

# TrajCogn: Leveraging LLMs for Cognizing Movement Patterns and Travel Purposes from Trajectories

Zeyu Zhou\*  
zeyuzhou@bjtu.edu.cn  
Beijing Jiaotong University  
Beijing, China

Yan Lin\*  
lyan@cs.aau.dk  
Aalborg University  
Aalborg, Denmark

Haomin Wen  
haominwe@andrew.cmu.edu  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, USA

Qisen Xu  
Shengnan Guo  
{23218133,guoshn}@bjtu.edu.cn  
Beijing Jiaotong University  
Beijing, China

Jilin Hu  
jlhu@dase.ecnu.edu.cn  
East China Normal University  
Shanghai, China

Youfang Lin  
Huaiyu Wan†  
{yflin,hywan}@bjtu.edu.cn  
Beijing Jiaotong University  
Beijing, China

## Abstract

Spatio-temporal trajectories are crucial in various data mining tasks. It is important to develop a versatile trajectory learning method that performs different tasks with high accuracy. This involves effectively extracting two core aspects of information—movement patterns and travel purposes—from trajectories. However, this is challenging due to limitations in model capacity and the quality and scale of trajectory datasets. Meanwhile, large language models (LLMs) have shown great success in versatility by training on large-scale, high-quality datasets. Given the similarities between trajectories and sentences, there’s potential to leverage LLMs to develop an effective trajectory learning method. However, standard LLMs are not designed to handle the unique spatio-temporal features of trajectories and cannot extract movement patterns and travel purposes.

To address these challenges, we propose a model called TrajCogn that effectively utilizes LLMs to model trajectories. TrajCogn leverages the strengths of LLMs to create a versatile trajectory learning approach while addressing the limitations of standard LLMs. First, TrajCogn incorporates a novel trajectory semantic embedder that enables LLMs to process spatio-temporal features and extract movement patterns and travel purposes. Second, TrajCogn introduces a new trajectory prompt that integrates these patterns and purposes into LLMs, allowing the model to adapt to various tasks. Extensive experiments on two real-world datasets and two representative tasks demonstrate that TrajCogn successfully achieves its design goals. Codes are available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/TrajCogn-5021>.

## 1 Introduction

A spatio-temporal (ST) trajectory is a sequence of timestamped locations, represented as  $\mathcal{T} = \langle (l_1, t_1), (l_2, t_2), \dots, (l_n, t_n) \rangle$ . It tracks the movements of an individual or object in a geographical space. With the widespread use of mobile phones, car navigation systems, location-based services, and online map services, ST trajectories are being recorded and collected from various sources [43]. They enable a wide range of spatio-temporal data mining tasks and applications, including trajectory prediction [11, 19], anomaly detection [25, 36],




Figure 1: A trajectory of commuting to work.

trajectory similarity measurement [9, 20, 38, 41], and trajectory-user linking [27, 44].

To enhance the use of ST trajectories in tasks and applications, it is essential to develop a trajectory learning method that 1) effectively captures the information embedded in the trajectory, specifically, movement patterns that describe how the individual or object moves from one location to another and travel purposes that indicate the underlying reason or motivation for the movement; and 2) accurately performs a variety of downstream tasks, reducing the need for designing a separate method for each task and application. Existing efforts mostly adhere to the self-supervised representation learning approach [6, 7], which builds a trajectory learning model that maps a trajectory into its embedding vector and trains the model from scratch [12, 16, 40]. However, considering the complexity of the information embedded in trajectories and the difficulty in creating a versatile learning model capable of performing different tasks, the effectiveness of these existing models is limited by their capacities and the size and quality of available trajectory datasets.

On the other hand, versatile models have been highly successful in the domain of natural language processing (NLP), showcasing promising results on various downstream tasks [7, 8, 31, 32]. These models, often referred to as large language models (LLMs), benefit mainly from their large capacity, abundant large-scale corpus datasets, and well-thought-out prompt engineering [1]. Given the

\*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

†Corresponding author.

similarities between trajectories and sentences in NLP, there is significant potential in building a more effective trajectory learning model by leveraging LLMs. Trajectory points exhibit spatio-temporal correlations similar to the contextual correlations between words in sentences. Additionally, movement patterns in trajectories, such as turning and acceleration, can be considered akin to the semantics of words. Furthermore, the travel purpose of trajectories, such as leisure activities or commuting, can be seen as similar to the semantics of sentences. Despite this potential, there are two challenges in adapting LLMs to model trajectories.

**First, LLMs are incapable of processing the spatio-temporal features in trajectories.** LLMs are designed to handle sequences of discrete word tokens as input. However, trajectories consist of both continuous and discrete spatio-temporal features, such as GPS coordinates, timestamps, and road segments. It is challenging to process these features in a way that LLMs can understand and extract information from.

**Second, LLMs are unable to extract the movement patterns and travel purposes directly from trajectories.** The movement patterns in trajectories are represented by the changes between features of trajectory points. Take Figure 1 as an example, where the moving object goes straight from points  $(l_1, t_1)$  to  $(l_3, t_3)$ , accelerates between points  $(l_2, t_2)$  and  $(l_3, t_3)$ , and turns left between points  $(l_3, t_3)$  and  $(l_4, t_4)$ . These patterns can be derived from changes in coordinates, timestamps, and velocities. Moreover, the travel purpose of a trajectory is closely linked to its origin and destination (OD). As shown in Figure 1, the trajectory originates near several residential buildings and concludes near an office building, indicating that the travel purpose of this trajectory is commuting. However, LLMs primarily focus on modeling the semantic meaning of words in a sentence. They lack the necessary design to effectively extract movement patterns from spatio-temporal features, or to model travel purposes from the functionalities of locations near a trajectory’s OD.

To address these challenges and effectively leverage LLMs to construct a versatile trajectory learning model, we propose a novel approach named *Trajectory Cognition (TrajCogn)*. TrajCogn employs a trajectory prompt to integrate movement patterns and travel purposes from trajectories. Additionally, by implementing the task-tuning mechanism in the prompt, TrajCogn can adapt to various downstream tasks and generate accurate predictions. TrajCogn also encompasses a trajectory semantic embedder to enable LLMs to process the spatio-temporal features in trajectories and effectively extract movement patterns and travel purposes. To enhance the training of TrajCogn, we implement a cross-reconstruction pretext task based on self-supervised reconstruction. This improves the model’s ability to learn from trajectory data. Our contributions are summarized as follows:

- We propose TrajCogn, a model that effectively migrates LLMs to cognize movement patterns and travel purposes from trajectories. By taking advantage of the adaptability of LLMs, TrajCogn accurately performs different downstream tasks, mitigating the limitation of small-scale trajectory datasets.
- We introduce a novel trajectory prompt that integrates the two essential aspects of information in trajectories, namely movement patterns and travel semantics, into LLMs. This prompt also

enables the model to effectively adapt to various downstream tasks.

- We propose a novel trajectory semantic embedder that enables LLMs to process the spatio-temporal features of trajectories. This embedder ensures that LLMs can effectively extract movement patterns and travel semantics in an explainable manner.
- We conduct extensive experiments on two real-world trajectory datasets to evaluate the proposed model with a variety of experimental settings. The results showcase that TrajCogn is a versatile trajectory learning model that demonstrates strong performance across different tasks.

## 2 Related Works

**Trajectory Learning Models** aim to extract information from trajectories and perform various related tasks. Compared to task-specific prediction models [5, 9, 11, 21, 35, 41], which are end-to-end trained for one specific task, trajectory learning models are versatile and useful in modern intelligent transportation applications that usually involve multiple tasks.

