

Data-efficient Trajectory Prediction via Coreset Selection

Ruining Yang and Lili Su

Abstract—Modern vehicles are equipped with multiple information-collection devices such as sensors and cameras, continuously generating a large volume of raw data. Accurately predicting the trajectories of neighboring vehicles is a vital component in understanding the complex driving environment. Yet, training trajectory prediction models is challenging in two ways. Processing the large-scale data is computation-intensive. Moreover, easy-medium driving scenarios often overwhelmingly dominate the dataset, leaving challenging driving scenarios such as dense traffic under-represented. For example, in the Argoverse motion prediction dataset, there are very few instances with ≥ 50 agents, while scenarios with $10 \sim 20$ agents are far more common. In this paper, to mitigate data redundancy in the over-represented driving scenarios and to reduce the bias rooted in the data scarcity of complex ones, we propose a novel data-efficient training method based on coreset selection. This method strategically selects a small but representative subset of data while balancing the proportions of different scenario difficulties. To the best of our knowledge, we are the first to introduce a method capable of effectively condensing large-scale trajectory dataset, while achieving a state-of-the-art compression ratio. Notably, even when using only 50% of the Argoverse dataset, the model can be trained with little to no decline in performance. Moreover, the selected coreset maintains excellent generalization ability.

I. INTRODUCTION

Reliably understanding the driving environment paves the way for the downstream safe navigation of autonomous vehicles. Modern autonomous vehicles are equipped with multiple information-collection devices such as sensors and cameras, continuously generating a large volume of raw data. Leveraging these large-scale datasets, significant attention has been devoted to predicting the trajectories of neighboring vehicles, with a focus on designing complex neural networks to capture both agent-agent and agent-infrastructure interactions [1], [2], [3], [4], [5], [6].

The practice of training trajectory prediction models is challenging in two ways. First, although known to be data-hungry, training complex deep neural networks on a large dataset consumes forbiddenly high computational resources. For example, training a SceneTransformer [7] model with 15.3 million parameters using a dataset containing over 0.2 million trajectory samples consumes thousands of GPU hours. This dilemma raises the following pivotal question:

Q1: How can we identify and maintain the most critical data without significant accuracy degradation?

The second challenge lies in the fact that standard machine learning tasks often use the weighted average accuracy of all




Fig. 1: **Top**: Visualization of trajectory prediction scenarios with different traffic densities (i.e., number of agents) in the Argoverse motion prediction dataset 1.1 [8]. Intuitively, trajectory prediction becomes more challenging in scenarios with more agents. **Bottom left**: Distribution of different scenario difficulty levels in the entire training set of Argoverse 1. **Bottom right**: Distribution of different scenarios difficulty levels in the coreset with a 10% data keep ratio selected by our balanced method. The numbers above each bar represent the proportion of data points at each difficulty level relative to the total dataset.

data as the performance metric of a model [9]; the more samples a driving scenario has, the higher the weight it has in the metric. Consequently, the trained model is biased towards well-represented driving scenarios. Yet, the trajectory prediction tasks for autonomous vehicles are safety-critical. A desired trajectory predictor should work well on both well-represented and under-represented driving scenarios. We aim to address the following question:

Q2: How to mitigate the bias rooted in the unbalance of different driving scenarios?

In this paper, to address these two questions, we develop a data-efficient and balanced training method. Specifically, we focus on selecting a small coreset of trajectory data that significantly contributes to the model, while balancing the proportion of data across varying difficulty levels.

The concept of coreset was first introduced by approximating the k -means clustering centers and constructing a small weighted subset that maintains a clustering cost close to that of the original data [10]. Since then, coreset selection has garnered significant attention in traditional machine learning tasks, such as natural language processing [11],

[12] and computer vision [13], for its ability to reduce the size of the dataset without compromising performance [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23]. Recently, inspired by knowledge distillation [24], [25], [26] which transfers knowledge from a large teacher network to a smaller student network, dataset distillation methods [18], [19] extract key knowledge from large datasets and create a smaller synthetic dataset. This smaller dataset allows models to perform similarly to those trained on the full dataset. While coreset selection and data distillation share the goal of data compression, data distillation is computationally expensive [11] for large datasets, limiting its use in trajectory prediction tasks. In contrast, coreset selection overcomes these limitations by selecting a small, representative subset directly from the original dataset, thereby avoiding the high computational costs associated with synthesizing new data.

Applying coreset selection methods to the field of trajectory prediction presents considerable challenges. Unlike the fixed dimensions of image data, the dimensions of trajectory prediction data are heterogeneous across driving scenarios and dynamic over time. Specifically, the number of vehicles in a scene directly affects the data’s dimensionality; the more vehicles involved, the higher the data dimension. This heterogeneity can be substantial; in the Argoverse motion prediction dataset 1.1 [8], the number of vehicles in a scene can range from just a few to over 200. What’s more, the mobility of vehicles results in varying data dimensions in time.

