuScenes, its addition to the ensemble adds small improvements to the overall and long-tail performances, making the three-model ensemble even better than the two-model ensemble without Autobot.

On the Argoverse 2 dataset, however, the overall performance of all the ensemble models is quite similar, except for the AB + WF model which is significantly worse (see Table II). This result can be explained by the fact that MTR




Fig. 4: Qualitative Results on Argoverse 2 dataset: the top row contains examples that show improvement while the bottom row demonstrates different types of failure cases. Failure modes with high variance between models are marked as low confidence, as discussed in Section VI-C. The figures show the ground truth, the most-likely prediction for each of the three models (AutoBot, Wayformer, and MTR), and the weighted average of these three predictions.

has much better performance than AutoBot and Wayformer due to the fact that it is 4 times bigger than Wayformer and 40 times bigger than AutoBot, and therefore has the model capacity to learn more from the much bigger Argoverse 2 dataset. Therefore, the smaller combined AB + WF ensemble cannot perform better than the bigger MTR model on this much bigger dataset. Furthermore, the rest of the ensemble models which include MTR perform only about 1-3% better on FDE and 4% better on ADE than MTR, which shows that they may be relying on MTR’s confident predictions to form a disproportionately large portion of the weighted average. As for the long-tail performance, long-tail metrics on the Argoverse 2 dataset show consistent improvement as we add more models to the ensemble: here we again see the 10% improvement from the three-model ensemble that we saw in NuScenes.

It is interesting to note that AutoBot, though it has 10x fewer parameters, is the second best-performing model on the Argoverse 2 dataset. This may be because we are using only the most likely prediction here. While Wayformer is good at predicting a wide distribution of good predictions, it’s not as good at choosing the best of those predictions to be the most likely.

For both datasets, long-tail metrics improved significantly when using the ensemble. As was discussed in [56], when it comes to predicting out-of-distribution scenes, which long-tail examples commonly are, ensembles have been shown to help by reducing overconfident catastrophic extrapolation. In our case, we see that in long-tailed examples, variance between the three models’ predictions is high, as can be seen in the top-right example in Figure 3, and by taking the weighted average of the predicted trajectories, we can find a result in the middle that can be closer to the ground truth.

Most of the cases in which the ensemble shows the most improvement over the baseline are ones in which there is relative agreement among the models on whether the vehicle will go straight, right, or left, but high variance across the predicted paths taken, like in the top row of examples in Figure 3. Since our method simply performs a weighted

average, in these cases, our method achieves better results than the individual models by finding consensus among them.

### C. Failure cases

The failure cases of the proposed ensemble method typically fall into one of two scenarios: either one of the models is overconfident and wrong (as is the case in the bottom left examples in both Figures 3 and 4), or the three models are predicting different modes of behaviors (e.g. one model predicts the vehicle will go straight and the other predicts it will turn) and the ensemble experiences mode collapse by predicting the path in between.

In the second case, this can lead to a weighted average that straddles the two modes, as can be seen in the bottom-right examples in Figures 3- 4. This can cause downstream tasks like path planners to expect trajectories that would never occur in real life. However, our variance-based confidence score can help alert downstream tasks to the low quality of the prediction by translating the high variance between the three models’ predictions into a low confidence score.

### D. Ablation

Method	nuScenes		Argoverse	
	Top 10%	Overall	Top 10%	Overall
Simple	6.75 / 18.18	2.29 / 6.00	6.75 / 18.18	2.29 / 6.00
Weighted (Ours)	<b>6.68 / 18.10</b>	<b>2.25 / 5.91</b>	<b>6.31 / 16.68</b>	<b>1.87 / 4.69</b>
Threshold-W [50]	6.72 / 18.30	2.27 / 5.95	6.72 / 18.30	2.27 / 5.95

TABLE III: Ablation study: Comparison of ensemble strategies on nuScenes and Argoverse 2 datasets (ADE / FDE)