Most existing efforts adhere to the self-supervised learning approach. Earlier research commonly used RNNs to reconstruct discrete locations [12, 20, 25] or continuous movement features [42] of trajectories based on auto-encoding [14] and variational auto-encoders [18]. Additionally, methods like CTLE [24] and Toast [4], based on transformers [34] and Masked Language Model (MLM) tasks [7], treat trajectory points as tokens in a sentence. Furthermore, contrastive learning methods such as PIM [39], TrajCL [2], and MMTEC [23] implicitly model the travel purpose of a trajectory. More recently, methods combining multiple approaches have been developed. START [16] leverages both MLM tasks and SimCLR [3], while LightPath [40] incorporates a reconstruction task and a contrastive-style rational reasoning task.

Since these methods are self-supervised and trained from scratch, their performance heavily relies on the size and quality of the training datasets, which often have limitations. Despite the achievements of existing methods, further efforts are needed to enhance the performance of trajectory learning models.

**Cross-domain Application of LLMs.** The versatility and superior performance of large language models (LLMs) in the NLP domain have led to efforts to adopt LLMs in other fields to enhance performance. In time series analysis, GPT4TS [45] uses LLMs by freezing the self-attention feed-forward layers. Time-LLM [17] introduces a reprogramming framework. For visual encoding tasks, LM4VisualEncoding [29] incorporates a frozen transformer block from an LLM as a general-purpose visual encoder layer. RLM-Rec [33] integrates the semantic space of LLMs with collaborative relational signals using an alignment framework.

Although these studies provide valuable insights, their methods cannot be directly applied to trajectory learning. Trajectory data has unique spatio-temporal features that require tailored approaches and considerations.

## 3 Preliminaries

### 3.1 Definition

**DEFINITION 1 (ROAD NETWORK).** A road network is represented as a directed graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ .  $\mathcal{V}$  is a set of  $|\mathcal{V}|$  vertices, and each

vertex  $v_i \in \mathcal{V}$  represents an intersection between road segments or the end of a segment.  $\mathcal{E}$  is a set of  $|\mathcal{E}|$  segments, where each segment  $s_i \in \mathcal{E}$  represents a road segment linking two vertices.

**DEFINITION 2 (TRAJECTORY).** A trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  is a sequence of timestamped locations, represented as  $\mathcal{T} = \langle (l_1, t_1), (l_2, t_2), \dots, (l_n, t_n) \rangle$ . Here, each location  $l_i$  is represented by its latitude and longitude coordinates, i.e.,  $l_i = (l_i^{\text{lat}}, l_i^{\text{lng}})$ . The timestamp  $t_i$  indicates when  $l_i$  is visited. To simplify, we denote the  $i$ -th trajectory point  $(l_i, t_i)$  as  $\tau_i$ .

**DEFINITION 3 (POINT OF INTEREST, POI).** A POI is a particular location that individuals may find valuable or intriguing. It is denoted as  $p = (l, n, a)$ , where  $l$  represents its coordinates,  $n$  indicates its name, and  $a$  refers to its address.

### 3.2 Problem Statement

*Trajectory Learning.* The objective is to develop a trajectory learning model  $f_\Theta$  with a set of learnable parameters  $\Theta$ . This model takes a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$  as input and extracts information from it. Subsequently, this model can adapt to various downstream tasks by accurately predicting the required outputs  $y$  for the task at hand, denoted as  $\hat{y} = f_\Theta(\mathcal{T})$ . For example, in travel time estimation,  $y$  and  $\hat{y}$  represent the ground truth and the estimated travel time, respectively.

### 3.3 Pre-trained Language Model

In this work, a Large Language Model (LLM) refers to a Transformer-based language model pre-trained on corpus datasets. It consists of four essential functions. Formally,

$$\text{LLM} = \text{LMHead} \circ \text{TransBlk} \circ \text{WTE} \circ \text{Tok}(\cdot), \quad (1)$$

where  $\circ$  represents the composition of functions. Specifically, a LLM consists of a tokenizer (Tok) to break down text into discrete tokens, a word token embedding layer (WTE) that converts the tokens into numerical vectors to capture their linguistic features, a transformer block (TransBlk) that further processes the vectors to capture their contextual relationships, and a prediction head (LMHead) that is responsible for making specific predictions, such as generating the next word in a sequence. In a LLM, the dimension of the word token embedding is denoted as  $d$ .

## 4 Methodology

### 4.1 Overview

Figure 2 shows the overall framework of TrajCogn. It is implemented in the following four steps:

- (1) **Trajectory and POI Feature Extraction:** Given a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , we perform map-matching and calculate high-order features such as velocity, acceleration, and direction to expand its features, denoted as  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ . We also extract the address and name features of POIs near the trajectory’s origin and destination.
- (2) **Trajectory Prompt Construction:** We integrate the extracted features into one sequence, called the trajectory prompt. This prompt also includes a task-p-tuning mechanism-based suffix to enable adaptation to various tasks.
- (3) **Trajectory Prompt Embedding:** We map the trajectory prompt into a sequence of  $d$ -dimensional embeddings with a trajectory semantic embedder. This embedder is designed to enable

LLMs to process spatio-temporal features and effectively extract movement patterns and travel purposes with explainability.

- (4) **Model Training and Task Adaptation:** We process the embedding sequence with a *LLM Encoder for Trajectory (LET)*. The last point of the output sequence of LET is used for performing downstream tasks. The learnable parameters in the model are refined by integrating a cross-reconstruction pretext task and further optimized with a dedicated objective function for each specific downstream task.

The following sections provide a detailed explanation of the steps in TrajCogn.

### 4.2 Trajectory Prompt

As illustrated in Figure 1, movement patterns in a trajectory can be represented by positions on the road network and variations in spatio-temporal features. Travel purposes can be inferred from the functionalities of locations near the OD points, and the address and name features of a POI indicate its functionalities.

To incorporate the movement patterns and travel purposes of a trajectory, we first extract spatio-temporal and POI features from the trajectory, as shown in Figure 2(a). To integrate these features into LLMs, we introduce a *Trajectory Prompt*, as illustrated in Figure 2(b). This prompt fuses natural language and the extracted features into a sequence. Furthermore, to adapt the model to different downstream tasks, we introduce a task-p-tuning mechanism, which provides a specific suffix for each task.

**4.2.1 Trajectory and POI Feature Extraction.** Given a trajectory  $\mathcal{T} = \langle (l_1, t_1), (l_2, t_2), \dots, (l_n, t_n) \rangle$  and the road network  $\mathcal{G}$ , we utilize the Leuven Map Matching (LMM) algorithm [26] to map each trajectory point  $\tau_i$  onto the road network. This mapping is denoted as  $\text{LMM}(\tau_i, \mathcal{G}) = (l_i, s_i, t_i)$ , where  $s_i$  represents the road segment on which  $l_i$  is located. We also calculate the velocity  $v_i$ , acceleration  $a_i$ , and direction  $\theta_i$  of each trajectory point  $\tau_i$  according to the difference between the features of  $\tau_i$  and  $\tau_{i+1}$ . Next, we gather the trajectory point  $\tilde{\tau}_i = (l_i, s_i, t_i, v_i, a_i, \theta_i)$  with extracted spatio-temporal features. We set the velocity and acceleration of the last point  $\tilde{\tau}_n$  to 0. Finally, we obtain the trajectory  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \langle \tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_n \rangle$  with extracted features.

To extract POI features, we begin by identifying the origin  $l_1$  and destination  $l_n$  of trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ . Using the Ball Tree algorithm [28], we retrieve the closest  $N_{\text{POI}}$  POIs to  $l_1$ . The set of retrieved POIs is denoted as  $\mathcal{P}_O$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_O = \{p_o^{(1)}, \dots, p_o^{(N_{\text{POI}})}\}$ , and the POIs in  $\mathcal{P}_O$  are arranged in ascending order based on their distance from the origin. Similarly, we retrieve the set of POIs around  $l_n$  as  $\mathcal{P}_D = \{p_d^{(1)}, \dots, p_d^{(N_{\text{POI}})}\}$ . For each POI  $p \in \mathcal{P}_O \cup \mathcal{P}_D$ , we extract its address  $p.a$  and name  $p.n$  features, both represented as lists of words.