Contributions. In this paper, we develop a novel data-efficient training method based on coreset selection. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work on coreset construction for trajectory prediction. Our approach consists of multiple steps. We preprocess the dataset to group the data according to their difficulty levels (measured by the traffic density in a scene). Then, we calculate the submodular gain for each sample and select the most valuable data. To more effectively manage the coreset budget, we design two different coreset selection methods:

- **Fixed Selection:** This method reduces the data amount for all categories of difficulty by the same proportion, keeping the original dataset’s distribution unchanged.
- **Balanced Selection:** This method aims to address the imbalance in the original dataset by prioritizing more complex scenarios, leading to a more even distribution of agents in the selected coreset. Unlike fixed selection, it dynamically adjusts the number of samples from each category based on the remaining budget.

Experimental results demonstrate that the coreset selected using the fixed selection method achieves performance comparable to training with the full dataset, even when only 50% of the original data is retained (with a minADE difference of just 0.022 and a minFDE difference of 0.047). The balanced selection method shows significant advantages in more complex driving scenarios, and the data distribution variance of the coresets is significantly lower than that of the original dataset. In addition, the coresets selected by

both methods demonstrate strong generalization capabilities to different models. We tested these coresets on HPNet, the current state-of-the-art (SOTA) model, and found that their performance across different difficulty scenarios closely matches that of the backbone model.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Trajectory Prediction

Early approaches [27], [28], [29] to trajectory prediction focused primarily on modeling the future path of a single agent without considering interactions with other agents in the environment. Recent trajectory prediction methods [30], [31] shifted to vectorization-based techniques to capture road geometry and contextual information more efficiently. Transformer-based models emerged as a powerful approach to capture complex multi-agent interactions in trajectory prediction [32], [33], [34]. mmTransformer [35] and scene-Transformer [7] fused information over time by combining road elements, agent interactions, and time steps through an attention mechanism. HiVT [1] extended these Transformer-based methods by leveraging multimodal attention to capture complex interactions between multiple agents, extracting local context while modeling global interactions for more accurate predictions. QCNet [36] introduced a query-centric approach that reused past map information to achieve faster inference by minimizing redundant processing of static features. The latest model, HPNet [37], contained a historical prediction attention module that improved predictions by considering correlations between consecutive time steps, thereby enhancing temporal consistency and accuracy.

B. Training Data Selecting

Training complex neural networks on large-scale datasets consumed extremely high computation resources. To address this, various data-efficient approaches were explored, including optimization algorithms and dataset distillation. Model optimization algorithms enhanced training efficiency through frequent parameter updates [38], reduced iterations [39], and adaptive learning rates [40], [41]. While optimization algorithms aimed to accelerate convergence speed and improve performance with limited data, data distillation methods [18] focused on directly reducing the size of the dataset. These methods aimed to distill the knowledge of a dataset into a smaller synthetic dataset while preserving the performance of the models trained on it.

Data distillation methods (e.g., the method proposed by [18]) introduced a bi-level learning framework to ensure that models trained on distilled samples perform well on real samples. Later methods, such as gradient matching [19], learn synthetic datasets by minimizing the difference between gradients computed from real and synthetic datasets. [42] proposed matching model training trajectories on real and synthetic data to capture long-term behavior. However, data distillation methods are computationally expensive, as they require synthesizing new data and repeatedly optimizing complex objectives [19]. In contrast, coreset selection has

proven more efficient by directly selecting a small representative subset from the original data, avoiding the high computational costs associated with generating synthetic datasets while retaining critical information for effective model training.

Coreset selection aimed to extract a small and representative subset from a large-scale dataset. The most basic random sampling was often not sufficient to represent data diversity [43]. Subsequently, there were methods that selected subsets by calculating feature space distances [22], measured complexity by sample entropy values [44], and selected high entropy samples to improve the decision boundary of the model. Other approaches selected samples based on prediction confidence [45], evaluated sample importance using gradient norms [46], optimized objective functions and gradient matching [47], [48], and selected representative subsets using submodular function scores [11], all of which achieved the goal of reducing training data. However, reducing training samples in high-dimensional data such as trajectory prediction remained challenging. In our work, we utilize submodular function scores to assess the contribution of each scene to the model and select samples that significantly enhance the trajectory prediction model. This approach ensures greater diversity in the selected data [49], as submodular functions naturally modeled diversity through the property of diminishing returns—meaning that as more elements were added to the subset, the marginal gain from each additional element decreased.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

The training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{S^j\}_{j=1}^n$ consists of n driving scenarios/scenes. Each driving scenario (i.e. each sample) is described by a triple $S = (X, Y, \mathcal{M})$, where X and Y are the collections of observed and future trajectories of neighboring agents (an agent can be a vehicle or a pedestrian), and \mathcal{M} is the map. Let m denote the number of agents in the scenario, then X and Y can be expressed as $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times T_{obs}}$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times T_{pre}}$ are the two-dimensional observed and future trajectory coordinates of agent i , with lengths T_{obs} and T_{pre} , respectively.

