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Abstract

Vision-Language Navigation (VLN) is a challenging task that requires an embodied agent to perform action-level modality alignment, i.e., make instruction-asked actions sequentially in complex visual environments. Most existing VLN agents learn the instruction-path data directly and cannot sufficiently explore action-level alignment knowledge inside the multi-modal inputs. In this paper, we propose modality-aligned Action Prompts (ADAPT), which provides the VLN agent with action prompts to enable the explicit learning of action-level modality alignment to pursue successful navigation. Specifically, an action prompt is defined as a modality-aligned pair of an image sub-prompt and a text sub-prompt, where the former is a single-view observation and the latter is a phrase like “walk past the chair”. When starting navigation, the instruction-related action prompt set is retrieved from a pre-built action prompt base and passed through a prompt encoder to obtain the prompt feature. Then the prompt feature is concatenated with the original instruction feature and fed to a multi-layer transformer for action prediction. To collect high-quality action prompts into the prompt base, we use the Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining (CLIP) model which has powerful cross-modality alignment ability. A modality alignment loss and a sequential consistency loss are further introduced to enhance the alignment of the action prompt and enforce the agent to focus on the related prompt sequentially. Experimental results on both R2R and RxR show the superiority of ADAPT over state-of-the-art methods.

1. Introduction

In the Vision-Language Navigation (VLN) task [1, 4], an embodied agent is required to navigate through complex scenes following a given language instruction. To accomplish successful navigation, the agent needs to implement both object-level and action-level modality alignment accurately given the instruction and visual observations. For example, given an instruction of “exit the bedroom”, the agent should not only locate the “bedroom” in its observation but also find the door of the bedroom to make the action of “exit”. With great potential in the applications such as in-home robots and personal assistants, VLN has received wide spread attention in the robotic visual applications. Early VLN approaches explore diverse data augmentation strategies [8, 9, 27, 38], efficient learning paradigms [15, 24, 40, 46, 47] and useful model architecture [7, 13, 29, 40] to improve the agent performance. Motivated by the significant progress made by large-scale cross-modal pre-trained models in vision-language tasks [6, 21, 23, 25, 37], more and more works attempt to introduce the pretraining paradigms and models into the VLN task. PREVALENT [11] pretrains the model on a large amount of image-text-action triplets in a self-supervised learning manner. VLN+BERT [14] introduces a recurrent function into the pretrained models to make the VLN agent time-aware. Although the object-level alignment ability may be significantly enhanced through the
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level alignment ability. Concretely, the image sub-prompt is an object-related action phrase like “go to the staircase”.

Before navigating, the instruction-related action prompts are retrieved from a pre-constructed action prompt base. Then the action prompts are passed through a prompt en-
coder and the output feature is concatenated with the original instruction feature. The prompt-based instruction fea-
ture, together with the visual feature are fed to a multi-layer transformer for making action decision. Note that differ-
ent from the common prompt engineering methods which change the output prediction form of a downstream task by introducing the prompt [28], in this work, we keep the same form of the action prediction as the baseline model and focus on the design of the prompts. Through these provided action prompts, the agent can learn the action-level modal-
y alignment explicitly and make robust actions in different scenes. To enhance the discriminative power of the action prompts and enforce the agent to attend to related action prompts at each timestep, a modality alignment loss and a sequential consistency loss are further introduced into the training. Fig. 1 presents an action decision comparison be-
tween the baseline agent [14] and our ADAPT. As shown in Fig. 1, with the help of the action prompts related to “walk to the staircase”, our ADAPT can choose the correct action in the given observations to navigate successfully.

To collect high-quality action prompts into the action prompt base, we resort to the recently developed Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining (CLIP) [32] model which has powerful cross-modal object/location-level alignment ability. Concretely, the image sub-prompt is obtained by retrieving object/location-related images using CLIP from the action image sequence where each image contains the action information itself. The text sub-prompt is derived through a simple nearest-verb-search scheme.

Experimental results on both Room-to-Room (R2R) [1] and Room-across-Room (RxR) [19] benchmarks show the superiority of our proposed ADAPT over the state-of-the-art methods, demonstrating that introducing explicit action prompts is promising for improving the agent navigation performance. Our ablation study indicates the effectiveness of each method component and the good generalization ability of ADAPT. The visualization analysis also shows its good interpretability.

