

What-If Analysis of Large Language Models: Explore the Game World Using Proactive Thinking

Yuan Sui^{1*} Yanming Zhang² Yi Liao³ Yu Gu³ Guohua Tang³
Zhongqian Sun³ Wei Yang³ Bryan Hooi¹

¹National University of Singapore ²Zhejiang University ³Tencent

Abstract

Large Language Models (LLMs) are effective at reasoning and information retrieval, but remain unreliable for decision-making in dynamic, partially observable, high-stakes environments such as MOBA games. One key limitation is weak counterfactual reasoning: LLMs struggle to conduct precise what-if analysis over candidate actions and their future consequences. We address this limitation with What-if Analysis LLM (WiA-LLM), a framework that trains an LLM as an explicit language-based world model. Instead of representing the environment in latent vectors, WiA-LLM models how the game state evolves over time with candidate actions using language, and provides textual justifications for these predicted outcomes. This explicit modeling supports (1) interpretability, since the model’s predictions and underlying rationales are human-readable, and (2) semantic generalization, as the model can transfer knowledge across situations that share similar game concepts (e.g., roles, objectives, or tactics). WiA-LLM is trained in two stages: supervised fine-tuning on human-like reasoning traces, followed by reinforcement learning with outcome-based rewards that depend on the discrepancy between predicted and ground-truth future states. In the Honor of Kings (HoK) environment, WiA-LLM attains 74.2% accuracy (27%↑ vs. base model) in forecasting game-state changes. In addition, we find that agents with WiA-LLM exhibit closer strategic behavior to expert players than purely reactive LLM agents, indicating more foresight-aware and expert-aligned decision-making.

1 Introduction

What-If Analysis (WIA), as the name suggests, is a systematic decision-making approach to address hypothetical questions such as “*What if we take this action? How will it affect the final outcome?*”. It enables decision-makers to simulate hypothetical sce-

narios by altering specific action variables and assessing their potential implications (Gathani et al., 2022). This methodology proves useful for strategic planning, risk assessment, and enhancing the explainability of decision-making processes (Tang et al., 2025).

Despite its potential, the integration of WIA capabilities into large language models (LLMs) remains less explored, and expose a significant gap for the current LLMs in dynamic, high-stakes scenarios like strategic planning, risk assessment, and real-time decision making. As shown in Figure 1, current LLMs excel at *reactive thinking* (Liao et al., 2025; Wei et al., 2023; Li et al., 2025; Yu et al., 2024), where they generate answers based on the current context (state) and their prior knowledge. However, they lack the mechanisms for *proactive thinking*, which is essential for forecasting the consequences of actions before they occur. This limitation is especially critical in dynamic environments, where each action may trigger a series of cascading effects (Wei et al., 2022; Hu et al., 2024c; Sui et al., 2025). Understanding the consequences of different actions not only provides a clearer understanding of the environment but also offers better intuition for informed decision-making.

To bridge this gap, we introduce **WiA-LLM**, a novel framework that equips LLMs with proactive thinking capabilities through explicit world modeling. By leveraging environmental feedback via RL, WiA-LLM learns to forecast the outcomes of different actions on the entire game state. Our core insight draws from human cognition: “**Look before you leap**”, i.e., **you shouldn’t act without first considering the possible consequences or dangers**. We formalize this process as explicit world modeling: $S_{\Delta} = f(S_t, a_t)$, where the model predicts the state transition S_{Δ} from taking action a_t on state S_t using natural language. The task difficulty increases as more properties change in S_{Δ} (see §3.2). The training pipeline first applies

* Corresponding Email: yuan.sui@u.nus.edu




Figure 1: Illustration of reasoning paradigms: (a) reactive thinking, where the model selects an action given the current game state; (b) proactive thinking, where the model also forecasts the consequences of candidate actions on future game states. In this work, we focus on proactive thinking and train models to forecast the consequences of different actions.

supervised fine-tuning (SFT) on human gameplay trajectories to provide basic behavioral and environmental knowledge. It then applies RL with rule-based, verifiable rewards that compare forecasts against actual environment transitions, in order to align model predictions with true dynamics (see §3.3). WiA-LLM thus shifts LLMs from purely reactive pattern matching to model-based forecasting, analogous to how humans mentally simulate outcomes before deciding.

We evaluate WiA-LLM in *Honor of Kings* (HoK), a large-scale multiplayer online battle arena (MOBA) game (Wei et al., 2022). HoK is an attractive testbed for three reasons. First, it has *high dynamic complexity*: players must adapt in real time to over one hundred heroes, shifting objectives, and coordinated team strategies. Second, it offers *quantifiable states*: the game state can be encoded as JSON-structured objects with hero positions, resources, and map conditions, which enables precise and automatic reward computation. Third, it features *high-stakes consequences*: a single mistimed objective contest (e.g., a dragon fight) can flip the match outcome, creating a rich space for WIA evaluation. We construct two benchmarks in this environment, **WIA-General** and **WIA-Hardest**, to test whether WiA-LLM can support dynamic proactive reasoning and adapt decision-making based on forecasted consequences (see §3.2 and §4.1).