We quantify the difficulty of a scenario S^j by its traffic density (i.e., the number of agents involved), denoted as m^j . Let $m^* = \max_{j \in [n]} m^j$. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{\max}\}$ denote the user-specific difficulty fidelity. For example, one can set $l_1 = \{1, \dots, 10\}$, $l_2 = \{11, \dots, 20\}$, \dots , $l_{\max} = \{m^* - (m^* \bmod 10) + 1, \dots, m^*\}^1$. In this example, class l_1 is the group of difficulties $1 \sim 10$, and the same applies to other classes. With a bit of abuse of notation, let

$$L_k := \{S^j \subseteq \mathcal{D} : m^j \in l_k\} \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, \max,$$

be a partition of \mathcal{D} for the given data difficulty fidelity \mathcal{L} .

Our goal is to efficiently and meticulously pinpoint a subset of data $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that (1) a model trained on \mathcal{C} performs comparably to one trained on the entire dataset \mathcal{D} , and (2) the proportion of data in \mathcal{C} across different difficulty levels \mathcal{L} is as close to uniform as possible.

¹For ease of exposition, in this example, we assume $(m^* \bmod 10) \neq 0$.

IV. METHOD

A. Managing Heterogeneity in Data Dimensions

Unlike image data whose dimension is fixed in a dataset, the dimensions of trajectory prediction data vary depending on the number of agents in the scene. As shown in Fig.1, the dimension of a scene with 80 agents is eight times that of a scene with 10 agents. In addition, a given agent may be present or absent at different time frames. This is because that trajectory prediction data is temporally continuous, with agents moving at different speeds, and that the sensing range of information-collection devices (such as LiDAR or cameras) is limited.² We address these challenges by preprocessing the trajectory data in two steps.

Filtering: For each scene, we determine its difficulty m by ranking all involved agents in descending order based on their frequency of appearance in the scene duration, and removing agents that appear infrequently.

Categorization: We partition the dataset into subsets based on user-specified difficulty fidelity \mathcal{L} , and obtain $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_{\max}$.

B. Coreset Selection

We use HiVT-64 as the backbone model in assisting the coreset construction and employ a corresponding submodular function P to evaluate the contribution of each sample. A greedy algorithm is then utilized to construct the coreset, ensuring that the selected subset best represents the characteristics of the entire dataset. Notably, the identified coreset is not limited to the HiVT-64 model but can be effectively used to train other trajectory prediction models, as demonstrated in our experiments (see Section V, Table I). We propose two coreset constructions, which we refer to as *fixed selection* and *balanced selection*, respectively. Since they share a common structure, we describe them together in Algorithm 1. In line 7 of Algorithm 1, $\Delta(S^j | \mathcal{C}) := P(\mathcal{C} \cup \{S^j\}) - P(\mathcal{C})$ is the submodular gain of adding S^j to the current coreset \mathcal{C} .

1) *Fixed Selection*: This method uses a fixed sample ratio of data to include in the coreset. Let α represent the fixed ratio (e.g., $\alpha = 0.1$ for 10%). The number of samples selected from each difficulty level $l_k \in \mathcal{L}$ is determined by $n_k = \alpha \times |L_k|$, where $|L_k|$ is the total number of samples in L_k . To select the most important samples to iteratively build \mathcal{C} , we utilize the following submodular function

$$P(S^j) = \sum_{S^i \in \mathcal{C}} |f(S^i) - f(S^j)|^2 - \sum_{S^i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{C}} |f(S^i) - f(S^j)|^2, \quad (1)$$

where $f(\cdot)$ represents the objective function of HiVT-64, composed of Laplace Negative Log-Likelihood Loss and Soft Target Cross-Entropy Loss, \mathcal{C} is the set of already selected samples, S^j is the sample currently being considered for inclusion in the coreset, and S^i represents the samples already in the coreset. The first term, $\sum_{S^i \in \mathcal{C}} |f(S^i) - f(S^j)|^2$, measures the similarity between the candidate sample S^j and the samples S^i in \mathcal{C} . This term assesses how well S^j aligns

²For example, a given agent may only be present for a few time frames and then move quickly outside the sensing scope of the ego vehicle.

with the samples already selected in \mathcal{C} . The second term, $\sum_{S^i \in \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{C}} |f(S^i) - f(S^j)|^2$, measures the similarity between S^j and the samples in the remainder of the dataset $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{C}$. This term evaluates how distinct S^j is from the samples that have not yet been selected. By maximizing $P(S^j)$, the goal is to select samples that are highly representative of the current subset \mathcal{C} while being sufficiently distinct from the rest of the dataset $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{C}$. This ensures that the coreset \mathcal{C} remains diverse and representative of the entire dataset.