To demonstrate the robustness of our results, we also compare our weighted average ensembling method with two other other types of averaging, as shown in Table III. One is a simple unweighted average while the other is a thresholded weighted average proposed by [50], where thresholding is first applied on the confidence of the best performing model. If confidence is high, that model’s output is used, otherwise the variance-weighted (or in our case, confidence-weighted) average over all models is used [50]. Though this requires

the extra step of determining the optimal threshold (which, for our ensemble, we found to be a confidence score of 0.75 on our best performing model, MTR, after trying thresholds at 0.25, 0.5, and 0.75), our weighted average method still outperforms both the simple and threshold-weighted average methods. This is likely because our confidence-weighted average automatically takes into account the relative confidences of all models instead of ignoring them or applying a preset threshold which does not adapt to each example.

Method	Time (ms)	GFLOPs
AutoBot (AB) [12]	20.98	1.55
Wayformer (WF) [13]	17.23	8.76
MTR [14]	64.28	17.31
Ensemble (Weighted) AB + WF + MTR	100.63	27.62

TABLE IV: Computational cost: inference time (ms) and computational complexity in giga-FLOPs (GFLOPs) of each method for one input example

### E. Computational Cost

In addition to the memory requirements described in our methodology, we also report the computational cost of running each model compared to the combined ensemble. In Table IV we show the number of floating-point operations (FLOPs) required to run each of the 3 base models, as well as our combined ensemble, on one input scene. This metric provides a hardware-independent way to estimate the computational complexity [57].

Furthermore, we also provide the time taken on our own GPU (NVIDIA A100 SXM4 40GB) to run one example through each of the base models, and through our ensemble (in which we run each base model serially, and then combine their results through the weighted average). Parallelization of the base models may yield a better computational time cost.

## VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we provide a flexible approach to ensemble modeling which doesn't require re-training models, where newer state-of-the-art pre-trained models can be swapped in or out at any time. We use three previously state-of-the-art models perform a confidence-weighted average on their most likely predictions to produce an ensembled prediction which beats the best of the models' performances by around 10%.

In the future we aim to expand to use more models. Instead of trying all possible combinations like in Tables I- II, we plan to automatically select for the optimal set of models using a method like [58] which iteratively adds successive models such that the average of the selected models' predictions minimizes overall error [59]. Furthermore, since our method's biggest drawback is having to run multiple models at inference time, we also plan to explore knowledge distillations strategies like those in [60] to train one model to achieve the same output as our ensemble.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was jointly supported by Vinnova, Sweden (research grant), the EPSRC Programme Grant "From Sensing to Collaboration" (EP/V000748/1), and RobotCycle. The