**4.2.2 Trajectory Prompt Construction.** The trajectory prompt is composed of four parts, defined as follows:

- (1) **⟨Head Part⟩:** "The trajectory happened on {day-in-week} at {hour} o'clock, "
- (2) **⟨POI Part⟩:** "starts near:  $\{p_o^{(1)}, p_o^{(2)}, \dots, p_o^{(N_{\text{POI}})}\}$ , ends near:  $\{p_d^{(1)}, p_d^{(2)}, \dots, p_d^{(N_{\text{POI}})}\}$ ,"
- (3) **⟨Trajectory Part⟩:** "passes through  $\{\tilde{\tau}_1, \tilde{\tau}_2, \dots, \tilde{\tau}_n\}$ ."




Figure 2: Overall framework of TrajCogn.

## (4) ⟨Suffix Prompt⟩

The ⟨Head Part⟩ enriches the input context and guides the LLM in analyzing trajectories. The ⟨POI Part⟩ provides information about the addresses and names of the POIs around the OD points, allowing the LLM to infer travel purposes. The ⟨Trajectory Part⟩ comprises the extracted features of the trajectory points, enabling the model to extract movement patterns. The placeholders  $\{\}$  are filled with trajectory-specific features and information.

The ⟨Suffix Prompt⟩ is constructed using the proposed task-p-tuning mechanism, enabling the model to perform different downstream tasks. It is a hybrid of hard and soft components [13]. The hard component consists of words that signify the particular task. The soft component [Token] is a task-specific token with a learnable embedding vector. For example, in the case of travel time estimation (TTE), the suffix prompt would be "the total travel time is [TTEToken]." Similarly, for destination prediction (DP), the suffix prompt would be "the destination is [DPToken]."

### 4.3 Trajectory Semantic Embedder

In order to equip LLMs with the ability to process the spatio-temporal features in the trajectory prompt, we propose the *Trajectory Semantic Embedder*, demonstrated in Figure 2(c).

**4.3.1 Spatio-temporal Feature Embedding.** We embed the spatio-temporal features in the constructed trajectory prompt into a  $d$ -dimensional embedding space. For the discrete road segment  $s_i$ , we use an index-fetching embedding module  $E_{\mathcal{E}} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{E}| \times d}$ . The embedding vector for road segment  $s_i$  is represented as  $E_{\mathcal{E}}(s_i)$ . Similarly, for the timestamp  $t_i$ , we use two index-fetching embedding modules:  $E_{\text{dw}} \in \mathbb{R}^{7 \times d}$  and  $E_{\text{h}} \in \mathbb{R}^{24 \times d}$  to embed the cyclic time features, namely day-in-week and hour, as  $E_{\text{dw}}(t_i)$  and  $E_{\text{h}}(t_i)$  respectively.

To facilitate the modeling of movement patterns from variations of continuous features, we take inspiration from previous

studies [22, 35] and employ a one-dimensional convolution for embedding continuous features. Given the continuous features of the  $i$ -th trajectory point, denoted as  $\tau_i^{\text{con}} = (l_i^{\text{lat}}, l_i^{\text{lon}}, v_i, a_i, \theta_i, t_i)$ , the convolution on this point is formulated as follows:

$$E_{\text{con}}(i) = \text{Conv1D}(\tau_{i-\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor : i + \lfloor \frac{k}{2} \rfloor}^{\text{con}}), \quad (2)$$

where  $k$  is a hyper-parameter, denoting the kernel size, and  $E_{\text{con}}(i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  represents the continuous embedding vector of  $\tau_i$ .

Finally, the embedding vector  $e_i$  of the  $i$ -th trajectory point  $\tau_i$  is derived as follows:

$$e_i = E_{\text{con}}(i) + E_{\mathcal{E}}(s_i) + E_{\text{dw}}(t_i) + E_{\text{h}}(t_i) \quad (3)$$

**4.3.2 Movement Pattern Semantic Projection.** To enhance the model's ability to understand the semantics of movement patterns and improve its interpretability, we project each embedding vector  $e_i$  onto a semantic-rich textual space, as shown in Figure 3.

The textual space is defined by a set of words that we choose to describe the movement patterns. Specifically, we establish a set of words  $\mathcal{M}$ , with its content listed in Table 1. For words in  $\mathcal{M}$ , we obtain their embedding vectors using LLM components WTE  $\circ$  Tok introduced in Equation 1.

Table 1: Words describing movement patterns.

Categories	Words
Driving Behaviors	straight, turn, u-turn, brake, accelerate, decelerate, stop, overtake, zigzag, swerve, detour, slide, cruise, glide, cautious, reckless, leisurely
Traveling Dynamics	steady, smooth, rough, constant, dynamic, fast, slow, rapid, rushed, erratic, agile, stationary, sluggish

Furthermore, we introduce a set  $\mathcal{A}$  of virtual words:

$$\mathcal{A} = \langle "[\text{virt}]_1", "[\text{virt}]_2", \dots, "[\text{virt}]_{N_{\mathcal{A}}}" \rangle, \quad (4)$$




Figure 3: Movement pattern semantic projection.

where their word embeddings are initialized randomly and trained end-to-end, and  $N_A$  is the number of virtual words. The words in  $\mathcal{M} \cup \mathcal{A}$  are termed anchor words. We concatenate the embeddings of all anchor words, denoted as  $E_{\text{an}} \in \mathbb{R}^{(|\mathcal{M}|+N_A) \times d}$ .

To project an embedding vector  $e_i$  onto the space defined by  $E_{\text{an}}$ , we employ a dot-product multi-head attention [34] with  $N_H$  attention heads. The attention is calculated using  $e_i$  as query and  $E_{\text{an}}$  as key and value:

$$\tilde{z}_i = \text{Attention}(e_i, E_{\text{an}}, E_{\text{an}}) \quad (5)$$

The final embedding vector  $z_i$  for each trajectory point is then obtained with a residual connection:

$$z_i = \text{MLP}(\tilde{z}_i) + e_i, \quad (6)$$

where MLP represents a two-layer fully connected network. Finally, the embedding sequence of  $\mathcal{T}$  is denoted as  $Z_{\mathcal{T}} = \langle z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n \rangle$ .

**4.3.3 POI Feature Embedding.** The travel purpose can be determined by analyzing the functionalities of POIs around the OD points, as shown in Figure 1. To model the functionalities of POIs, we fetch their embeddings based on their address and name features.

Specifically, in the case of a POI  $p$  is either  $p_o^{(1)}$  or  $p_d^{(1)}$ , which are the closest POIs to the origin or destination, we obtain its embedding as follows:

$$E_{\text{Tok}}(p) = \text{WTE} \circ \text{Tok}(p.a \| p.n), \quad (7)$$

where  $p.a$  and  $p.n$  are the address and name of  $p$ , consists of list of words.  $\|$  denotes list concatenation. For the remaining POIs, we solely utilize their names to obtain their embeddings as  $E_{\text{Tok}}(p) = \text{WTE} \circ \text{Tok}(p.n)$ .

**4.3.4 Sequence of Trajectory Prompt Embeddings.** After obtaining embeddings of spatio-temporal and POI features, the remaining textual components in the trajectory prompt are embedded using  $\text{WTE} \circ \text{Tok}$ . Then, we concatenate the embeddings into a sequence in the same order as their raw features appear in the prompt. For example, the embeddings of the trajectory part are obtained as follows:

$$Z_t = E_{\text{Tok}}(\text{"passes through"}) \| Z_{\mathcal{T}} \quad (8)$$

The embeddings of the (Head Part), (POI Part), and (Suffix Prompt) are denoted as  $Z_h$ ,  $Z_p$ , and  $Z_s$ , respectively. Finally, the

sequence of trajectory prompt embeddings is gathered as follows:

$$Z = Z_h \| Z_p \| Z_t \| Z_s \quad (9)$$

#### 4.4 LLM Encoder for Trajectory

We use the transformer block TransBlk from an LLM as the backbone for the proposed *LLM Encoder for Trajectory* (LET). To better adapt the pre-trained TransBlk to trajectory learning, we employ the Low Rank Adaptation (LoRA) algorithm [15], adding extra parameters to TransBlk.