2) *Balanced Selection*: This method is designed to mitigate biases stemming from the distribution imbalance in scenes with heterogeneous difficulties. It focuses on selecting more challenging but less frequent samples to ensure a relatively balanced representation of difficulty levels in the final coreset. The selection budget is dynamically allocated between different difficulty levels to reduce bias towards over-represented, easier scenarios. We use the `DynamicBudget` function as shown in Algorithm 1 to determine n_k . That is, n_k is determined starting from $k = \max$ so that greater complexity are prioritized. The balanced selection method dynamically adjusts the budget based on the remaining coreset size and the number of difficulty levels.

Within each difficulty level l_k , similar to fixed selection, the balanced selection method also uses the given submodular optimization to select the most representative samples, as shown in Eq. (1). By focusing on more challenging but less frequent samples, the balanced selection method achieves a relatively balanced proportion of different difficulty levels in the selected coreset. The results are shown in Table III.

V. EXPERIMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

A. Dataset and Metrics

We use the large-scale Argoverse Motion Forecasting Dataset 1.1 [8] as the core data source. This dataset is specifically designed for trajectory prediction tasks in autonomous driving and includes 323,557 real-world scenarios, covering the motion trajectories of various traffic participants and providing high-definition map information. The dataset is divided into a training set (205,942 samples), a validation set (39,472 samples), and a test set (78,143 samples). The test set only provides the first 2 seconds of trajectory data, requiring prediction for the subsequent 3 seconds. The map data includes lane geometry, direction, connectivity, and traffic light locations, which helps the model understand the dynamic interactions between the environment and participants.

We use the standard evaluation metrics: minADE, minFDE, and MR to assess model performance, where minADE measures the average distance between the predicted and ground truth trajectories, minFDE evaluates the deviation between the predicted and ground truth endpoints, and MR calculates the proportion of endpoints with a deviation exceeding 2 meters.

B. Implementation Details

Coreset Selection. To identify the most impactful coreset of Argoverse 1 [8], we used HiVT-64 [1] as the backbone

Algorithm 1 Coreset Selection

Input: Entire dataset \mathcal{D} , ratio α , submodular function $P(\cdot)$, selection method (Fixed or Balanced)

Output: Selected coreset \mathcal{C}

```

1: Initialize:  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: For each difficulty level  $l_k \in \mathcal{L}$  ( $k = \max, \dots, 1$ )
3:    $\mathcal{C}_k \leftarrow \emptyset$  ▷ Initialize selected set for difficulty level  $l_k$ 
4:    $n_{\text{rest}} \leftarrow |\mathcal{D}|$ 
5:    $n_k \leftarrow \begin{cases} \alpha \times |L_k|, & \text{if Fixed} \\ \text{DynamicBudget}(n_{\text{rest}}, \alpha, k), & \text{if Balanced} \end{cases}$ 
        ▷ Compute number of samples to select  $n_k$ 
6:   For  $j = 1$  to  $n_k$  ▷ Iterate to select  $n_k$  samples
7:      $S^j \leftarrow \arg \max_{S^i \in L_k \setminus \mathcal{C}_k} \Delta(S^i | \mathcal{C}_k)$ 
        ▷ Select  $S^j$  with the highest submodular gain
8:      $\mathcal{C}_k \leftarrow \mathcal{C}_k \cup \{S^j\}$ 
        ▷ Update the coreset for difficulty level  $l_k$ 
9:   end for
10:   $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{C}_k$ 
11:   $\mathcal{D} \leftarrow \mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{C}_k$ 
12: end for
13: Return  $\mathcal{C}$ 

14: function DYNAMICBUDGET( $n_{\text{rest}}, \alpha, k$ )
15:   budget  $\leftarrow \alpha \times n_{\text{rest}}$ 
16:    $l_{\text{rest}} \leftarrow k$ 
17:   if  $|L_k| \leq \text{budget}$  then
18:      $n_k \leftarrow |L_k|$ 
19:   else
20:      $n_k \leftarrow \frac{\text{budget}}{l_{\text{rest}}}$ 
21:   return  $n_k$ 

```

model. First, we pretrained on the full dataset for 10 epochs to establish baseline prediction capabilities. Then, we computed the submodular function score for each sample and iteratively added the most contributing samples to the coreset until the budget was met.