computations were enabled by the supercomputing resource Berzelius provided by National Supercomputer Centre at Linköping University and the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, Sweden.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Huang, J. Du, Z. Yang, Z. Zhou, L. Zhang, and H. Chen, "A Survey on Trajectory-Prediction Methods for Autonomous Driving," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 652–674, Sep. 2022.
- [2] Y. Yuan, X. Weng, Y. Ou, and K. Kitani, "AgentFormer: Agent-Aware Transformers for Socio-Temporal Multi-Agent Forecasting," in *2021 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. Montreal, QC, Canada: IEEE, Oct. 2021, pp. 9793–9803.
- [3] S. Lee, J. Lee, Y. Yu, T. Kim, and K. Lee, "MART: MultiscAle Relational Transformer Networks for Multi-agent Trajectory Prediction," Jul. 2024.
- [4] O. Makansi, O. Cicek, Y. Marrakchi, and T. Brox, "On Exposing the Challenging Long Tail in Future Prediction of Traffic Actors," *arXiv:2103.12474 [cs]*, Aug. 2021.
- [5] A. Das, W. Kong, R. Sen, and Y. Zhou, "A decoder-only foundation model for time-series forecasting," Apr. 2024.
- [6] K. Rasul, A. Ashok, A. R. Williams, H. Ghonia, R. Bhagwatkar, A. Khorasani, M. J. D. Bayazi, G. Adamopoulos, R. Riachi, N. Hassen, M. Biloš, S. Garg, A. Schneider, N. Chapados, A. Drouin, V. Zantedeschi, Y. Nevmyvaka, and I. Rish, "Lag-Llama: Towards Foundation Models for Probabilistic Time Series Forecasting," Feb. 2024.
- [7] P. Kothari, S. Kreiss, and A. Alahi, "Human Trajectory Forecasting in Crowds: A Deep Learning Perspective," Jan. 2021.
- [8] L. Li, X. Lin, Y. Huang, Z. Zhang, and J.-F. Hu, "Beyond Minimum-of-N: Rethinking the Evaluation and Methods of Pedestrian Trajectory Prediction," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 12 880–12 893, Dec. 2024.
- [9] E. Pajouheshgar and C. H. Lampert, "Back to square one: Probabilistic trajectory forecasting without bells and whistles," Dec. 2018.
- [10] "[1903.11027] nuScenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving," <https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.11027>.
- [11] B. Wilson, W. Qi, T. Agarwal, J. Lambert, J. Singh, S. Khandelwal, B. Pan, R. Kumar, A. Hartnett, J. K. Pontes, D. Ramanan, P. Carr, and J. Hays, "Argoverse 2: Next Generation Datasets for Self-Driving Perception and Forecasting," Jan. 2023.
- [12] R. Girgis, F. Golemo, F. Codevilla, M. Weiss, J. A. D'Souza, S. E. Kahou, F. Heide, and C. Pal, "Latent variable sequential set transformers for joint multi-agent motion prediction," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. [Online]. Available: [https://openreview.net/forum?id=Dup\\_dDqkZC5](https://openreview.net/forum?id=Dup_dDqkZC5)
- [13] N. Nayakanti, R. Al-Rfou, A. Zhou, K. Goel, K. S. Refaat, and B. Sapp, "Wayformer: Motion forecasting via simple & efficient attention networks," in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 2980–2987.
- [14] S. Shi, L. Jiang, D. Dai, and B. Schiele, "Motion transformer with global intention localization and local movement refinement," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 6531–6543, 2022.
- [15] M.-F. Chang, J. W. Lambert, P. Sangkloy, J. Singh, S. Bak, A. Hartnett, D. Wang, P. Carr, S. Lucey, D. Ramanan, and J. Hays, "Argoverse: 3d tracking and forecasting with rich maps," in *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2019.
- [16] H. Caesar, V. Bankiti, A. H. Lang, S. Vora, V. E. Liong, Q. Xu, A. Krishnan, Y. Pan, G. Baldan, and O. Beijbom, "nuscnets: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 621–11 631.
- [17] S. Eitinger, S. Cheng, B. Caine, C. Liu, H. Zhao, S. Pradhan, Y. Chai, B. Sapp, C. R. Qi, Y. Zhou *et al.*, "Large scale interactive motion forecasting for autonomous driving: The waymo open motion dataset," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 9710–9719.
- [18] W. Zhan, L. Sun, D. Wang, H. Shi, A. Clausse, M. Naumann, J. Kummerle, H. Konigshof, C. Stiller, A. de La Fortelle *et al.*, "Interaction dataset: An international, adversarial and cooperative motion dataset in interactive driving scenarios with semantic maps," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.03088*, 2019.