Our experiments demonstrate that: (1) WiA-

LLM achieves 74.2% forecasting accuracy on HoK’s scenarios, outperforming base model (qwen3-14b) by 27% and surpassing deepseek-r1 by 41.6%; (2) it improves downstream decision-making and leads agents to exhibit strategic behavior closer to expert human players; (3) it improves steadily across difficulty tiers, with 93.9% accuracy on the simplest forecasting tasks and 73.1% on tasks of moderate complexity; (4) it exhibits stable optimization during RL training, with reward convergence within 400 steps and no clear degradation of output quality; and (5) it maintains strong zero-shot generalization on standard academic benchmarks.

Overall, our main contributions are as follows:

- We propose WiA-LLM, a framework that equips LLMs with proactive thinking by forecasting the consequences of actions using environment feedback.
- We design a training paradigm that combines SFT on human gameplay data with RL guided by rule-based, verifiable rewards, which aligns model forecasts with actual environment transitions.
- We demonstrate that WiA-LLM attains strong performance in a complex MOBA environment and leads agents to exhibit strategic behavior closer to expert human players.

2 Preliminary

In this section, we formally define the What-If Analysis task within the game environment and define the necessary notations for our framework.

What-If Analysis Task. Given a game state S_t at time step t , the objective is to forecast the resulting state change, denoted as S_{Δ} , after a player executes a specific action a_t . This task requires the model to reason about the current environmental conditions and apply a deep understanding of game mechanics to predict the causal impact of the action. As illustrated in Figure 1, WIA represents a shift toward *proactive thinking*: rather than merely reacting to the current state, the model anticipates the future consequences of its decisions, thereby enabling more informed strategic planning.

Game State. We model the game environment as a sequence of discrete states. Each state S_t encapsulates the visible information from the primary player’s perspective, including teammate attributes, visible turrets, and map vision data. Crucially, to simulate realistic gameplay, we strictly enforce **partial observability** by excluding hidden information,

such as the status of enemies currently in the "fog of war." To facilitate compatibility with LLMs, we serialize the game state S_t into a JSON object, a format that LLMs can naturally parse and process.

Game Environment. We conduct our study in *Honor of Kings (HoK)* (Wei et al., 2022; Qu et al., 2023). In HoK, players control unique heroes and coordinate with teammates to defeat opponents, neutral creatures, and defensive structures. The ultimate victory condition is the destruction of the opposing team’s base crystal. HoK serves as an ideal testbed due to its complexity: the necessity for team cooperation, dynamic strategy shifts, and the high-dimensional state space create a challenging environment for decision-making. Conversely, mastering this proactive thinking paradigm in such a complex domain offers significant potential for advancing the reasoning capabilities of game AI.

3 Method: WiA-LLM

3.1 Overview & Problem Formulation

Our framework, WiA-LLM, facilitates the transition of LLMs from reactive pattern matching to proactive world modeling. We conceptualize the What-If Analysis task as a conditional state prediction problem within a partially observable Markov Decision Process (POMDP) (Wikipedia, 2025). Formally, let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{A} denote the game state and action space. At time step t , the agent observes a state S_t and chooses a candidate action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$, the objective is to approximate its transition function $\mathcal{T}(S_{t+1}|S_t, a_t)$ by predicting the future state changes S_Δ . S_Δ representing the causal impact of the action to the entire state. Unlike standard next-token prediction, this task requires the model to implicitly simulate environment dynamics and explicitly generate the reasoning process underlying the state transition.

3.2 Data Construction and Utilization

To ground the model in realistic dynamics, we construct a scalable dataset derived from *Honor of Kings (HoK)*. This dataset is pivotal for our multi-stage training pipeline, providing both the reasoning priors for SFT and the ground-truth oracle for RL verification.

Trajectory Parsing and Difference Extraction.

We process raw gameplay logs using a strict state-parsing pipeline (Algorithm 1) to generate the base transition dataset $\mathcal{G}_D = \{(S_t, a_t, S_\Delta^*)_{i=1}^N$. Specifically, each state S_t is first serialized into a

Algorithm 1 Game State Parsing and Difference Extraction

Require: Raw Game State Sequence $S = [S_1, \dots, S_T]$
Ensure: Transition Dataset \mathcal{G}_D

```

1: Constant  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow \{\text{hero, tower, minions, dragon}\}$ 
2: Initialize lists:  $P \leftarrow []$ ;  $G_D \leftarrow []$ 
3: for  $t \leftarrow 1$  to  $T$  do ▷ Phase 1: Annotate Actions
4:    $a_t \leftarrow \text{ANNOTATE}(S_t)$ 
5:    $P.\text{APPEND}((S_t, a_t))$ 
6: end for
7: for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $|P| - 1$  do ▷ Phase 2: Extract Transitions
8:   Let  $(S_{cur}, a_{cur}) = P[i]$  and  $(S_{next}, a_{next}) = P[i + 1]$ 
9:   if  $\text{TIMEDELTA}(P[i], P[i + 1]) > 60\text{s}$  then
10:    continue
11:   end if
12:   if  $a_{cur} \neq a_{next}$  then
13:      $S_\Delta \leftarrow \text{COMPUTESTATEDIFF}(S_{cur}, S_{next})$ 
14:      $G_D.\text{APPEND}((S_{cur}, a_{cur}, S_\Delta))$ 
15:   end if
16: end for
17: return  $G_D$ 
18: function  $\text{COMPUTESTATEDIFF}(S_{old}, S_{new})$ 
19:    $S_\Delta \leftarrow \text{Map}()$ 
20:   for each  $c \in \mathcal{C}$  do
21:     if  $S_{old}[c] \neq S_{new}[c]$  then
22:        $S_\Delta[c] \leftarrow \text{DIFF}(S_{old}[c], S_{new}[c])$ 
23:     end if
24:   end for
25:   return  $S_\Delta$ 
26: end function

```

structured JSON object encompassing all visible information, such as hero attributes, turret status, and map vision, to enforce partial observability. We then parse the player’s executed action a_t corresponding to S_t using a predefined taxonomy. To compute the target label, we calculate the ground-truth state difference S_Δ^* by comparing S_t with the future state $S_{t+\delta}$ (where $\delta > 0$). This difference vector S_Δ^* captures changes in critical components $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{hero, tower, minions, dragon}\}$ and serves as the definitive label for environmental consequences. The gathered dataset \mathcal{G}_D are utilized across two optimization stages.