Trajectory Prediction Model Training on Coreset. We trained three trajectory prediction models, HiVT-64 [1], HiVT-128 [1], and HPNet [37], on an RTX 2080 Ti GPU using the AdamW optimizer for 64 epochs. The batch size was set to 32, with an initial learning rate of 3×10^{-4} , a weight decay of 1×10^{-4} , and a dropout rate of 0.1. The learning rate was decayed using a cosine annealing scheduler. The local area radius was set to 50 meters to capture the local environment effectively. The number of prediction modes F was set to 6. The primary difference between HiVT-64 and HiVT-128 was the number of hidden units, with 64 and 128, respectively. No additional techniques, such as ensemble methods or data augmentation, were used during training.

C. Experiment Results

We use randomly sampled subsets with corresponding data keep ratios as benchmarks to compare against the performance of the coresets selected by our methods. The




Fig. 2: The coresets selected using the random, fixed, and balanced methods were tested on three models: (top): HiVT-64 [1], (middle): HiVT-128 [1], and (bottom): HPNet [37], the current SOTA model. The results are organized from left to right according to different validation set difficulties: (left): the entire validation set, (left2): a new validation set consisting of scenes with more than 40 agents, (right2): scenes with more than 60 agents, and (right): scenes with more than 80 agents. The x-axis represents the data keep ratio, and the y-axis represents the model’s minADE. Each figure includes a star indicating the minADE results when trained on the entire Argoverse Motion Forecasting 1.1 dataset [8]. Additionally, the embedded table presents the minADE, minFDE, and MR results for the models trained on the complete Argoverse dataset, alongside the results for coresets with a 50% data keep ratio selected using the fixed (F.) and balanced (B.) methods.

results are presented in Figure 2. The HiVT-64 model trained on the entire training set achieves a minADE of 0.692 and a minFDE of 1.047. Remarkably, using the fixed and balanced methods to select 50% of the coreset data yields results that closely rivaled those obtained from training with the full dataset. Specifically, the HiVT-64 model achieves minADE scores of 0.714 and 0.711, respectively, using the fixed and balanced coresets. A similar trend is observed with the HiVT-128 model, which demonstrates comparable performance when utilizing the reduced coresets.

Generalization Performance Analysis. To assess the generalization capability of the selected coresets, we further tested them on HPNet[37], the current SOTA model. The results are shown in Table I. The models trained on half of the coreset data exhibited only marginal increases in minADE, with differences of 0.051 and 0.042, and minFDE differences of 0.132 and 0.089 for the fixed and balanced methods, respectively, compared to models trained on the full dataset. This indicates that our coreset selection methods can effectively reduce the training data while maintaining competitive performance.

Analysis of Diverse Difficult Scenarios. Due to the potential encounters with highly complex scenarios in real-world autonomous driving systems, we decided to evaluate our methods in more challenging environments, particularly those involving a large number of agents. For example, in

dense urban settings, an autonomous driving system may simultaneously face interference from multiple vehicles. In such cases, the quality of system decisions is directly related to driving safety. To thoroughly assess the performance of our coreset selection methods—random, fixed, and balanced—we partitioned the validation set based on the number of agents present in each scenario, creating new validation subsets with more than 40 agents, more than 60 agents, and more than 80 agents, respectively. We trained models using the entire dataset as well as coresets selected by the random, fixed, and balanced methods, and then tested these models on the aforementioned validation subsets. The results are presented in Figure 2.

Across all validation subsets, the coresets selected by our balanced method consistently demonstrated excellent performance, particularly excelling in more complex scenarios. For instance, as shown in Table II, in the validation set containing more than 60 agents, the balanced method achieved a minADE of 1.216 with a data keep ratio of 40%, compared to 1.292 achieved by the random method. Additionally, the fixed method exhibited strong performance at higher data keep ratios, outperforming the random selection approach. When operating under low data keep ratios, the balanced method showed a more significant advantage over the other methods. Notably, the performance of the random method deteriorated considerably at low data keep

| HPNet[37] | minADE | | minFDE | | MR | |
|--------------|--------|----------|--------|----------|-------|----------|
| All | 0.875 | | 1.202 | | 0.127 | |
| α (%) | fixed | balanced | fixed | balanced | fixed | balanced |
| 50 | 0.926 | 0.917 | 1.334 | 1.291 | 0.145 | 0.144 |
| 40 | 0.931 | 0.920 | 1.336 | 1.301 | 0.153 | 0.146 |
| 30 | 0.937 | 0.924 | 1.365 | 1.307 | 0.160 | 0.148 |
| 20 | 0.951 | 0.937 | 1.363 | 1.342 | 0.158 | 0.157 |
| 10 | 0.968 | 0.954 | 1.409 | 1.363 | 0.169 | 0.158 |
| 5 | 1.003 | 0.980 | 1.487 | 1.407 | 0.182 | 0.163 |
| 2 | 1.091 | 1.022 | 1.695 | 1.517 | 0.227 | 0.186 |
| 1 | 1.125 | 1.086 | 1.798 | 1.686 | 0.236 | 0.223 |