- [19] M. Bansal, A. Krizhevsky, and A. Ogale, "Chauffeurnet: Learning to drive by imitating the best and synthesizing the worst," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.03079*, 2018.
- [20] Y. Chai, B. Sapp, M. Bansal, and D. Anguelov, "Multipath: Multiple probabilistic anchor trajectory hypotheses for behavior prediction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05449*, 2019.
- [21] J. Hong, B. Sapp, and J. Philbin, "Rules of the road: Predicting driving behavior with a convolutional model of semantic interactions," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2019.
- [22] J. Gao, C. Sun, H. Zhao, Y. Shen, D. Anguelov, C. Li, and C. Schmid, "Vectornet: Encoding hd maps and agent dynamics from vectorized representation," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020, pp. 11 525–11 533.
- [23] M. Liang, B. Yang, R. Hu, Y. Chen, R. Liao, S. Feng, and R. Urtasun, "Learning lane graph representations for motion forecasting," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 541–556.
- [24] Y. Huang, H. Bi, Z. Li, T. Mao, and Z. Wang, "Stgat: Modeling spatial-temporal interactions for human trajectory prediction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2019, pp. 6272–6281.
- [25] Y. Ngiam, B. Caine, V. Vasudevan, Z. Zhang, H. L. Chiang, J. Ling, R. Roelofs, A. Bewley, C. Liu, A. Venugopal, D. Weiss, B. Sapp, Z. Chen, and J. Shlens, "Scene transformer: A unified multi-task model for behavior prediction and planning," *ICLR*, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.08417>
- [26] Y. Liu, J. Zhang, L. Fang, Q. Jiang, and B. Zhou, "Multimodal motion prediction with stacked transformers," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021, pp. 7577–7586.
- [27] Z. Zhou, L. Ye, J. Wang, K. Wu, and K. Lu, "Hivt: Hierarchical vector transformer for multi-agent motion prediction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 8823–8833.
- [28] Z. Huang, X. Mo, and C. Lv, "Multi-modal motion prediction with transformer-based neural network for autonomous driving," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 2605–2611.
- [29] N. Carion, F. Massa, G. Synnaeve, N. Usunier, A. Kirillov, and S. Zagoruyko, "End-to-end object detection with transformers," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2020, pp. 213–229.
- [30] S. Shi, L. Jiang, D. Dai, and B. Schiele, "Mtr++: Multi-agent motion prediction with symmetric scene modeling and guided intention querying," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 3955–3971, 2024.
- [31] Z. Zhou, J. Wang, Y.-H. Li, and Y.-K. Huang, "Query-centric trajectory prediction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 17 863–17 873.
- [32] M. Wang, X. Zhu, C. Yu, W. Li, Y. Ma, R. Jin, X. Ren, D. Ren, M. Wang, and W. Yang, "Ganet: Goal area network for motion forecasting," in *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1609–1615.
- [33] X. Wang, T. Su, F. Da, and X. Yang, "Prophet: Efficient agent-centric motion forecasting with anchor-informed proposals," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023, pp. 21 995–22 003.
- [34] M. Ye, J. Xu, X. Xu, T. Wang, T. Cao, and Q. Chen, "Bootstrap motion forecasting with self-consistent constraints," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 8504–8514.
- [35] S. Choi, J. Kim, J. Yun, and J. W. Choi, "R-pred: Two-stage motion prediction via tube-query attention-based trajectory refinement," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 8525–8535.
- [36] Y. Zhou, H. Shao, L. Wang, S. L. Waslander, H. Li, and Y. Liu, "Smartrefine: A scenario-adaptive refinement framework for efficient motion prediction," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 15 281–15 290.
- [37] Y. Yang, Q. Zhang, T. Gilles, N. Batool, and J. Folkesson, "Rmp: A random mask pretrain framework for motion prediction," in *2023 IEEE 26th International Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 3717–3723.
- [38] J. Cheng, X. Mei, and M. Liu, "Forecast-mae: Self-supervised pre-training for motion forecasting with masked autoencoders," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 8679–8689.