Stage I: Reasoning Distillation (SFT). To initialize the model with strong reasoning capabilities, we augment the base training samples with synthetic reasoning traces. Utilizing a teacher model (DeepSeek-R1) which has access to the ground truth (S_t, a_t, S_Δ^*) , we distill a "thinking process" C_t that explains the causal link between the action and the outcome. This yields the SFT corpus $\mathcal{D}_{SFT} = \{(S_t, a_t, C_t, S_\Delta^*)\}$, used to train the model to output structured reasoning before the final prediction.

Stage II: Outcome Verification (RL). For the reinforcement learning stage, we revert to the original real-world data \mathcal{G}_D . Here, the pair (S_t, a_t) serves as the prompt q , while the ground truth S_Δ^*




Figure 2: Workflow of WiA-LLM. Given the current game state and a set of hypothetical actions, the model is asked to forecast the potential changes to the entire game state once the player takes the action, and provide the justification for the forecasts. We then use the predicted game state changes to compare with ground-truth values using a rule-based verifier to update the policy model. This process enables the model to perform what-if analysis (forecasting) by simulating action outcomes and refining its decision-making accordingly.

is reserved strictly as the oracle for the rule-based reward function. This ensures that the policy optimization is driven by actual environmental dynamics rather than distilled approximations.

3.3 Policy Learning via Verifiable Rewards

While SFT provides basic behavioral patterns, it lacks the ability to effectively guide the model to do self-explore against dynamic environments. We therefore use a RL framework (i.e., GRPO (Shao et al., 2024)) that directly aligns the policy’s forecasts with actual environmental transitions.

Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO).

For each query $q = (S_t, a_t)$, we sample a group of outputs from the current policy and evaluate them against the ground truth. The optimization objective maximizes the expected advantage of accurate forecasts while constraining the policy shift from a reference model. By normalizing advantages within the group, GRPO stabilizes training without requiring a separate value network. We provide the detailed mathematical formulation and derivation of the GRPO objective in Appendix B.

Rule-Based Verifiable Rewards. Following the success in Deepseek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025) using rule-based reward, we adopt a similar rule-based reward r_t to measures the factual alignment between the predicted state change S_Δ and the ground truth S_Δ^* as.

$$r_t = \frac{\sum_{(k, v_k) \in S_\Delta} w_k \cdot \text{Score}(v_k, v_k^*)}{\sum_{(k, v) \in S_\Delta} w_k} \quad (1)$$

where w_k denotes the weight assigned to each key k , reflecting its relative importance. The scoring function assigns a value of 1 for exact matches,

0.5 for partial matches, and 0 otherwise. This reward encourages the model to generate action predictions that closely match real player behavior while penalizing overly verbose or irrelevant outputs. We do not incorporate format rewards, as our learned model already demonstrates strong structural adherence. Furthermore, following Deepseek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025), we avoid training neural reward models. The decision is motivated by the sensitivity of LLMs to specific forms of rewards in large-scale RL, as well as the additional computational cost and complexity introduced by retraining these models. The training prompts for WiA-LLM can be found in the Appendix §F.

3.4 Inference-Time Decision Making

To leverage the learned world model for strategic gameplay, we implement a **lookahead search mechanism** during inference (Figure 7). Unlike reactive agents that map states directly to actions ($\pi : S \rightarrow a$), our approach explicitly reasons about future outcomes before committing to a decision. In specific, the agent can performs a one-step lookahead search:

- **Candidate Generation:** Given the current state S_t , the model first functions as a policy proposal network. It samples a set of k plausible candidate actions $\mathcal{A}_{cand} = \{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ derived from the policy distribution $\pi_\theta(\cdot | S_t)$.
- **What-if Simulation:** For each candidate action $a_i \in \mathcal{A}_{cand}$, the WiA-LLM is queried to forecast the differential state transition $S_{\Delta, i}$. This step represents the core "What-If" analysis, where the model conditions on the hypothetical execution of a_i to output $S_{\Delta, i} = f_\theta(S_t, a_i)$.

- **Heuristic Evaluation:** To ensure robust selection, we employ a deterministic, rule-based value function $V(S_\Delta)$. This function acts as a classifier that categorizes the forecasted consequences (e.g., tower destroyed, resource gained vs. hero death) into strategic values (positive or negative).
- **Optimal Selection:** The final action a^* is then selected by maximizing the evaluated outcome of the simulated future: $a^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{a_i \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{cand}}} V(S_{\Delta,i})$. This decouples the generation of possibilities from the evaluation of strategic success, mitigating the risk of the model rationalizing suboptimal plans.