**4.4.1 Construction of LET.** As illustrated in Figure 2(d), all parameters in the TransBlk are kept fixed, while we introduce a new learnable parameter matrix  $\Delta W_*$  of the same size for each of  $W_q, W_k, W_v$  in every self-attention block of TransBlk. Each  $\Delta W$  is a low-rank matrix that can be written as the product of two low-rank matrices, i.e.,  $\Delta W = BA, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}, A \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times d}$ , where  $r$  is a hyper-parameter, denoting the rank of LoRA with  $r \ll d$ . The modified query matrix in each self-attention block of TransBlk is presented as  $Q = (W_q + \Delta W_q)H = W_qH + B_qA_qH$ , where  $H$  represents a hidden state of a model layer. The same modification is applied to the key and query matrices. Next, the proposed LET can be expressed as follows:

$$\text{LET} = \text{LoRA}(\text{TransBlk}) \quad (10)$$

LET takes the embedding sequence  $Z$  from Equation 9 as input, and outputs a sequence of hidden vectors  $H \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times d}$ , where  $L$  represents the length of  $Z$ .

$$H = \text{LET}(Z) \quad (11)$$

**4.4.2 Adaptation to Downstream Tasks.** LET adapts to different downstream tasks using the task-p-tuning mechanism described in Section 4.2.2. Specifically, the hidden vector corresponding to the task-specific token, i.e., the  $L$ -th hidden vector  $h_{\text{task}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  in  $H$ , can be utilized to perform downstream tasks.

In this study, we present *Travel Time Estimation* (TTE), *Destination Prediction* (DP), and *Similar Trajectory Search* (STS) tasks for evaluation, as shown in Figure 2(e).

The TTE task aims to estimate the travel time of a trajectory given its spatial features and departure time, without using time-related features including timestamp, velocity, and acceleration. For this task, a prediction head is built using a two-layer fully connected network to obtain the prediction as follows:

$$\hat{y}_{\text{TTE}} = \text{MLP}_{\text{TTE}}(h_{\text{task}}) \quad (12)$$

The DP task aims to predict the road segment where the destination of a trajectory is located, given the trajectory excluding its last 5 points. To prevent data leakage, the trajectory prompt does not include any POIs near the destination while performing this task. For this task, a prediction head is built with a two-layer fully connected network, where the output dimension corresponds to the total number of segments  $|\mathcal{E}|$ :

$$\hat{y}_{\text{DP}} = \text{argmax}_s(\hat{p}), \hat{p} = \text{Softmax}(\text{MLP}(h_{\text{task}})) \quad (13)$$

The STS task aims to find the most similar trajectory from a set of candidates given a query. We use cosine similarity on  $h_{\text{task}}$  to determine the similarity between trajectories. Since most datasets do not provide ground truth for this task, we construct the ground truth following the method introduced in Appendix A.




Figure 4: Reconstruction of trajectory points in cross-reconstruction pretext task.

## 4.5 Model Training

We propose a cross-reconstruction pretext task to train the learnable parameters in the model, helping it adapt to trajectories. Before performing a specific task, the model can be further fine-tuned with supervision for that task.

**4.5.1 Cross-reconstruction Pretext Task.** The proposed pretext task involves reconstructing each trajectory point given  $\langle$ Head Part $\rangle$  and  $\langle$ POI Part $\rangle$ , and reconstructing each POI given  $\langle$ Head Part $\rangle$  and  $\langle$ Trajectory Part $\rangle$ .

Firstly, we autoregressively reconstruct the trajectory point features, as shown in Figure 4. Given a trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , this reconstruction consists of  $|\mathcal{T}|$  steps. In the  $i$ -th step, LET receives the embeddings of trajectory prompt composed of  $\langle$ Head Part $\rangle$ ,  $\langle$ Trajectory Part $\rangle$  with the first  $i - 1$  trajectory points:

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{traj},i-1} = \text{LET}(\mathbf{Z}_h \| \mathbf{Z}_p \| \mathbf{Z}_{t,i-1}) \quad (14)$$

Afterwards, we obtain predicted features by applying prediction heads on the last vector in  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{traj},i-1}$ . All prediction heads are implemented with two-layer fully connected networks. The loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{traj}}$  for trajectory reconstruction is then calculated by summing the cross-entropy loss of the predicted segments and the MSE loss of the predicted continuous features.

Next, we proceed with the reconstruction of the POI features. Similar to Equation 14, in the  $i$ -th step, LET receives the embeddings of the trajectory prompt composed of  $\langle$ Head Part $\rangle$ ,  $\langle$ Trajectory Part $\rangle$ , and  $\langle$ POI Part $\rangle$  with the first  $i - 1$  POIs:

$$\mathbf{H}_{\text{POI},i-1} = \text{LET}(\mathbf{Z}_h \| \mathbf{Z}_t \| \mathbf{Z}_{p,i-1}) \quad (15)$$

Then, we obtain the predicted POI features by applying the LMHead component of LLMs on the last vector in  $\mathbf{H}_{\text{POI},i-1}$ . The loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{POI}}$  for POI reconstruction is the cross-entropy loss of the predicted POI features.

Finally, the loss function of the pretext task is represented as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{pre}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{traj}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{POI}} \quad (16)$$

To improve the training efficiency, we utilize the teacher-forcing mode [37] to parallelize the reconstruction process.

**4.5.2 Task-specific Fine-tuning.** When performing a specific task, the proposed model can be fine-tuned with the task’s supervision to further improve prediction accuracy.

For the TTE task, the loss function is defined with mean square error (MSE) loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{TTE}} = \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{y}_{\text{TTE}} - y_{\text{TTE}}\|_2^2 \quad (17)$$

For the DP task, the loss function is defined with the cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{DP}} = -\log \hat{p}(s_d), \quad (18)$$

where  $s_d$  represents the label of the destination segment, and  $\hat{p}(s_d)$  denotes the  $s_d$ -th value of the predicted probability score  $\hat{p}$ .

For the STS task, no fine-tuning is involved. We directly use the hidden state  $\mathbf{h}_{\text{task}}$  from the cross-reconstruction pretext task.

## 5 Experiments

To evaluate the proposed method’s effectiveness on trajectory learning, we conduct experiments on two real-world datasets and compare its performance against several state-of-the-art baselines.

### 5.1 Datasets

In our experiments, we use two real-world datasets called Chengdu and Xi’an. These datasets were released by Didi<sup>1</sup> and consist of GPS trajectories recorded by taxis in Chengdu and Xi’an, China. Trajectories shorter than 6 points are excluded from our study. We fetch road networks covering the two datasets from OpenStreetMap<sup>2</sup> to map-match trajectories. An overview of the dataset statistics is shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Dataset statistics.

Dataset	Chengdu	Xi’an
Time span	09/30 - 10/10, 2018	09/29 - 10/15, 2018
#Segments	4,315	3,392
#Trajectories	140,000	210,000
#Records	18,832,411	18,267,440

### 5.2 Comparison Methods

We compare the proposed method with several state-of-the-art trajectory learning methods.