To summarize, the main contributions of this paper are:
1) We propose modality-aligned action prompts (ADAPT) to enforce the VLN agent to learn cross-modal action knowledge explicitly for improving action decision during navigation. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first attempt to develop prompt-based agents in the VLN task.
2) We develop a modality alignment loss and a sequential consistency loss for enabling efficient learning of action prompts. The Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining (CLIP) model is employed to ensure the quality of the action prompts.
3) ADAPT establishes new state-of-the-art results on both R2R and RxR. It also shows good interpretability and generalization ability.

2. Related Work

Vision-Language Navigation. Given the language in-
struction, a VLN agent is required to follow it to reach a predefined goal position. Early methods usually employ a sequence-to-sequence model architecture [8,38,46], Speaker-follower [8] introduces synthetic instructions to alleviate the annotation burden of instructions. EnvDrop [38] develops an environmental dropout strategy to generate augmented data by mimicking unseen environments.

Recently, large-scale vision-language pretraining models [6,21,23,25,37] have shown significant superiority on multi-
ple vision-language understanding tasks like Visual Com-
monsense Reasoning [42] and Visual Question Answering [2]. Inspired by this, more and more works have intro-
duced vision-language pretrained models into the VLN area [11,14,31]. PREVALENT [11] collects plenty of image-
text-action triplets to pretrain the agent with self-supervised tasks such as attended masked language modeling and action prediction. VLN$\bowtie$BERT [14] adds a recurrent function to help the agent recognize time-dependent input. However, in these pretrained VLN methods, the agent learns the relationship between the action decision and multi-modal information implicitly, leading to inefficient training and limited generalization abilities. In this paper, we take the first step to develop a prompt-based VLN agent, which receives explicit action prompts indicating cross-modal action knowledge for assisting the action decision during navigation.

Prompt Engineering. Recent studies have shown that prompts play a vital role in improving pretrained language models in many downstream NLP tasks [3,20,26,28,33,43]. Jiang et al. [18] apply the text mining and paraphrasing techniques to generate the candidate prompts and choose the one with the highest accuracy. For facilitating prompt learning, Shin et al. [36] propose to generate prompts auto-
Given a language instruction \( I = \{ w_0, \ldots, w_L \} \) with \( L \) words, a VLN agent is required to find a route from a start viewpoint \( c_0 \) to the target viewpoint \( c_T \). At each timestep \( t \), the agent observes a panoramic view, which contains 36 image views \( \{ o_{t,i} \}_{i=1}^{36} \). Each image view \( o_{t,i} \) includes an RGB image \( b_{t,i} \) accompanied with its orientation \( (\theta_{1,i}, \theta_{2,i}) \), where \( \theta_{1,i} \) and \( \theta_{2,i} \) are the angles of heading and elevation, respect-
3.2. VLN Agent with Action Prompts

3.2.1 Baseline Agent

Our baseline agent follows the architecture of VLN$\odot$BERT [14], which is a multi-layer transformer model consisting of the self-attention module and cross-modal attention module. At each timestep, the model receives the cross-modal inputs for the action prediction.

**Visual Input.** For each image view $o_{t,i}$ in the candidate views at timestep $t$, a pretrained Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) [14] or a transformer [35] is applied in advance to extract image feature $v_{t,i}$. Then $v_{t,i}$ is projected by a visual encoder $F_v$ [14] to get the visual encoding $V_{t,i}$:

$$V_{t,i} = F_v(v_{t,i}; \theta_v),$$  

(1)

where $\theta_v$ denotes the parameters of $F_v$. The set $V_t = \{V_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^{36}$ denotes the candidate visual encodings at timestep $t$.

**Language Input.** When initialization, the instruction encoding $X$ and the initialized state feature $s_0$ are obtained by feeding the instruction sequence $I$ together with [CLS] and [SEP] tokens to the self-attention module in the transformer:

$$s_0, X = \text{SelfAttn}(\text{Concat}([\text{CLS}], I, [\text{SEP}]); \theta_s^1),$$  

(2)

where $\text{Concat}()$ represents the concatenation operation, and $\theta_s^1$ denotes the parameters of the self-attention module. $s_0$ will be updated to obtain $s_t$ at each timestep $t$.