This "simulate-and-evaluate" process is the essence of model-based planning. It allows the agent to "think ahead" and choose the action with the best forecasted outcome, rather than just the action that seems best reactively. However, we acknowledge that the underlying LLM inference may carries a substantial latency cost, making it unsuitable for execution on every game frame. To solve this, we propose a two-pronged strategy in Appendix C.

4 Experiments

In this section, we first illustrate the experiment setup for our experiments, including datasets, environments, and the baseline models used for the comparison (§4.1). Then we discuss the training details of our method (§4.2), and provide the analysis of the main results (§4.3). We also present ablation studies, error analysis, and case studies (§4.4) to further analyze the effectiveness of the proposed method.

4.1 Experiment Setup

Environment. All experiments were conducted on four servers, each equipped with 8 NVIDIA H20 (96 GB) GPUs. For SFT, we utilized the Megatron-LM (Shoeybi et al., 2019) training platform. For online RL, we utilized OpenRLHF (Hu et al., 2024a). **Datasets.** We curate two new benchmarks for WIA tasks, **WIA-General** and **WIA-Hardest**. We quantify task difficulty using the number of altered game-critical components, denoted as $d = \|S_\Delta\|$, where S_Δ is the differential set draws from $\mathcal{C} = \{\text{hero, tower, minion_waves, dragon}\}$ defined in Algorithm 1. The difficulty d ranges from 1 (single-component change) to 4 (simultaneous changes to all components). The statistics of WIA-General ($\mathcal{D}_g = \{(S_i, a_i, S_\Delta) \mid 1 \leq d \leq 4\}$) and WIA-Hardest ($\mathcal{D}_h = \{(S_i, a_i, S_\Delta) \mid d = 4\}$) are

Metric	WIA-General (n=1,476)		WIA-Hardest (n=452)		Combined (n=1,928)	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Change Types Distribution						
Minion Changes	1,003	67.95	452	100.00	1,455	75.47
Tower Changes	1,355	91.80	452	100.00	1,807	93.73
Hero Changes	412	27.91	452	100.00	864	44.81
Dragon Changes	37	2.51	452	100.00	489	25.36
Difficulty Levels Distribution						
d=1 (1 change)	524	35.50	0	0.00	524	27.18
d=2 (2 changes)	567	38.41	0	0.00	567	29.42
d=3 (3 changes)	369	25.00	0	0.00	369	19.15
d=4 (4 changes)	16	1.08	452	100.00	468	24.28

Table 1: Dataset Statistics: WIA-General & WIA-Hardest.

detailed in Table 1 and results can be found in Table 2 and Table 3.

To further verify whether our models sacrifice their native language understanding and reasoning capabilities during training, we also test WIA-LLM on several standard benchmarks: **Ape210K** (Zhao et al., 2020), **MMLU** (Hendrycks et al., 2021), **CEval** (Huang et al., 2023), **School-Chinese** (lanhin, 2018), **BBH** (Suzgun et al., 2023), and **IfE-val** (Zhou et al., 2023). The detailed description of these benchmarks is provided in the Appendix E.

Baselines. We use LLMs of various scales as baseline models for evaluation. We mainly focus on Qwen3-models (Yang et al., 2025) with the native thinking capabilities, including Qwen3-14B and Qwen3-8B. We also consider several other models: Deepseek-R1, Deepseek-R1-distilled-Qwen3-14B, and QwQ-32B. All model checkpoints are accessible via HuggingFace.

4.2 Training Details

We follow the insights from Deepseek-R1 (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025) to employ multi-stage training that combines supervised fine-tuning (SFT) and reinforcement learning (RL) to enhance the capabilities of our language models. Specifically, SFT helps improve the foundational language understanding and reasoning capabilities of our models, while online RL enables the models to efficiently explore and select the most effective solutions through trial and error.

We choose Qwen3-8B and Qwen3-14B as our base models. For the SFT stages, we curate the training dataset by distilling knowledge from Deepseek-R1, which demonstrates strong reasoning capabilities in game environments and can thoroughly analyze the game states based on its pre-existing knowledge. In specific, we provide the ground truth of game state change and the instruc-

Model	$d = 1$	$d = 2$	$d = 3$	$d = 4$
deepseek-r1	0.443	0.298	0.213	0.102
deepseek-r1-distilled-qwen-3-14B	0.566	0.339	0.156	0.023
qwq-32b	0.467	0.361	0.246	0.016
qwen-3-14b	0.640	0.486	0.234	0.008
WiA-LLM (14b-sft)	0.777	0.590	0.433	0.297
WiA-LLM (14b-grpo)	0.895	0.660	0.404	0.117
WiA-LLM (14b-sft-grpo) (our best model)	0.939	0.731	0.497	0.312
qwen-3-8b	0.601	0.457	0.245	0.023
WiA-LLM (8b-sft)	0.898	0.625	0.431	0.172
WiA-LLM (8b-grpo)	0.831	0.601	0.367	0.094
WiA-LLM (8b-sft-grpo) (our best model)	0.938	0.728	0.500	0.430

Table 2: Model performance across different difficulty levels ($d = 1$ to $d = 4$), where d is defined in Section 3.2. The results demonstrate how each model performs as the difficulty increases, with our best models (*-sft-grpo) consistently achieving superior results, especially on the hardest level ($d = 4$).

tion to the R1 model and let it generate the reasoning process (Wei et al., 2023), which leads to the final answer based on the given information. We provide the prompt in the Appendix §F. The distilled data is formatted as (game state: S_t , action: a_t , and thinking process: C_t). We consider this to make it a valuable resource for training smaller models to acquire R1-like deep reasoning capabilities. For the online RL stage, we use real gameplay data collected as described in Section 3. We explore two setups: (1) applying GRPO directly to the base model without any prior SFT, and (2) applying GRPO to a model that has already been fine-tuned. The comparison of these two strategies is presented in Tables 3 and 2. Due to computational constraints, we limit GRPO training to approximately 400 steps for all models to ensure a fair comparison, and set the number of epochs for the SFT stage to three.