- **Traj2vec** [42] calculates features with sliding windows and trains the model with an auto-regressive pretext task.
- **T2vec** [20] pre-trains the model by reconstructing original trajectories from low-sampling ones using a denoising auto-encoder.
- **TremBR** [12] constructs an RNN-based seq2seq model that recovers the road segments and time of the input trajectories.
- **CTLE** [24] pre-trains a bi-directional Transformer with two MLM tasks of location and hour predictions. The trajectory representation is obtained by applying mean pooling on point embeddings.
- **Toast** [4] utilizes a context-aware node2vec model to generate segment representations and trains the model with an MLM-based task and a sequence discrimination task.
- **TrajCL** [2] introduces a dual-feature, self-attention-based encoder and trains the model in a contrastive style using the InfoNCE loss.
- **START** [16] includes a time-aware trajectory encoder and a GAT that considers the transfer between road segments. The model is

<sup>1</sup><https://gaia.didichuxing.com/>

<sup>2</sup><https://www.openstreetmap.org/>

**Table 3: Overall performance of methods.**

Task		Travel Time Estimation			Destination Prediction			Similar Trajectory Search		
Datasets	Methods	RMSE (sec) ↓	MAE (sec) ↓	MAPE (%) ↓	ACC@1 (%) ↑	ACC@5 (%) ↑	Recall (%) ↑	Mean Rank ↓	ACC@1 (%) ↑	ACC@5 (%) ↑
Chengdu	Traj2vec	130.872 ± 2.013	59.993 ± 2.225	14.870 ± 0.698	43.074 ± 1.255	73.899 ± 1.568	14.760 ± 0.345	3.371 ± 0.156	83.325 ± 0.754	89.375 ± 0.459
	T2vec	128.508 ± 2.600	60.520 ± 2.575	15.224 ± 0.446	47.739 ± 0.239	73.509 ± 0.147	16.638 ± 0.108	3.345 ± 0.380	81.450 ± 0.778	93.700 ± 1.838
	TremBR	125.535 ± 2.849	57.965 ± 2.588	13.964 ± 0.860	48.987 ± 0.377	72.082 ± 0.289	17.010 ± 0.495	4.659 ± 1.010	83.980 ± 1.145	89.880 ± 0.303
	CTLE	132.636 ± 3.973	57.481 ± 1.144	13.153 ± 0.750	51.004 ± 0.683	79.434 ± 0.641	21.467 ± 0.704	9.429 ± 1.587	53.767 ± 7.414	69.200 ± 4.508
	Toast	128.793 ± 2.566	60.997 ± 3.537	14.883 ± 0.576	50.897 ± 0.495	79.664 ± 0.498	21.068 ± 0.383	5.944 ± 1.130	53.640 ± 2.244	71.600 ± 2.819
	TrajCL	120.211 ± 1.040	59.816 ± 1.841	14.741 ± 0.443	50.847 ± 0.249	79.693 ± 0.577	21.572 ± 0.324	1.198 ± 0.219	95.125 ± 5.022	98.875 ± 1.350
	START	122.205 ± 3.181	55.922 ± 2.397	12.717 ± 0.788	<u>52.775 ± 0.311</u>	<u>80.423 ± 0.409</u>	<u>23.316 ± 0.310</u>	<u>1.089 ± 0.041</u>	<u>96.933 ± 2.060</u>	<u>99.900 ± 0.100</u>
	LightPath	<u>119.23 ± 2.367</u>	<u>55.614 ± 1.518</u>	<u>12.760 ± 0.854</u>	49.154 ± 0.234	78.587 ± 0.583	20.660 ± 0.273	27.266 ± 3.544	74.267 ± 4.765	86.100 ± 3.874
<b>TrajCogn (ours)</b>	<b>115.079 ± 1.608</b>	<b>51.973 ± 1.922</b>	<b>11.635 ± 0.587</b>	<b>59.594 ± 0.867</b>	<b>86.740 ± 0.294</b>	<b>30.184 ± 0.875</b>	<b>1.068 ± 0.044</b>	<b>99.240 ± 0.152</b>	<b>99.940 ± 0.060</b>	
Xi'an	Traj2vec	187.010 ± 1.100	86.450 ± 2.884	13.634 ± 0.651	42.506 ± 0.394	75.761 ± 0.506	13.961 ± 0.376	2.284 ± 0.359	90.600 ± 0.704	98.017 ± 0.523
	T2vec	199.132 ± 2.447	86.008 ± 2.827	14.222 ± 0.495	43.596 ± 0.133	74.670 ± 0.343	13.527 ± 0.103	1.600 ± 0.340	89.467 ± 3.556	97.100 ± 1.637
	TremBR	185.727 ± 3.563	81.119 ± 2.411	12.770 ± 0.766	44.500 ± 0.349	75.111 ± 0.667	12.903 ± 0.741	3.478 ± 0.959	88.000 ± 1.355	93.000 ± 0.639
	CTLE	182.278 ± 2.665	<u>79.712 ± 1.621</u>	12.780 ± 0.571	44.837 ± 0.720	76.777 ± 0.610	14.826 ± 0.408	6.045 ± 1.149	41.200 ± 3.832	59.800 ± 9.835
	Toast	183.092 ± 3.827	84.925 ± 2.472	13.436 ± 0.627	45.078 ± 0.517	77.651 ± 0.123	15.459 ± 0.547	6.176 ± 1.042	30.600 ± 5.597	64.300 ± 6.505
	TrajCL	179.806 ± 3.298	82.494 ± 2.909	13.231 ± 0.270	45.807 ± 0.474	79.063 ± 0.596	16.836 ± 0.884	<u>1.091 ± 0.024</u>	95.625 ± 1.212	99.200 ± 0.116
	START	182.346 ± 3.254	80.763 ± 2.756	12.547 ± 0.501	<u>46.127 ± 0.267</u>	<u>79.335 ± 0.489</u>	16.306 ± 1.359	1.139 ± 0.201	<u>95.925 ± 3.877</u>	<u>99.525 ± 0.763</u>
	LightPath	180.032 ± 2.367	80.420 ± 2.189	<u>12.253 ± 0.686</u>	44.390 ± 0.247	72.753 ± 0.466	14.416 ± 0.539	13.877 ± 1.231	79.625 ± 3.236	91.700 ± 3.135
<b>TrajCogn (ours)</b>	<b>166.884 ± 1.843</b>	<b>77.285 ± 2.086</b>	<b>11.357 ± 0.317</b>	<b>49.192 ± 0.238</b>	<b>81.763 ± 1.246</b>	<b>20.753 ± 0.210</b>	<b>1.083 ± 0.012</b>	<b>99.400 ± 0.254</b>	<b>99.800 ± 0.152</b>	

**Bold** denotes the best result, and underline denotes the second-best result. ↑ means higher is better, and ↓ means lower is better.

trained with both an MLM task and a contrastive task based on SimCLR loss.


- **LightPath** [40] constructs a sparse path encoder and trains it with a path reconstruction task and a cross-view & cross-network contrastive task.

### 5.3 Settings

For each dataset, we divide the trajectories into training, validation, and testing sets in an 8:1:1 ratio, with their departure times in chronological order. Models are trained on the training set and evaluated on the testing set. The cross-reconstruction pretext task and embedding methods are pre-trained for 20 epochs, while the downstream predictors are stopped early based on the validation set. The final metrics are calculated on the testing set. We use root mean square error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) for the travel time estimation task; and Top- $N$  accuracy (ACC@ $N$ ,  $N = 1, 5$ ) and macro-F1 for the destination prediction task.

All models are implemented using PyTorch [30]. We choose GPT2 [31] as the foundation LLM to develop our model and obtain addresses and names of POIs using Amap APIs<sup>3</sup>. The four key hyper-parameters of TrajCogn and their optimal values are  $N_A = 15$ ,  $K = 5$ ,  $r = 8$ , and  $N_{POI} = 3$ . We choose parameters based on the Acc@1 and Recall of the destination prediction task on the validation set of the Chengdu dataset. We report the effectiveness of these parameters in the subsequent section. For model training, we utilize the Adam optimizer with an initial learning rate of  $1e-4$  for the proposed method and 0.001 for other methods. The experiments are conducted on Ubuntu 22.04 servers equipped with Intel(R) Xeon(R) W-2155 CPUs and nVidia(R) TITAN RTX GPUs. We run each set of experiments 5 times and report the mean and deviation of the metrics.