- [39] Z. Lan, Y. Jiang, Y. Mu, C. Chen, and S. E. Li, "Sept: Towards efficient scene representation learning for motion prediction," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- [40] Y. Zhou, H. Shao, L. Wang, S. L. Waslander, H. Li, and Y. Liu, "Smartpretrain: Model-agnostic and dataset-agnostic representation learning for motion prediction," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- [41] L. Feng, M. Bahari, K. M. B. Amor, É. Zablocki, M. Cord, and A. Alahi, "Unitraj: A unified framework for scalable vehicle trajectory prediction," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024, pp. 106–123.
- [42] B. Varadarajan, A. Hefny, A. Srivastava, K. S. Refaat, N. Nayakanti, A. Corrman, K. Chen, B. Douillard, C. P. Lam, D. Anguelov *et al.*, "Multipath++: Efficient information fusion and trajectory aggregation for behavior prediction," in *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 7814–7821.
- [43] A. Nayak, A. Eskandarian, Z. Doerzaph, and P. Ghorai, "Pedestrian Trajectory Forecasting Using Deep Ensembles Under Sensing Uncertainty," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 11 317–11 329, Sep. 2024.
- [44] A. Distelzweig, A. Look, E. Kosman, F. Janjós, J. Wagner, and A. Valada, "Stochasticity in Motion: An Information-Theoretic Approach to Trajectory Prediction," Feb. 2025.
- [45] B. Lakshminarayanan, A. Pritzel, and C. Blundell, "Simple and Scalable Predictive Uncertainty Estimation using Deep Ensembles," Nov. 2017.
- [46] M. Liu, H. Cheng, L. Chen, H. Broszio, J. Li, R. Zhao, M. Sester, and M. Y. Yang, "LAformer: Trajectory Prediction for Autonomous Driving with Lane-Aware Scene Constraints," Feb. 2023.
- [47] N. Deo, E. Wolff, and O. Beijbom, "Multimodal trajectory prediction conditioned on lane-graph traversals," in *5th Annual Conference on Robot Learning*, 2021.
- [48] B. Kim, S. H. Park, S. Lee, E. Khoshimjonov, D. Kum, J. Kim, J. S. Kim, and J. W. Choi, "LaPred: Lane-Aware Prediction of Multi-Modal Future Trajectories of Dynamic Agents," Apr. 2021.
- [49] Z. Li, Y. Lin, C. Gong, X. Wang, Q. Liu, J. Gong, and C. Lu, "An Ensemble Learning Framework for Vehicle Trajectory Prediction in Interactive Scenarios," in *2022 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, Jun. 2022, pp. 51–57.
- [50] G. Kim, D. Kim, Y. Ahn, and K. Huh, "Hybrid Approach for Vehicle Trajectory Prediction Using Weighted Integration of Multiple Models," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 78 715–78 723, 2021.
- [51] Y. Wang, P. Zhang, L. Bai, and J. Xue, "FEND: A Future Enhanced Distribution-Aware Contrastive Learning Framework for Long-tail Trajectory Prediction," Mar. 2023.
- [52] R. C. Mercurius, E. Ahmadi, S. M. A. Shabestary, and A. Rasouli, "AMEND: A Mixture of Experts Framework for Long-tailed Trajectory Prediction," 2024.
- [53] J. Zhang, M. Pourkeshavarz, and A. Rasouli, "TrACT: A Training Dynamics Aware Contrastive Learning Framework for Long-tail Trajectory Prediction," Apr. 2024.
- [54] J. Kozerawski, M. Sharan, and R. Yu, "Taming the Long Tail of Deep Probabilistic Forecasting," *arXiv:2202.13418 [cs]*, Mar. 2022.
- [55] T. Salzmann, B. Ivanovic, P. Chakravarty, and M. Pavone, "Trajectron++: Dynamically-Feasible Trajectory Forecasting With Heterogeneous Data," *arXiv:2001.03093 [cs]*, Jan. 2021.
- [56] A. Filos, P. Tigas, R. McAllister, N. Rhinehart, S. Levine, and Y. Gal, "Can Autonomous Vehicles Identify, Recover From, and Adapt to Distribution Shifts?" Sep. 2020.
- [57] B. Zargar, F. Ponci, and A. Monti, "Evaluation of computational complexity for distribution systems state estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, vol. 72, pp. 1–12, 2023.
- [58] D. Salinas and N. Erickson, "TabRepo: A Large Scale Repository of Tabular Model Evaluations and its AutoML Applications," Aug. 2024.
- [59] R. Caruana, A. Niculescu-Mizil, G. Crew, and A. Ksikes, "Ensemble selection from libraries of models," in *Twenty-First International Conference on Machine Learning - ICML '04*. Banff, Alberta, Canada: ACM Press, 2004, p. 18.
- [60] J. Gou, B. Yu, S. J. Maybank, and D. Tao, "Knowledge Distillation: A Survey," *International Journal of Computer Vision*, vol. 129, no. 6, pp. 1789–1819, Jun. 2021.