TABLE I: Quantitative results on validation set with the number of agents more than 40 for HPNet[37] model. The top row displays results from training on the entire dataset, while the rows below show results from training on coresets selected by the fixed and balanced method with different data keep ratios.

| HiVT-64[1] | minADE | | | minFDE | | |
|--------------|--------|-------|----------|--------|-------|----------|
| All | 1.248 | | | 1.898 | | |
| α (%) | random | fixed | balanced | random | fixed | balanced |
| 50 | 1.268 | 1.263 | 1.228 | 1.969 | 1.945 | 1.873 |
| 40 | 1.292 | 1.267 | 1.216 | 2.067 | 2.051 | 1.918 |
| 10 | 1.470 | 1.446 | 1.323 | 2.416 | 2.414 | 2.178 |
| 5 | 1.616 | 1.570 | 1.463 | 2.849 | 2.687 | 2.389 |
| 1 | 2.760 | 2.452 | 2.195 | 5.773 | 4.887 | 4.412 |

TABLE II: Quantitative results on validation set with the number of agents more than 60 for HiVT-64[1] model. The top row displays results from training on the entire dataset, while the rows below show results from training on coresets selected by the fixed and balanced method with different data keep ratios.

ratios, underscoring the superiority of our fixed and balanced coreset selection strategies in maintaining model accuracy with reduced data.

Insight into Data Distribution. The performance of trajectory prediction models is significantly influenced by the distribution of data within the training dataset. When certain scene categories are overrepresented, the model tends to learn patterns specific to those scenes, which can result in poor generalization in underrepresented or more complex scenarios. To quantify the data distribution in the Argoverse [8] training dataset, we calculated the proportion of samples for each scene category and the mean variance of the dataset, as shown in Table III. Variance is a measure of data spread, reflecting how evenly the data is distributed within a dataset. The variance for each dataset is calculated as:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{\max} \sum_{l=1}^{\max} (x_{l_k} - \mu)^2,$$

where x_{l_k} is the proportion of data points for difficulty level l_k , $\mu = 10\%$ is the baseline proportion for each level. We categorized the dataset into 10 difficulty levels based on the number of agents per scene, ranging from 10 to 90 agents, with samples containing more than 100 agents grouped into one difficulty level.

In the full training dataset (100% data), the proportion of data across categories varies significantly, with scenes containing more than 60 agents accounting for only 2.31%, a

| | α (%) | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60+ | σ^2 |
|----------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| All | | 32.26 | 28.32 | 17.98 | 7.90 | 3.23 | 2.31 | 140.12 |
| random | 50 | 33.98 | 31.44 | 20.05 | 8.53 | 3.57 | 2.85 | 162.60 |
| balanced | 50 | 23.45 | 23.45 | 23.45 | 17.41 | 7.12 | 5.11 | 101.53 |
| | 40 | 21.18 | 21.18 | 21.18 | 21.18 | 8.90 | 6.40 | 89.12 |
| | 30 | 19.90 | 19.90 | 19.90 | 19.90 | 11.87 | 8.53 | 75.71 |
| | 20 | 17.44 | 17.44 | 17.44 | 17.44 | 17.44 | 12.78 | 59.36 |
| | 10 | 15.01 | 15.01 | 15.01 | 15.01 | 15.01 | 24.95 | 39.62 |

TABLE III: The distribution of different scenario difficulty levels across various training sets and data selection methods, as well as the corresponding mean variance (σ^2). The top row shows the distribution for the entire Argoverse [8] training set. The second row represents the distribution of a randomly selected 50% subset. The following rows display the distribution of coresets selected using our balanced method at different data keep ratios. The last column provides the mean variance, indicating the deviation of the data distribution from the standard proportion (10%).

very small percentage. Scenarios with fewer than 10 agents, which constitute 8% of the data, are excluded from comparison as they were filtered out during the coreset selection. In the randomly sampled 50% subset, simple scenarios (less than 30 agents) dominate, making up over 85% of the data, while more complex scenarios with a larger number of agents are underrepresented. The mean variance of the dataset is 162.60, indicating a considerable imbalance in the data distribution across all scene categories.