<sup>3</sup><https://lbs.amap.com/>



**Figure 5: Scalability of fine-tuning on Chengdu.**

**Table 4: Efficiency of methods on Chengdu.**

Methods	Learnable Param (MB)	Pre-Train Speed (min/epoch)	Fine-Tune Speed (min/epoch)	Embed Time (sec)
CTLE	3.756	4.533	3.516	14.581
Toast	4.007	4.400	3.517	14.539
TrajCL	5.634	7.699	4.543	10.253
START	15.928	15.927	7.573	28.704
<b>TrajCogn</b>	<b>27.922</b>	<b>24.931</b>	<b>19.644</b>	<b>110.516</b>

### 5.4 Performance Comparison

**5.4.1 Overall Performance.** Table 3 presents a comprehensive comparison of the performance of all task-adaptable trajectory learning methods across two tasks and two datasets. Our proposed method consistently outperforms the others and performs well across tasks, providing evidence that it is an advanced task-adaptable trajectory learning method.

Traj2vec, T2vec, and TremBR all adopt RNN-based auto-encoding or auto-regressive frameworks. T2vec and TremBR do not consider

**Table 5: Performance of variants of TrajCogn.**

Task	Travel Time Estimation			Destination Prediction			Similar Trajectory Search		
Methods	RMSE (sec) ↓	MAE (sec) ↓	MAPE (%) ↓	ACC@1 (%) ↑	ACC@5 (%) ↑	Recall (%) ↑	Mean Rank ↓	ACC@1 (%) ↑	ACC@5 (%) ↑
w/o PT	120.737 ± 0.634	54.951 ± 2.632	12.087 ± 0.980	57.455 ± 0.723	85.331 ± 0.161	28.390 ± 1.512	3.914 ± 0.033	88.000 ± 0.566	94.600 ± 0.707
w/o POI	116.132 ± 2.131	52.941 ± 4.453	12.080 ± 0.924	58.711 ± 0.215	86.128 ± 0.118	29.372 ± 0.666	1.092 ± 0.065	98.200 ± 2.115	99.325 ± 0.754
w/o Conv	117.038 ± 2.237	53.402 ± 3.175	<u>11.836 ± 1.175</u>	<u>59.078 ± 1.054</u>	86.200 ± 0.673	29.521 ± 1.477	1.137 ± 0.050	96.733 ± 1.823	98.700 ± 0.781
w/o PSP	115.454 ± 5.551	53.003 ± 2.363	12.265 ± 0.856	58.797 ± 0.698	86.166 ± 0.460	29.503 ± 0.779	1.256 ± 0.256	96.667 ± 2.214	98.367 ± 1.037
w/o $\mathcal{M}$	<u>115.233 ± 0.509</u>	<u>52.790 ± 3.297</u>	11.891 ± 0.794	58.930 ± 0.220	<u>86.668 ± 0.324</u>	<u>29.626 ± 0.287</u>	<u>1.069 ± 0.022</u>	<u>98.525 ± 0.551</u>	<u>99.350 ± 0.100</u>
TrajCogn (full)	<b>115.079 ± 1.608</b>	<b>51.973 ± 1.922</b>	<b>11.635 ± 0.587</b>	<b>59.594 ± 0.867</b>	<b>86.740 ± 0.294</b>	<b>30.184 ± 0.875</b>	<b>1.068 ± 0.044</b>	<b>99.240 ± 0.152</b>	<b>99.940 ± 0.060</b>

**Bold** denotes the best result, and underline denotes the second-best result. ↑ means higher is better, and ↓ means lower is better.

crucial spatio-temporal features and cannot capture travel purposes, resulting in subpar performance on downstream tasks. CTLE and Toast use bi-directional Transformers and incorporate MLM tasks [7]. Their performance suffers due to the absence of essential continuous features and the inability to extract travel purposes. Notably, their performance on the STS task is suboptimal as they do not learn a trajectory-level representation directly.

TrajCL, START, and LightPath employ contrastive learning pretext tasks, which contribute to their performance in the STS task. However, these methods fail to consider the functionalities of POIs, and START and LightPath also face challenges in extracting movement patterns due to insufficient consideration of continuous features. Consequently, they do not yield satisfactory results in TTE and DP tasks.

Our proposed method leverages the strong capabilities of LLMs for task-adaptable trajectory learning and can be adapted to various downstream tasks, regardless of the size of trajectory datasets. It effectively extracts movement patterns and provides explainability using the power of the LLM. The proposed model preserves the inherent functionalities of POIs around the OD points and incorporates travel purposes by employing a trajectory prompt that includes POIs. These advantages contribute to the superior performance of our model in multiple downstream tasks.

**5.4.2 Scalability.** To compare the scalability of the proposed model against START, one of the state-of-the-art models, we refine our model using varying proportions of the training data: 100%, 60%, and 20% for the destination prediction task on the Chengdu dataset. We use the START model as a reference point with an identical learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-4}$  for comparison. The results are presented in Figure 5. It can be seen that our model demonstrates faster progress and achieves superior performance with less data compared to START. This shows that our model can be adapted to downstream tasks with lightweight finetuning.

**5.4.3 Efficiency.** We investigate the efficiency of TrajCogn in comparison to other methods. We conduct the comparison on the Chengdu dataset and set the batch size of both pre-training and fine-tuning as 16. The result is detailed in Table 4. We consider the learnable parameter scale, pre-training speed, fine-tuning speed, and embedding time on the Chengdu dataset. While incorporating PLMs increases the model scale and reduces training speed, we have implemented efficient adaptation strategies such as LoRA to ensure that the additional learnable parameters and training speed remain reasonable.

**Table 6: Performance of anchor word selection strategies.**

Variants	ACC@1 (%)	ACC@5 (%)	Recall (%)
w/o $\mathcal{M}$	58.930 ± 0.220	86.668 ± 0.324	29.626 ± 0.287
Decrease	59.191 ± 0.291	86.791 ± 0.424	29.776 ± 0.439
Replace	58.107 ± 0.329	85.948 ± 0.237	28.798 ± 0.697
TrajCogn	<b>59.594 ± 0.867</b>	<b>86.740 ± 0.294</b>	<b>30.184 ± 0.875</b>

## 5.5 Model Analysis

**5.5.1 Effectiveness of Components.** To assess the effectiveness of the components implemented in TrajCogn, we compared the performance of the complete model with the following variants:

- (1) *w/o PT* removes the cross-reconstruction pretext task and trained the model directly on downstream tasks.
- (2) *w/o POI* removes the ⟨POI Part⟩ from the trajectory prompt.
- (3) *w/o Conv* removes the convolution operator in the trajectory semantic embedder and used a one-layer fully connected layer for continuous feature embedding.
- (4) *w/o PSP* removes the pattern semantic projector and used  $e_i$  from Equation 3 as the trajectory point embedding  $z_i$ .
- (5) *w/o  $\mathcal{M}$*  removes the movement pattern vocabulary  $\mathcal{M}$  and only used the virtual anchor words in the pattern semantic projector.

We measured the performance of these variants on the Chengdu dataset, and the results are presented in Table 5. Based on the results, we made the following observations:

- (1) *w/o PT* shows performance degradation, proving the contribution of the cross-reconstruction pretext task to TrajCogn.
- (2) The worse performance witnessed by *w/o POI* demonstrates the effectiveness of integrating POI information.
- (3) *w/o Conv*, *w/o PSP*, and *w/o  $\mathcal{M}$*  all have worse performance compared to *full*, showing that the removed components all contribute to TrajCogn’s performance.

**5.5.2 Impact of Anchor Word Selection.** To investigate the impact of anchor words used in the movement pattern semantic projection, we compare the performance of the current selection strategy with the following variants:

- *w/o  $\mathcal{M}$*  excludes the movement pattern vocabulary  $\mathcal{M}$ , retaining only virtual anchor words within the pattern semantic projector.
- *Decrease* reduces the predefined movement pattern descriptive words to half their original number.