**Action Decision.** During the action decision at timestep $t$, the state feature $s_t$ is concatenated with the visual feature $V_t$ to obtain the state-visual feature $K_t$. Then the cross-modal attention $\alpha_t$ between $K_t$ and the instruction feature $X$ is calculated to update $K_t$:

$$\tilde{K}_t, \alpha_t = \text{CrossAttn}(K_t, X; \theta_c),$$  

(3)

where $\theta_c$ represents the parameters of the cross-modal attention module. The attended instruction feature $\tilde{X}_t$ is derived by weighting the instruction feature $X$ by $\alpha_t$. The updated state-visual feature $\tilde{K}_t$ is further fed to another self-attention module $\text{SelfAttn}(\cdot)$ to obtain the attention scores $\beta_t$ of the state feature $s_t$ over the visual feature $V_t$, which is also treated as the action prediction probability:

$$\beta_t = \text{SelfAttn}(\tilde{K}_t; \theta_s^2),$$  

(4)

where $\theta_s^2$ represents the module parameters. The attended visual feature $\tilde{V}_t$ is obtained through weighting the visual feature $V_t$ by $\beta_t$. Then $\tilde{X}_t$ and $\tilde{V}_t$ are used for updating the state feature $s_t$, which is used for the next timestep action prediction. For more model details, refer to [14].

3.2.2 Action Prompts

Before describing our prompt-based VLN agent, we first define the action prompts. An action prompt is a modality-aligned pair of an image sub-prompt and a text sub-prompt, where the former is a single-view observation and the latter is an action phrase. The observation indicates a salient visual object or a location. The action phrase contains two main elements, i.e., a word/phrase representing the action such as “exit” or “walk into”, and a object/location word such as “chair” or “bedroom”. Fig. 3 shows some examples of the action prompts. From Fig. 3 we can find that an action prompt not only contains an aligned visual object or location in both modalities but also indicates the modality-aligned action knowledge. For example, the paired image sub-prompt of the text sub-prompt “walk out of bedroom” contains the appearance of the bedroom and its door, through which the agent can complete the action of “walk out of” the bedroom. Therefore, by explicitly providing the action prompts into the training, the agent is able to better explore the cross-modal action knowledge which is important for guiding correct action decision. The construction of the action prompt base is described in Sec. 3.3.

3.2.3 Action Decision with Action Prompts

At the beginning of the navigation, the agent retrieves instruction-correlated action prompts from the action prompt base. Specifically, the object/location-related action phrases in the given instruction are derived following the strategy for obtaining text sub-prompts (see Sec. 3.3). Then the sentence similarity between each object/location-related action phrase and the text sub-prompts in the prompt base is calculated to retrieve the instruction-related action prompt set $\{p_n\}_{n=1}^{N}$, where $N$ is the size of the set.

With $\{p_n\}_{n=1}^{N}$, we obtain the prompt encoding $\{P_n\}_{n=1}^{N}$ through the prompt encoder (see Fig. 2). The prompt encoder consists of two single-modal sub-prompt encoders and a multi-modal prompt encoder. Denote the image and text sub-prompts in the action prompt $p_n$ as $p_n^I$ and $p_n^T$, respectively, i.e., $p_n = \{p_n^I, p_n^T\}$. $p_n^I$ and $p_n^T$ are firstly passed through the single-modal sub-prompt en-
3.3. Construction of the Action Prompt Base

Although it is easy to assign an object category label to an image through object recognition, associating an image with an action phrase is not straightforward. To better align the image and the action phrase to form the action prompt, we design a two-branch scheme to collect the image and text sub-prompts, as shown in Fig. 4. At first, for an instruction-path instance in the training dataset, we use a pre-constructed visual object/location vocabulary to find the referred visual objects/locations in the instruction. Then for each visual object/location, we obtain the related image and text sub-prompts separately as described below.

Note that the ground-truth path sequence contains a set of single-view images, each of which indicates an action needed to make at the specific timestep. Therefore, for deriving the image sub-prompt in an action prompt, we only need to retrieve the object/location-related image from the ground-truth path sequence, which itself contains the action information. Instead of resorting to existing object classifiers or detectors trained on a fixed set of class categories \([12,34]\), we use CLIP [32] which shows excellent zero-shot cross-modal alignment ability to locate the object/location-related image. To adapt to the inference process of CLIP, we replace the \{CLASS\} token in the phrase “a photo of \{CLASS\}” with the visual object/location whose category label is \(c\). The probability that an image \(B\) in the action sequence belongs to the class \(c\) is calculated by:

\[
p(y = c|B) = \frac{\exp(\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{w}_c \rangle)/\tau_1}{\sum_{i=1}^{M}(\exp(\langle \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{w}_i \rangle)/\tau_1)},
\]