For the coresets selected using the balanced selection method, the variance within each coreset remains consistently lower than that of the full dataset as the retention rate decreases. For example, at the 50% retention level, the mean variance decreases to 101.53, significantly lower than the full dataset’s 140.12, indicating a more balanced distribution. As the retention level decreases further to 40%, 30%, 20%, and 10%, the variance values continue to decrease, demonstrating that the balanced selection method effectively maintains a more uniform distribution across different scene categories.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we address two major challenges in trajectory prediction for autonomous vehicles: the need for data-efficient training and reducing bias due to imbalanced data distribution in different driving scenarios. To address these challenges, we propose a novel data-efficient training method based on coreset selection. Our method focuses on selecting a small but representative subset of trajectory data that contributes significantly to model performance while balancing the proportion of data with different difficulty levels. The fixed coreset selection method can effectively find data that contributes significantly to the model, thereby significantly reducing the amount of training data while maintaining model performance. The balanced coreset selection method specifically addresses the data imbalance problem by prioritizing more challenging scenarios with higher agent density, thereby achieving a more uniform data distribution across different scenario categories. At the same time, our selected coreset shows good generalization ability to other models.

REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [2] C. Feng, H. Zhou, H. Lin, Z. Zhang, Z. Xu, C. Zhang, B. Zhou, and S. Shen, "Macformer: Map-agent coupled transformer for real-time and robust trajectory prediction," *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2023.
- [3] Y. Chai, B. Sapp, M. Bansal, and D. Anguelov, "Multipath: Multiple probabilistic anchor trajectory hypotheses for behavior prediction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.05449*, 2019.
- [4] J. Gu, C. Sun, and H. Zhao, "Densentnt: End-to-end trajectory prediction from dense goal sets," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021, pp. 15 303–15 312.
- [5] L. Zhang, P.-H. Su, J. Hoang, G. C. Haynes, and M. Marchetti-Bowick, "Map-adaptive goal-based trajectory prediction," in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 1371–1383.
- [6] H. Zhao, J. Gao, T. Lan, C. Sun, B. Sapp, B. Varadarajan, Y. Shen, Y. Shen, Y. Chai, C. Schmid *et al.*, "Tnt: Target-driven trajectory prediction," in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 895–904.
- [7] J. Ngiam, B. Caine, V. Vasudevan, Z. Zhang, H.-T. L. Chiang, J. Ling, R. Roelofs, A. Bewley, C. Liu, A. Venugopal *et al.*, "Scene transformer: A unified architecture for predicting multiple agent trajectories," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.08417*, 2021.
- [8] M.-F. Chang, J. Lambert, P. Sangkloy, J. Singh, S. Bak, A. Hartnett, D. Wang, P. Carr, S. Lucey, D. Ramanan *et al.*, "Argoverse: 3d tracking and forecasting with rich maps," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2019, pp. 8748–8757.
- [9] J. M. Johnson and T. M. Khoshgoftaar, "Survey on deep learning with class imbalance," *Journal of big data*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–54, 2019.
- [10] S. Har-Peled and S. Mazumdar, "On coresets for k-means and k-median clustering," in *Proceedings of the thirty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 2004, pp. 291–300.
- [11] D. Zhou, K. Wang, J. Gu, X. Peng, D. Lian, Y. Zhang, Y. You, and J. Feng, "Dataset quantization," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 17 205–17 216.
- [12] X. Huang, A. Khetan, R. Bidart, and Z. Karmin, "Pyramid-bert: Reducing complexity via successive core-set based token selection," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14380*, 2022.
- [13] K. Killamsetty, X. Zhao, F. Chen, and R. Iyer, "Retrieve: Coreset selection for efficient and robust semi-supervised learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 14 488–14 501, 2021.
- [14] E. D. Cubuk, B. Zoph, D. Mane, V. Vasudevan, and Q. V. Le, "Autoaugment: Learning augmentation policies from data," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1805.09501*, 2018.
- [15] D. C. Liu and J. Nocedal, "On the limited memory bfgs method for large scale optimization," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 503–528, 1989.
- [16] J. Bergstra and Y. Bengio, "Random search for hyper-parameter optimization," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2012.
- [17] M. D. Zeiler, "Adadelat: an adaptive learning rate method," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5701*, 2012.
- [18] T. Wang, J.-Y. Zhu, A. Torralba, and A. A. Efros, "Dataset distillation," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.10959*, 2018.
- [19] B. Zhao, K. R. Mopuri, and H. Bilen, "Dataset condensation with gradient matching," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.05929*, 2020.