- *Replace* substitutes the anchor words with an equal number of adjectives unrelated to movement patterns, such as "good", "new", and "little".

We measure the performance of these variants on the destination prediction task using the Chengdu dataset, and the results are presented in Table 6. It can be observed that reducing vocabulary and replacing it with irrelevant words both lead to worse results, proving the rationality of our selection strategy.

**5.5.3 Additional Model Analysis.** We present additional model analysis in the Appendix to provide further insights into the effectiveness of TrajCogn. Specifically, we analyze the effectiveness of hyper-parameters in Appendix B, investigate the impact of additional features in Appendix C, and present a visualization of the attention map between trajectory points and anchor words in Appendix D.

## 6 Conclusion

We propose TrajCogn, a novel trajectory learning model that leverages LLMs to model trajectories and accurately perform various trajectory-related tasks. TrajCogn introduces a trajectory prompt that integrates two key aspects of information: movement patterns and travel purposes. This prompt also enables the model to adapt to different tasks. Additionally, TrajCogn includes a trajectory semantic embedder, allowing LLMs to process the spatio-temporal features of trajectories. This facilitates the effective and explainable extraction of movement patterns and travel purposes. Experimental results on two real-world datasets in various settings demonstrate the superior performance of TrajCogn.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 62372031).




Figure 6: Effectiveness of hyper-parameters.

## A STS Ground Truth Construction

We randomly select 1,000 trajectories from the test dataset. For each trajectory  $\mathcal{T}$ , we collect the odd-numbered points to form the query  $\mathcal{T}^q$  and the even-numbered points to create the target  $\mathcal{T}^t$ . For each query, we discard the top 10 trajectories that are closest to the query, and then randomly choose 5,000 additional trajectories from the rest of the test dataset to serve as the database. In calculating the distances between the query and other trajectories, we follow [10], downsampling them to a uniform length and then computing the mean square error.

## B Effectiveness of Hyper-parameters

We analyze the effectiveness of the key hyper-parameters  $N_A$ ,  $r$ ,  $k$ , and  $N_{POI}$  on the performance of TrajCogn. We use the Acc@1 and Recall metrics of the destination prediction task. The results obtained on the Chengdu dataset are presented in Figure 6. We make the following observations:

- (1) As illustrated in Figure 6a, increasing the number of virtual anchor words generally improves performance. However, beyond  $N_A = 15$ , the improvements in both accuracy and recall are negligible, while computation and memory requirements increase. Therefore, we set  $N_A = 15$  to balance performance and efficiency.
- (2) We set the rank in LoRA to  $r = 8$ . As illustrated in Figure 6b, a smaller  $r$  decreases model complexity, making it challenging to fit the LLM on trajectory data. In contrast, a larger rank increases model capacity, leading to overfitting.
- (3) The convolution kernel with size 5 leads to optimal performance, so we set the kernel size to  $k = 5$ . A smaller receptive field is inadequate for accurately identifying the movement pattern of the current trajectory point, while a larger receptive field results in over-smoothing of features.

Table 7: Performance of variants of TrajCogn and START on Chengdu.

Downstream Task	Destination Prediction			Similar Trajectory Search		
Methods	ACC@1 (%) $\uparrow$	ACC@5 (%) $\uparrow$	Recall (%) $\uparrow$	Mean Rank $\downarrow$	ACC@1 (%) $\uparrow$	ACC@5 (%) $\uparrow$
START	52.775 $\pm$ 0.311	80.423 $\pm$ 0.409	23.316 $\pm$ 0.310	1.089 $\pm$ 0.041	96.933 $\pm$ 2.060	99.900 $\pm$ 0.100
START w/ AF	53.287 $\pm$ 0.172	81.897 $\pm$ 0.191	23.897 $\pm$ 0.321	1.073 $\pm$ 0.006	96.200 $\pm$ 0.707	99.850 $\pm$ 0.071
TrajCogn w/o AF	<u>56.565 <math>\pm</math> 0.360</u>	<u>85.023 <math>\pm</math> 0.176</u>	<u>27.833 <math>\pm</math> 0.302</u>	<u>1.072 <math>\pm</math> 0.035</u>	<u>98.600 <math>\pm</math> 1.097</u>	99.650 $\pm$ 0.336
TrajCogn	<b>59.594 <math>\pm</math> 0.867</b>	<b>86.740 <math>\pm</math> 0.294</b>	<b>30.184 <math>\pm</math> 0.875</b>	<b>1.068 <math>\pm</math> 0.044</b>	<b>99.240 <math>\pm</math> 0.152</b>	<b>99.940 <math>\pm</math> 0.060</b>

**Bold** denotes the best result, and underline denotes the second-best result.  $\uparrow$  means higher is better, and  $\downarrow$  means lower is better.




Figure 7: Visualization of attention maps in the movement pattern semantic projection.

- (4) The number of POIs  $N_{POI}$  has an optimal value of 3, as seen in Figure 6d. A smaller number of POIs can indicate a wrong origin or destination, while more POIs may introduce more noise.

### C Impact of Additional Features

To examine the impact of incorporating extra attributes such as velocity, acceleration, and direction, we omitted these features from the TrajCogn model and integrated them into START, denoted as *w/o AF* and *w/ AF*, respectively. We then compared the performance of both models on the DP and STS tasks using the Chengdu dataset. To prevent data leakage, we did not use additional features in the original TrajCogn for the TTE task. The results are presented in Table 7. We observe that *TrajCogn w/o AF* yields subpar results, proving the benefit of additional features. Additionally, *START w/ AF* shows improved performance, but not exceeding TrajCogn.

### D Attention Map Visualization

To demonstrate how our model effectively extracts movement patterns with considerable interpretability, we present an intuitive visualization of the attention scores in the pattern semantic projector, as shown in Figure 7. In each example, the original trajectory is on the left side, with certain points marked by sequence indices. Two subtrajectories are highlighted by blue and green boxes. The attention maps for these subtrajectories are displayed on the right side. In this case, we set  $N_A = 0$  and evaluated the model's performance after training on the cross-reconstruction pretext task for 20 epochs.

We discovered that specific movement patterns displayed by trajectory points are associated with particular anchor words. Key terms such as "turn", "slow", and "steady" within these anchor words uncover the underlying semantics of the movement patterns. Upon observing Figure 7, when the object makes a turn, the attention scores for "turn" increase. A high association with words like "slow", "sluggish", and "stationary" suggests the object is moving slowly.

Meanwhile, a trajectory that progresses steadily is strongly correlated with terms such as "steady", "cruise", and "straight".

However, the words linked to these patterns do not always precisely convey the true semantics of the movements. Accurate labeled data is required for more precise alignment effects.