where \(\tau_1\) is the temperature parameter, \(\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle\) represents the cosine similarity, \(\mathbf{b}\) and \(\mathbf{w}_c\) are the image and phrase features generated by CLIP, respectively, and \(M\) is the size of the vocabulary. Then the image having the maximum similarity with the phrase is selected as the image sub-prompt.
For obtaining the text sub-prompt, we use a simple nearest-verb-search scheme, that is, finding the nearest verb (which is in a pre-built verb vocabulary) just before a specific object/location word. As shown in Fig. 4, for the word “kitchen”, the verb “walk” is located and then the phrase “walk through the kitchen” is extracted as the text sub-prompt. Finally, the image and text sub-prompts with the same visual object/location and action are formed as an aligned action prompt.

3.4. Training and Inference

**Modality Alignment Loss.** While an action prompt has the matched image and text sub-prompts, they may not be aligned in the feature space. To address this problem, following the contrastive learning paradigm used in CLIP [32] that enforces paired image and text features to be similar and non-paired ones to be distant, we use the infoNCE loss [5] to encourage the feature alignment of the image and text sub-prompts in each action prompt:

\[
L_a = -\log \left( \frac{e^{\text{sim}(P^i_n, P^n_u)/\tau_2}}{e^{\text{sim}(P^i_n, P^n_n)/\tau_2} + \sum_{P^n_u} e^{\text{sim}(P^i_n, P^n_u)/\tau_2}} \right),
\]

(10)

where \(\tau_2\) is the temperature parameter, \(P^i_n\) and \(P^n_u\) represent the features of the paired image and text sub-prompts of action prompt \(p_n\), and \(P^n_n\) and \(P^n_u\) denote the non-paired sub-prompts. Through the modality alignment loss, the action prompts can become more discriminative for guiding the learning of action-level modality alignment.

**Sequential Consistency Loss.** Since an instruction usually refers to different visual landmarks sequentially, the action prompts in the retrieved action prompt set \(\{p_n\}\) are also related to different objects/locations. To encourage the agent to focus on related action prompts in the retrieved action prompt set sequentially according to its visual observations, we develop a sequential consistency loss which is the sum of two single-modal consistency losses. Take the text modality as an example, at each timestep \(t\), the attended text sub-prompt feature \(\hat{P}^u_t\) and the attended instruction feature \(\hat{X}_t\) are enforced to be close:

\[
L_c^u = ||\hat{P}^u_t - \hat{X}_t||^2.
\]

(11)

Similarly, define \(L_c^i = ||\hat{P}^i_t - \hat{V}_t||^2\), which is used to promote the similarity between the attended image sub-prompt feature \(\hat{P}^i_t\) and the attended visual feature \(\hat{V}_t\). Then the sequential consistency loss \(L_c\) is obtained by:

\[
L_c = L_c^i + L_c^u.
\]

(12)

**Total Objective.** Following most of existing works [13, 14, 38], we also use the navigation loss \(L_n\), which is the sum of an imitation loss \(L_{IL}\) and a reinforcement learning loss \(L_{RL}\). Thus, the total training objective of our ADAPT is:

\[
L = L_{RL} + \lambda_1 L_{IL} + \lambda_2 L_c + \lambda_3 L_a,
\]

(13)

where \(\lambda_1\), \(\lambda_2\), and \(\lambda_3\) are the loss weights to balance the loss items.

**Inference.** During inference, the agent retrieves instruction-related action prompts from the action prompt base built in the training stage.

4. Experiments

4.1. Experimental Setup

**Datasets.** We evaluate ADAPT on two public benchmarks, i.e., R2R [1] and RxR [19]. R2R [1] includes 10,800 panoramic views and 7,189 trajectories. Since the baseline [14] is pretrained on English language data, we test our ADAPT on the English subset of RxR (both en-IN and en-US), which includes 26,464 path-instruction pairs for training and 4,551 pairs in the val-unseen split.

**Evaluation Metrics.** We use four popular metrics [1] for the performance evaluation on R2R: 1) Trajectory Length (TL) calculates the average length of the trajectory, 2) Navigation Error (NE) is the distance between target viewpoint and agent stopping position, 3) Success Rate (SR) calculates the success rate of reaching the goal, and 4) Success rate weighted by Path Length (SPL) makes the trade-off between SR and TL. Three more metrics are used for RxR following other works [19, 22]: Coverage weighted by Length Score (CLS) [17], Normalized Dynamic Time Warping (nDTW) [16], and Success rate weighted normalized Dynamic Time Warping (SDTW) [16].