- [20] B. Zhao and H. Bilen, "Dataset condensation with differentiable siamese augmentation," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 12 674–12 685.
- [21] —, "Dataset condensation with distribution matching," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2023, pp. 6514–6523.
- [22] K. Wang, B. Zhao, X. Peng, Z. Zhu, S. Yang, S. Wang, G. Huang, H. Bilen, X. Wang, and Y. You, "Cafe: Learning to condense dataset by aligning features," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 12 196–12 205.
- [23] J.-H. Kim, J. Kim, S. J. Oh, S. Yun, H. Song, J. Jeong, J.-W. Ha, and H. O. Song, "Dataset condensation via efficient synthetic-data parameterization," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 11 102–11 118.
- [24] G. Hinton, "Distilling the knowledge in a neural network," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.02531*, 2015.
- [25] A. Romero, N. Ballas, S. E. Kahou, A. Chassang, C. Gatta, and Y. Bengio, "Fitnets: Hints for thin deep nets," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6550*, 2014.
- [26] 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, 2021.
- [27] N. Kaempchen, K. Weiss, M. Schaefer, and K. C. Dietmayer, "Imm object tracking for high dynamic driving maneuvers," in *IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium, 2004*. IEEE, 2004, pp. 825–830.
- [28] S. Ammoun and F. Nashashibi, "Real time trajectory prediction for collision risk estimation between vehicles," in *2009 IEEE 5th international conference on intelligent computer communication and processing*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 417–422.
- [29] T. Batz, K. Watson, and J. Beyerer, "Recognition of dangerous situations within a cooperative group of vehicles," in *2009 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 907–912.
- [30] 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.
- [31] M. Liang, B. Yang, R. Hu, Y. Chen, R. Liao, S. Feng, and R. Urta-sun, "Learning lane graph representations for motion forecasting," in *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part II 16*. Springer, 2020, pp. 541–556.
- [32] J. Wang, L. Su, S. Han, D. Song, and F. Miao, "Towards safe autonomy in hybrid traffic: Detecting unpredictable abnormal behaviors of human drivers via information sharing," *ACM Transactions on Cyber-Physical Systems*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 1–25, 2024.
- [33] F. Giuliani, I. Hasan, M. Cristani, and F. Galasso, "Transformer networks for trajectory forecasting," in *2020 25th international conference on pattern recognition (ICPR)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 10 335–10 342.
- [34] M. Xu, W. Dai, C. Liu, X. Gao, W. Lin, G.-J. Qi, and H. Xiong, "Spatial-temporal transformer networks for traffic flow forecasting," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.02908*, 2020.
- [35] 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.
- [36] 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.
- [37] X. Tang, M. Kan, S. Shan, Z. Ji, J. Bai, and X. Chen, "Hpnet: Dynamic trajectory forecasting with historical prediction attention," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 15 261–15 270.
- [38] H. Robbins and S. Monro, "A stochastic approximation method," *The annals of mathematical statistics*, pp. 400–407, 1951.
- [39] I. Sutskever, J. Martens, G. Dahl, and G. Hinton, "On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2013, pp. 1139–1147.
- [40] D. Kingma, "Adam: a method for stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [41] J. Duchi, E. Hazan, and Y. Singer, "Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization," *Journal of machine learning research*, vol. 12, no. 7, 2011.
- [42] G. Cazenavette, T. Wang, A. Torralba, A. A. Efros, and J.-Y. Zhu, "Dataset distillation by matching training trajectories," in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022, pp. 4750–4759.
- [43] F. Olken, "Random sampling from databases," Ph.D. dissertation, Citeseer, 1993.
- [44] C. Coleman, C. Yeh, S. Mussmann, B. Mirzasoleiman, P. Bailis, P. Liang, J. Leskovec, and M. Zaharia, "Selection via proxy: Efficient data selection for deep learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.11829*, 2019.
- [45] K. Margatina, G. Vernikos, L. Barrault, and N. Aletras, "Active learning by acquiring contrastive examples," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03764*, 2021.

- [46] M. Paul, S. Ganguli, and G. K. Dziugaite, “Deep learning on a data diet: Finding important examples early in training,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 20 596–20 607, 2021.
- [47] B. Mirzasoleiman, J. Bilmes, and J. Leskovec, “Coresets for data-efficient training of machine learning models,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 6950–6960.
- [48] K. Killamsetty, S. Durga, G. Ramakrishnan, A. De, and R. Iyer, “Grad-match: Gradient matching based data subset selection for efficient deep model training,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2021, pp. 5464–5474.
- [49] R. Balakrishnan, T. Li, T. Zhou, N. Himayat, V. Smith, and J. Bilmes, “Diverse client selection for federated learning via submodular maximization,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.