## References

- [1] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *NeurIPS*.
- [2] Yanchuan Chang, Jianzhong Qi, Yuxuan Liang, and Egemen Tanin. 2023. Contrastive Trajectory Similarity Learning with Dual-Feature Attention. In *ICDE*. 2933–2945.
- [3] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. 2020. A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations. In *ICML*, Vol. 119. 1597–1607.
- [4] Yile Chen, Xiucheng Li, Gao Cong, Zhifeng Bao, Cheng Long, Yiding Liu, Arun Kumar Chandran, and Richard Ellison. 2021. Robust Road Network Representation Learning: When Traffic Patterns Meet Traveling Semantics. In *CIKM*. 211–220.
- [5] Zebin Chen, Xiaolin Xiao, Yue-Jiao Gong, Jun Fang, Nan Ma, Hua Chai, and Zhiguang Cao. 2022. Interpreting Trajectories from Multiple Views: A Hierarchical Self-Attention Network for Estimating the Time of Arrival. In *KDD*. 2771–2779.
- [6] Andrew M. Dai and Quoc V. Le. 2015. Semi-supervised Sequence Learning. In *NeurIPS*. 3079–3087.
- [7] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. In *NAACL*. 4171–4186.
- [8] Zhengxiao Du, Yujie Qian, Xiao Liu, Ming Ding, Jiezhong Qiu, Zhilin Yang, and Jin Tang. 2022. GLM: General Language Model Pretraining with Autoregressive Blank Infilling. In *ACL*. 320–335.
- [9] Ziquan Fang, Yuntao Du, Xinjun Zhu, Danlei Hu, Lu Chen, Yunjun Gao, and Christian S. Jensen. 2022. Spatio-Temporal Trajectory Similarity Learning in Road Networks. In *KDD*. 347–356.
- [10] Ziquan Fang, Yuntao Du, Xinjun Zhu, Danlei Hu, Lu Chen, Yunjun Gao, and Christian S. Jensen. 2022. Spatio-Temporal Trajectory Similarity Learning in Road Networks. In *KDD*. 347–356.
- [11] Jie Feng, Yong Li, Chao Zhang, Funing Sun, Fanchao Meng, Ang Guo, and Depeng Jin. 2018. DeepMove: Predicting Human Mobility with Attentional Recurrent Networks. In *WWW*. 1459–1468.
- [12] Tao-Yang Fu and Wang-Chien Lee. 2020. Trembr: Exploring Road Networks for Trajectory Representation Learning. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.* 11, 1 (2020), 10:1–10:25.
- [13] Xu Han, Weilin Zhao, Ning Ding, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2022. PTR: Prompt Tuning with Rules for Text Classification. *AI Open* 3 (2022), 182–192.
- [14] Geoffrey E Hinton and Ruslan R Salakhutdinov. 2006. Reducing the dimensionality of data with neural networks. *science* 313, 5786 (2006), 504–507.
- [15] Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models. In *ICLR*.
- [16] Jiawei Jiang, Dayan Pan, Houxing Ren, Xiaohan Jiang, Chao Li, and Jingyuan Wang. 2023. Self-supervised Trajectory Representation Learning with Temporal Regularities and Travel Semantics. In *ICDE*. 843–855.
- [17] Ming Jin, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, Zhixuan Chu, James Y Zhang, Xiaoming Shi, Pin-Yu Chen, Yuxuan Liang, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, et al. 2023. Time-llm: Time series forecasting by reprogramming large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01728* (2023).
- [18] Diederik P. Kingma and Max Welling. 2014. Auto-Encoding Variational Bayes. In *ICLR*.
- [19] Dejiang Kong and Fei Wu. 2018. HST-LSTM: A Hierarchical Spatial-Temporal Long-Short Term Memory Network for Location Prediction. In *IJCAI*. 2341–2347.
- [20] Xiucheng Li, Kaiqi Zhao, Gao Cong, Christian S. Jensen, and Wei Wei. 2018. Deep Representation Learning for Trajectory Similarity Computation. In *ICDE*. 617–628.
- [21] Yaguang Li, Kun Fu, Zheng Wang, Cyrus Shahabi, Jieping Ye, and Yan Liu. 2018. Multi-task Representation Learning for Travel Time Estimation. In *KDD*. 1695–1704.
- [22] Yuxuan Liang, Kun Ouyang, Yiwei Wang, Xu Liu, Hongyang Chen, Junbo Zhang, Yu Zheng, and Roger Zimmermann. 2022. TrajFormer: Efficient Trajectory Classification with Transformers. In *CIKM*. 1229–1237.
- [23] Yan Lin, Huaiyu Wan, Shengnan Guo, Jilin Hu, Christian S Jensen, and Youfang Lin. 2023. Pre-Training General Trajectory Embeddings With Maximum Multi-View Entropy Coding. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.* (2023).
- [24] Yan Lin, Huaiyu Wan, Shengnan Guo, and Youfang Lin. 2021. Pre-training Context and Time Aware Location Embeddings from Spatial-Temporal Trajectories for User Next Location Prediction. In *AAAI*. 4241–4248.
- [25] Yiding Liu, Kaiqi Zhao, Gao Cong, and Zhifeng Bao. 2020. Online Anomalous Trajectory Detection with Deep Generative Sequence Modeling. In *ICDE*. 949–960.
- [26] Wannes Meert and Mathias Verbeke. 2018. HMM with non-emitting states for Map Matching. In *ECDA*.
- [27] Congcong Miao, Jilong Wang, Heng Yu, Weichen Zhang, and Yinyao Qi. 2020. Trajectory-User Linking with Attentive Recurrent Network. In *AAMAS*. 878–886.
- [28] Stephen M Omohundro. 1989. *Five balltree construction algorithms*. Citeseer.
- [29] Ziqi Pang, Ziyang Xie, Yunze Man, and Yu-Xiong Wang. 2023. Frozen transformers in language models are effective visual encoder layers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.12973* (2023).
- [30] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Köpf, Edward Z. Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *NeurIPS*. 8024–8035.
- [31] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [32] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J. Liu. 2020. Exploring the Limits of Transfer Learning with a Unified Text-to-Text Transformer. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21 (2020), 140:1–140:67.
- [33] Xubin Ren, Wei Wei, Lianghao Xia, Lixin Su, Suqi Cheng, Junfeng Wang, Dawei Yin, and Chao Huang. 2024. Representation Learning with Large Language Models for Recommendation. In *WWW*. 3464–3475.
- [34] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is All you Need. In *NeurIPS*. 5998–6008.
- [35] Dong Wang, Junbo Zhang, Wei Cao, Jian Li, and Yu Zheng. 2018. When Will You Arrive? Estimating Travel Time Based on Deep Neural Networks. In *AAAI*. 2500–2507.
- [36] Haiquan Wang, Jiachen Feng, Leilei Sun, Kaiqiang An, Guoping Liu, Xiang Wen, Runbo Hu, and Hua Chai. 2020. Abnormal Trajectory Detection Based on Geospatial Consistent Modeling. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 184633–184643.
- [37] Ronald J. Williams and David Zipser. 1989. A Learning Algorithm for Continually Running Fully Recurrent Neural Networks. *Neural Comput.* 1, 2 (1989), 270–280.
- [38] Peilun Yang, Hanchen Wang, Ying Zhang, Lu Qin, Wenjie Zhang, and Xuemin Lin. 2021. T3S: Effective Representation Learning for Trajectory Similarity Computation. In *ICDE*. 2183–2188.
- [39] Sean Bin Yang, Chenjuan Guo, Jilin Hu, Jian Tang, and Bin Yang. 2021. Unsupervised Path Representation Learning with Curriculum Negative Sampling. In *IJCAI*. 3286–3292.
- [40] Sean Bin Yang, Jilin Hu, Chenjuan Guo, Bin Yang, and Christian S. Jensen. 2023. LightPath: Lightweight and Scalable Path Representation Learning. In *KDD*. 2999–3010.
- [41] Di Yao, Gao Cong, Chao Zhang, and Jingping Bi. 2019. Computing Trajectory Similarity in Linear Time: A Generic Seed-Guided Neural Metric Learning Approach. In *ICDE*. 1358–1369.
- [42] Di Yao, Chao Zhang, Zhihua Zhu, Jian-Hui Huang, and Jingping Bi. 2017. Trajectory clustering via deep representation learning. In *IJCNN*. 3880–3887.
- [43] Yu Zheng, Longhao Wang, Ruochi Zhang, Xing Xie, and Wei-Ying Ma. 2008. GeoLife: Managing and Understanding Your Past Life over Maps. In *MDM*. 211–212.
- [44] Fan Zhou, Qiang Gao, Goce Trajcevski, Kunpeng Zhang, Ting Zhong, and Fengli Zhang. 2018. Trajectory-User Linking via Variational AutoEncoder. In *IJCAI*. 3212–3218.
- [45] Tian Zhou, Peisong Niu, Xue Wang, Liang Sun, and Rong Jin. 2023. One Fits All: Power General Time Series Analysis by Pretrained LM. In *NeurIPS*.