**Implementation Details.** All experiments are conducted on an NVIDIA V100 GPU. Two kinds of image features are used, i.e., the features extracted from a ResNet-152 [12] pretrained on Places365 [44] and the features extracted through the visual encoder of CLIP [35]. The model is trained for 300K and 100K iterations for R2R and RxR, respectively. The max sizes of the action prompt set are 60 and 100 for R2R and RxR, respectively. The instance whose number of retrieved action prompts less than the max size is padded. The values of \(\lambda_1\), \(\lambda_2\), and \(\lambda_3\) are 0.2, 0.01, and 0.0001, respectively. The same augmented data in [14] is used for R2R for fair comparison.

4.2. Quantitative Results

**Comparison with the State-of-the-Arts (SOTAs).** Table 1 and Table 2 give the comparison between existing methods and our ADAPT. Table 1 shows that ADAPT with ResNet-152 feature outperforms previous SOTA methods on RxR. Moreover, ADAPT significantly improves the performance of the baseline [14] with different visual features in both Val Seen and Val Unseen settings on RxR, showing that introducing explicit action prompts can effectively promote the agent navigation capability. From Table 2 we can
Table 1. Comparison with the SOTA methods on RxR. * indicates that the results are obtained by our re-implementation of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>RxR Val Seen</th>
<th>RxR Val Unseen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SR↑ SPL↑ CLS↑ nDTW↑ SDTW↑</td>
<td>SR↑ SPL↑ CLS↑ nDTW↑ SDTW↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvDropout [38]</td>
<td>ResNet-152</td>
<td>48.1 44 61 57 40</td>
<td>38.5 34 54 51 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax [22]</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.1 44 61 58 40</td>
<td>39.2 35 56 52 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLN*BERT* [14]</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.9 45.4 60.3 56.9 41.3</td>
<td>45.5 39.3 56.6 52.9 36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT (ours)</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.7 47.0 61.3 58.5 42.9</td>
<td>46.7 40.3 56.6 53.6 37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLN*BERT* [14]</td>
<td>CLIP</td>
<td>48.6 43.4 58.8 55.7 39.8</td>
<td>45.7 39.5 56.0 52.8 36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT (ours)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.3 44.6 59.6 56.3 40.6</td>
<td>46.9 40.2 57.2 54.1 37.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Comparison with the SOTA methods on R2R. * indicates that the results are obtained by our re-implementation of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th></th>
<th>Val Seen</th>
<th>Test Unseen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TL NE↑ SR↑ SPL↑</td>
<td>TL NE↑ SR↑ SPL↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EnvDropout [38]</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>3.99 62 59 10.70 5.22 52</td>
<td>48 11.66 5.23 51 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLN*BERT* [14]</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>2.90 72 68 12.01 3.93 63</td>
<td>57 12.35 4.09 63 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT (ResNet-152)</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>2.54 76 72 12.21 3.77 64</td>
<td>58 12.99 3.79 65 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLN*BERT* (CLIP)</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>3.17 70 66 12.03 3.81 65</td>
<td>56 12.73 4.26 61 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT (CLIP)</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>2.70 74 69 12.33 3.66 66</td>
<td>59 13.16 4.11 63 57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Ablation study of ADAPT on R2R Val Unseen. ResNet-152 and CLIP represent using different visual features. ADAPT-1: using action prompts only; ADAPT-2: using action prompts with the modality alignment loss; ADAPT-3: using action prompts with the sequential consistency loss; ADAPT-Full: our full model. All models are trained for 100K iterations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>ResNet-152</th>
<th>CLIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE↑ SR↑ SPL↑</td>
<td>NE↑ SR↑ SPL↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>4.17 60.4 54.7</td>
<td>4.11 61.5 55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT-1</td>
<td>4.19 60.5 55.2</td>
<td>3.90 61.6 56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT-2</td>
<td>4.16 61.7 55.4</td>
<td>3.78 62.8 56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT-3</td>
<td>4.07 60.7 56.1</td>
<td>4.05 61.9 56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT-Full</td>
<td>4.07 62.5 56.1</td>
<td>4.10 63.1 57.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To verify the generalization ability of ADAPT when a small amount of training data is available, we set up two training settings: “Scan” and “Instance”. “Scan” means that extracting part of the training scans with all the instances for training. “Instance” means that extracting all the training scans but with part of the instances for training. From the evaluation results given in Table 4, we can find that in both “Scan” and “Instance” settings, our ADAPT is superior over the strong baseline method, showing that by learning explicit action knowledge, the agent can have better generalization ability in different scenes.