4.3 Main Results

The main results can be found in Table 3 and Table 2. It reveals several critical insights about the effectiveness of our multi-stage training approach. Our WiA-LLM with SFT+GRPO method consistently achieves superior performance across all evaluation settings, with particularly impressive improvements on the challenging subsets (WIA-Hardest). On WIA-General, both WiA-LLM-14B and WiA-LLM-8B with SFT+GRPO achieve nearly identical performance (0.742), substantially outperforming the much larger model Deepseek-R1 (0.326). The performance improvement becomes even more pronounced on WIA-Hardest, where our 8B model achieves 0.426 accuracy compared to Deepseek-R1’s 0.111, while the 14B model reaches 0.295. In Table 2, we further evaluate the perfor-

Model	WIA-General	WIA-Hardest
deepseek-r1	0.326	0.111
deepseek-r1-distilled-qwen-3-14b	0.370	0.046
qwq-32b	0.366	0.037
qwen-3-14b	0.472	0.027
WiA-LLM(14b-sft)	0.614	0.281
WiA-LLM(14b-grpo)	0.674	0.132
WiA-LLM(14b-sft-grpo) (our best model)	0.742	0.295
qwen-3-8b	0.450	0.022
WiA-LLM (8b-sft)	0.669	0.179
WiA-LLM (8b-grpo)	0.619	0.108
WiA-LLM (8b-sft-grpo) (our best model)	0.742	0.426

Table 3: Performance comparison of different models on two test sets: WIA-General, which includes samples of varying difficulty levels, and WIA-Hardest, which contains only the most challenging samples. Our best models (*-sft-grpo) consistently achieve better results across both test sets.

mance across difficulty levels on WIA-General. It reveals that while all models experience degradation as task complexity increases from $d = 1$ to $d = 4$, our approach maintains the most robust performance. Notably, on the most challenging $d = 4$ task, our 8B model achieves 0.430 accuracy (compared to Deepseek-R1’s 0.102), and our 14B model reaches 0.312, which remarkably exceeds the 14B baseline’s performance on this difficulty level. These results show that: both SFT and GRPO independently deliver substantial performance improvements. When combined, however, they produce even greater gains, exceeding the results of either method alone.

To validate whether our models maintain general capabilities after domain-specific training, we evaluate performance across several standard benchmarks, including mathematics, knowledge-based questions, logical reasoning and instruction following. Tables 4 and 5 demonstrate that our training approach generally preserves fundamental language model capabilities with occasionally enhanced capabilities on logical reasoning and instruction-following. On math tasks (Ape210K), our models remain stable (93.5 across all variants for the 14B model) while showing modest degradation for 8B SFT-based configurations. Subject examinations (MMLU and CEval) exhibit exceptional robustness with performance variations within 1% point, indicating the factual knowledge is preserved during training. Notably, logical reasoning (BBH) consistently improves with SFT-based training, with 8B models achieving 60.17-60.52 vs. 58.35 baseline. In Table 5, we analyze the instruction following capabilities of the trained models. It reveals that our method with GRPO enhances the performance (8B: 0.379 vs. 0.351 on prompt-level accuracy) while




Figure 3: Demonstration of rewards (left) & total token length (right) change over training steps during the RL training process. It indicates that models with our method consistently achieve higher rewards and maintain more stable or longer token lengths compared to the baselines, demonstrating improved learning efficiency and output quality.

SFT alone may cause degradation on the 8B model (0.301 vs. 0.351). These results support that our approach enables domain-specific improvements while preserving essential language model capabilities, with RL components particularly beneficial for maintaining instruction-following abilities.

Model	Math	Memorization	Subject Exam		Logic
	Ape_210k	SchoolChinese	MMLU	CEval	BBH
qwen3-14b	93.5	91.85	80.21	82.76	65.48
WiA-LLM (14b-sft)	92.0	92.28	80.18	83.06	65.48
WiA-LLM (14b-grpo)	93.5	92.19	80.56	82.91	65.13
WiA-LLM (14b-sft-grpo)	93.5	91.69	80.25	83.14	65.30
qwen3-8b	93.0	88.0	75.96	78.08	58.35
WiA-LLM (8b-sft)	90.5	87.02	76.60	78.68	60.52
WiA-LLM (8b-grpo)	93.5	88.04	76.04	78.45	57.83
WiA-LLM (8b-sft-grpo)	89.5	86.72	76.631	78.6	60.17

Table 4: Performance of different models on math, academic, knowledge-based, and logical reasoning benchmarks.

4.4 Analysis

Response Length vs. Rewards. We illustrate how rewards and response lengths change during the RL training process in Figure 3. All models exhibit consistent reward improvements throughout training, with SFT-initialized variants (WiA-LLM-*-sft-grpo) starting from higher baseline rewards (0.6-0.65) compared to non-SFT models (0.35-0.4). Regarding response lengths, the patterns vary significantly by model: WiA-LLM(14b-grpo) shows a sharp initial drop before stabilizing, while WiA-LLM(14b-sft-grpo) maintains relatively stable lengths. The WiA-LLM(8b-grpo) exhibits a slight initial decrease followed by gradual recovery, whereas WiA-LLM(8b-sft-grpo) demonstrates steady length increases. These distinct length trajectories suggest that model size, initialization strategy, and architectural differences influence how models balance response elaboration with reward optimization during RL training.




Figure 4: Distribution of sample counts across different accuracy ranges. The stacked histograms demonstrate sample counts across accuracy ranges, while the smoothed trend line highlights the performance pattern of our method.

Distribution of the Performance Range. To further validate the robustness of our model’s performance, instead of tricking the evaluation metric, we analyze the distribution of sample numbers across different accuracy ranges. In Figure 4, we demonstrate the sample counts for different models across accuracy ranges and provide a smoothed trend line that highlights the performance pattern of model WiA-LLM(14b-sft-grpo). It showcases that our model outperforms baselines by concentrating more samples in the higher accuracy ranges (0.7 to 1.0), indicating more consistent and accurate predictions compared to base models.

Case Studies. To evaluate our proposed method, we conduct a detailed case study in Figure 5. We demonstrate how WiA-LLM leverage its forecasting capabilities for downstream tasks like action prediction (see Appendix A.1) using a lookahead search mechanism (§3.4). Specifically, WiA-LLM first predicts the top- K potential actions based on




Figure 5: Case study on WiA. To safeguard user privacy, we blurred the user’s Game ID.

Model	Prompt-level loose-acc	Inst-level loose-acc	Prompt-level strict-acc	Inst-level strict-acc
qwen3-14b	0.357	0.494	0.338	0.475
WiA-LLM (14b-grpo)	0.355	0.496	0.342	0.482
WiA-LLM (14b-sft)	0.355	0.498	0.336	0.480
WiA-LLM (14b-sft-grpo)	0.362	0.501	0.344	0.486
qwen3-8b	0.351	0.495	0.340	0.483
WiA-LLM (8b-grpo)	0.379	0.514	0.366	0.500
WiA-LLM (8b-sft)	0.301	0.440	0.290	0.429
WiA-LLM (8b-sft-grpo)	0.336	0.477	0.323	0.461

Table 5: Performance on IFEval benchmark (Zhou et al., 2023). Detailed metrics can be found in the Appendix E.1.

the current game state, and then analyzes the potential consequences of each action to the entire game state. We then apply a rule-based classifier to classify each action’s consequence as positive or negative, enabling us to select the most effective action. We compare this proactive approach with the reactive approach (using qwen3-8b). It shows that WiA-LLM provides more detailed, verifiable reasoning traces for each action. In this example, we can audit *why* the model chose the move: it correctly simulated the minion wave mechanics, whereas the baseline hallucinated a ganking opportunity that did not exist.

5 Related Works

Game Understanding of LLMs. While LLMs excel at language-based reasoning, effectively applying them to games remains challenging due to their reliance on static pre-training data and lack of environmental grounding (Hu et al., 2024b). Key challenges include: (1) *Contextual grounding*: difficulty interpreting dynamic game states for consistent decision-making (Hu et al., 2024c); (2) *Symbolic precision*: misinterpreting game terminology and item attributes that disrupt game engine interaction (Southey et al., 2012); and (3) *Long-term planning*: limited memory and strategic reasoning over extended horizons (Silver et al., 2016; Vinyals et al., 2017; He et al., 2025).

Role of RL in LLMs. Recent advances in LLMs have highlighted the crucial role of RL in aligning model outputs with human preferences (Sui et al., 2025; Jin et al., 2025). While pre-training on vast text corpora enables them to generate fluent and grammatically correct text, this alone cannot ensure models are helpful, harmless, and aligned with user expectations. RL from human feedback (RLHF) (Ouyang et al., 2022) addresses this by training a reward model based on human preferences to guide policy optimization via methods like PPO (Schulman et al., 2017), DPO (Rafailov et al., 2023) and SimPO (Meng et al., 2024). More recently, GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) has emerged as a flexible alternative for obtaining reward signals. Unlike PPO, GRPO does not strictly require a reward model; instead, it can incorporate reward signals from any function or model capable of evaluating response quality.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we mainly follow the insights from human cognition: before we apply any action, we may consider the consequences of each action to better adjust our decision-making. Following this insight, we propose a new paradigm, **WiA-LLM** for LLMs reasoning, which not only considers the current state information, but also learn from the feedback from the environment to equip the forecasting capabilities. We test our model on a MOBA game and find that WiA-LLM can achieve a deeper understanding of the game state and also learn the capabilities to forecast the future events during gameplay. To our knowledge, this work presents the first exploration of What-If-Analysis capabilities in LLMs. We posit that this capability provides a powerful tool for LLMs to reason within complex environments.

Limitations

In this work, we focus on the *strategic reasoning capabilities* of LLMs. While we demonstrate superior alignment with expert human actions and high-fidelity state forecasting, we do not deploy this in an online ranked environment to measure Win Rate. Online performance depends heavily on low-level execution (micro-mechanics/reaction time), which is outside the scope of this work on proactive world modeling.