4.3. Visualization

We present some visualization results in this subsection to further analyze how introducing the explicit action prompts can contribute to correct navigation action decision. From Fig. 5 we can see that by introducing the action prompts related to “walk around the bed” and “walk into the hallway” in the instruction, our ADAPT can successfully enforce the agent to choose the correct actions of walking around the bed and walking into the hallway in different visual observations. The baseline agent, however, leaves the original room and makes the wrong navigation trajectory.

We further validate the action-level modality alignment ability of ADAPT by comparing the action prompt alignment between the CLIP features and the sub-prompt features of ADAPT. For the action phrase feature, the top 5 similar image features are retrieved from the object-related image set. From Fig. 6 we can find that compared with CLIP, ADAPT can perform better action-level modality alignment. Given the action phrase of “walk up the stairs”, the top 5 results retrieved by CLIP from a set of stairs images all indicate the action of “walk down” the stairs. Our ADAPT, however, can obtain 3 images indicating the action of “walk up” the stairs in the top 5 results.

see that ADAPT (ResNet-152) establishes new SOTA results on R2R. Moreover, from the results of VLN\*BERT* (CLIP) and ADAPT (CLIP) we can find that by introducing the CLIP visual feature, both models show a performance enhancement in Val Unseen while a performance drop in both Val Seen and Test Unseen. However, ADAPT (CLIP) outperforms VLN\*BERT* (CLIP) on all the metrics, showing the effectiveness of the proposed method.

Ablation Study. Table 3 presents the ablation study results of ADAPT. As shown in Table 3, explicitly introducing the action prompts can effectively improve the performance of the strong baseline model [14]. By comparing the results between “ADAPT-1” and “ADAPT-2” we can find that introducing the modality alignment loss can effectively enhance the navigation performance, demonstrating that the action prompts with good discriminative power are useful for learning better action-level modality alignment. Comparing the results between “ADAPT-2” and “ADAPT-Full”, we can see that the introduction of the sequential consistency loss further improves the navigation performance, which shows that attending to related action prompts sequentially is helpful for making correct action decision.
Table 4. Results of the baseline [14] and our ADAPT on R2R Val Unseen with fewer training data. * indicates that the results are obtained by our re-implementation of the model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Scan 20%</th>
<th>Instance 20%</th>
<th>Scan 40%</th>
<th>Instance 40%</th>
<th>Scan 60%</th>
<th>Instance 60%</th>
<th>Scan 80%</th>
<th>Instance 80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR↑</td>
<td>SPL↑</td>
<td>SR↑</td>
<td>SPL↑</td>
<td>SR↑</td>
<td>SPL↑</td>
<td>SR↑</td>
<td>SPL↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLN* BERT* [14]</td>
<td>30.8 44.0</td>
<td>53.7 48.1</td>
<td>57.7 31.7</td>
<td>57.4 53.3</td>
<td>51.8 47.0</td>
<td>35.8 49.7</td>
<td>37.1 32.1</td>
<td>37.9 52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPT (ours)</td>
<td>52.5 46.4</td>
<td>55.1 48.8</td>
<td>57.2 51.8</td>
<td>59.1 53.3</td>
<td>52.5 47.3</td>
<td>56.6 49.8</td>
<td>58.8 53.5</td>
<td>59.4 54.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Visualization of panoramic views and action comparison in a trajectory example between the baseline [14] and our ADAPT.

Figure 6. Action prompt alignment comparison between the CLIP features and the sub-prompt features of our ADAPT.

5. Conclusion and Limitation

In this work, we propose modality-aligned action prompts (ADAPT), which prompts the VLN agent with explicit cross-modal action knowledge for enhancing the navigation performance. During navigation, the agent retrieves the action prompts from a pre-built action prompt base. Then the prompt-based instruction features are obtained for improving action decision. The CLIP model is used to collect high-quality action prompts into the prompt base. We also propose a modality alignment loss and a sequential consistency loss for training. Experiments on the public VLN benchmarks show the effectiveness of our ADAPT, which establishes new SOTA results. We hope this work can offer new directions for prompt-based navigation research.

With regards to the limitation of our work, our constructed action prompt base in ADAPT contains more or less noise due to the ability of CLIP, the scene complexity and instruction diversity in the VLN task. The future work includes finding action prompts of better quality.
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