References

- DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, et al. 2025. [Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2501.12948.
- Sneha Gathani, Madelon Hulsebos, James Gale, Peter J. Haas, and Çağatay Demiralp. 2022. [Augmenting decision making via interactive what-if analysis](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2109.06160.
- Yufei He, Ruoyu Li, Alex Chen, Yue Liu, Yulin Chen, Yuan Sui, Cheng Chen, Yi Zhu, Luca Luo, Frank Yang, and Bryan Hooi. 2025. Enabling self-improving agents to learn at test time with human-in-the-loop guidance. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2507.17131*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring massive multitask language understanding](#). In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net.
- Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Zilin Zhu, Xianyu, Weixun Wang, Dehao Zhang, and Yu Cao. 2024a. Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*.
- Sihao Hu, Tiansheng Huang, Gaowen Liu, Ramana Rao Kompella, Fatih Ilhan, Selim Furkan Tekin, Yichang Xu, Zachary Yahn, and Ling Liu. 2024b. A survey on large language model-based game agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2404.02039*.
- Sihao Hu, Tiansheng Huang, and Ling Liu. 2024c. [Pokellmon: A human-parity agent for pokemon battles with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.01118.
- Yuzhen Huang, Yuzhuo Bai, Zhihao Zhu, Junlei Zhang, Jinghan Zhang, Tangjun Su, Junteng Liu, Chuancheng Lv, Yikai Zhang, Jiayi lei, Yao Fu, Maosong Sun, and Junxian He. 2023. [C-eval: A multi-level multi-discipline chinese evaluation suite for foundation models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 62991–63010. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Bowen Jin, Hansi Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Jinsung Yoon, Sercan Arik, Dong Wang, Hamed Zamani, and Jiawei Han. 2025. Search-r1: Training llms to reason and leverage search engines with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2503.09516*.
- Ming Jin, Shiyu Wang, Lintao Ma, Zhixuan Chu, James Y. Zhang, Xiaoming Shi, Pin-Yu Chen, Yuxuan Liang, Yuan-Fang Li, Shirui Pan, and Qingsong Wen. 2024. [Time-llm: Time series forecasting by re-programming large language models](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- lanhin. 2018. [School chinese benchmark](#).
- Junlong Li, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Runxin Xu, Yu Wu, and Junxian He. 2025. Codei/o: Condensing reasoning patterns via code input-output prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2502.07316*.
- Yi Liao, Yu Gu, Yuan Sui, Zining Zhu, Yifan Lu, Guohua Tang, Zhongqian Sun, and Wei Yang. 2025. Think in games: Learning to reason in games via reinforcement learning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2508.21365*.
- Yu Meng, Mengzhou Xia, and Danqi Chen. 2024. Simpo: Simple preference optimization with a reference-free reward. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:124198–124235.
- Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll L. Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, et al. 2022. [Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Yun Qu, Boyuan Wang, Jianzhun Shao, Yuhang Jiang, Chen Chen, Zhenbin Ye, Liu Linc, Yang Feng, Lin Lai, Hongyang Qin, Minwen Deng, Juchao Zhuo, Ye, et al. 2023. [Hokoff: Real game dataset from honor of kings and its offline reinforcement learning benchmarks](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 22166–22190. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D. Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. 2023. [Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1707.06347*.

- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. [Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2402.03300.
- Jimeng Shi, Mahek Jain, and Giri Narasimhan. 2022. [Time series forecasting \(tsf\) using various deep learning models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2204.11115.
- Mohammad Shoeybi, Mostofa Patwary, Raul Puri, Patrick LeGresley, Jared Casper, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2019. Megatron-lm: Training multi-billion parameter language models using model parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 1909.08053*.
- David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. 2016. Mastering the game of go with deep neural networks and tree search. *nature*, 529(7587):484–489.
- Finnegan Southey, Michael P Bowling, Bryce Larson, Carmelo Piccione, Neil Burch, Darse Billings, and Chris Rayner. 2012. Bayes’ bluff: Opponent modelling in poker. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.1411*.
- Aarohi Srivastava, Abhinav Rastogi, Abhishek Rao, Abu Awal Md Shoeb, Abubakar Abid, Adam Fisch, Adam R. Brown, Adam Santoro, Aditya Gupta, et al. 2023. [Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models](#). *Trans. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2023.
- Yuan Sui, Yufei He, Tri Cao, Simeng Han, Yulin Chen, and Bryan Hooi. 2025. [Meta-reasoner: Dynamic guidance for optimized inference-time reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2502.19918.
- Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Scales, Nathanael Schärli, Sebastian Gehrmann, Yi Tay, Hyung Won Chung, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Quoc V. Le, Ed H. Chi, Denny Zhou, and Jason Wei. 2023. [Challenging big-bench tasks and whether chain-of-thought can solve them](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023, Toronto, Canada, July 9-14, 2023*, pages 13003–13051. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hua Tang, Chong Zhang, Mingyu Jin, Qinkai Yu, Zhenxing Wang, Xiaobo Jin, Yongfeng Zhang, and Mengnan Du. 2025. Time series forecasting with llms: Understanding and enhancing model capabilities. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 26(2):109–118.
- Quan Tu, Shilong Fan, Zihang Tian, and Rui Yan. 2024. Charactereval: A chinese benchmark for role-playing conversational agent evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2401.01275*.
- Oriol Vinyals, Timo Ewalds, Sergey Bartunov, Petko Georgiev, et al. 2017. [Starcraft ii: A new challenge for reinforcement learning](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:1708.04782.
- Hua Wei, Jingxiao Chen, Xiyang Ji, Hongyang Qin, Minwen Deng, Siqin Li, Liang Wang, Weinan Zhang, Yong Yu, Liu Lin, et al. 2022. [Honor of kings arena: an environment for generalization in competitive reinforcement learning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*.
- Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Brian Ichter, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc Le, and Denny Zhou. 2023. [Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2201.11903.
- Wikipedia. 2025. Partially observable Markov decision process — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Partially%20observable%20Markov%20decision%20process&oldid=1318763884>. [Online; accessed 03-December-2025].
- An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, Chujie Zheng, Dayiheng Liu, Fan Zhou, Fei Huang, Feng Hu, Hao Ge, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jialong Tang, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiaxi Yang, Jing Zhou, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Lianghao Deng, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Mingze Li, Pei Zhang, Peng Wang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Ruize Gao, Shixuan Liu, Shuang Luo, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Wenbiao Yin, Xingzhang Ren, Xinyu Wang, Xinyu Zhang, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yinger Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zekun Wang, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, Zhipeng Zhou, and Zihan Qiu. 2025. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2505.09388*.
- Chengyue Yu, Lei Zang, Jiaotuan Wang, Chenyi Zhuang, and Jinjie Gu. 2024. [CharPoet: A Chinese classical poetry generation system based on token-free LLM](#). In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pages 315–325, Bangkok, Thailand. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wei Zhao, Mingyue Shang, Yang Liu, Liang Wang, and Jingming Liu. 2020. [Ape210k: A large-scale and template-rich dataset of math word problems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2009.11506.
- Jeffrey Zhou, Tianjian Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Siddhartha Brahma, Sujoy Basu, Yi Luan, Denny Zhou, and Le Hou. 2023. Instruction-following evaluation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2311.07911*.

A Case Studies

A.1 Downstream task definition.

We consider the action prediction task as one of the downstream tasks for the game decision-making process. The task can be formalized as follows: $a_t^* = f(S_t)$, where models predict the best action based on the current game state S_t . In the HoK environment, the actions available to players are defined as a set of A (see Table E.1 for the detailed explanation of each action). Noted that the actions designed are mainly focused on the strategic level, which aims to guide the user to adjust their low-level actions (such as moving the hero or executing the skills) based on this high-level strategic guidance. This work differs from previous works (Wei et al., 2022; Qu et al., 2023) in that it targets low-level actions, such as changing the heroes' positions and releasing skills.

B GRPO with Game State

To enable effective learning of proactive reasoning in game environments, we employ *Group Relative Policy Optimization* (GRPO) (Shao et al., 2024), an online RL algorithm designed to maximize the advantage of generated completions while constraining policy divergence from a reference model.

GRPO Formalization. We formalize the training process of WiA-LLM using GRPO below. Let q denote a sampled prompt (e.g., a game state s_t and context i_t), and let $\{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_G\}$ be a group of G completions generated by the old policy $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$. For each completion o_i , a reward r_i is computed using a rule-based reward function (see §3.3). The group-relative advantage for each completion is then calculated as:

$$\hat{A}_{i,t} = \frac{r_i - \text{mean}(r)}{\text{std}(r)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\text{mean}(r)$ and $\text{std}(r)$ denote the mean and standard deviation of rewards within the group, respectively. This normalization ensures that the advantage reflects the relative quality of each completion.

To optimize the policy, we first define the importance sampling ratio $\rho_t(\theta)$ between the current policy π_θ and the sampling policy $\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}$:

$$\rho_t(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(o_{i,t}|q, o_{i,<t})}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(o_{i,t}|q, o_{i,<t})}. \quad (3)$$

Additionally, to ensure the policy stays close to the original behavior, we compute the token-level Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the current policy π_θ and the reference policy π_{ref} :

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[\pi_\theta \parallel \pi_{\text{ref}}] = \pi_\theta(o_{i,t}|q, o_{i,<t}) \log \frac{\pi_\theta(o_{i,t}|q, o_{i,<t})}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(o_{i,t}|q, o_{i,<t})}. \quad (4)$$

Alternatively, this can be approximated using the estimator $\frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}}{\pi_\theta} - \log \frac{\pi_{\text{ref}}}{\pi_\theta} - 1$ (Schulman et al., 2017).

The overall GRPO objective is to maximize the expected group-relative advantage while penalizing deviation from the reference model. We formulate the total objective $\mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}$ as:

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = \hat{\mathbb{E}}_{i,t} [\mathcal{L}_t^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta) - \beta \mathbb{D}_{\text{KL}}[\pi_\theta \parallel \pi_{\text{ref}}]] \quad (5)$$

where β is the coefficient controlling the strength of the KL regularization. To ensure training stability, we employ the clipped surrogate objective $\mathcal{L}_t^{\text{CLIP}}(\theta)$, defined as:

$$\min \left(\rho_t(\theta) \hat{A}_{i,t}, \text{clip}(\rho_t(\theta), 1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon) \hat{A}_{i,t} \right) \quad (6)$$

Here, the clipping operator constrains the update magnitude relative to the old policy within the range $[1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]$, preventing destructive policy updates.

C Latency & Real-Time Inference

The core contribution of the WiA-LLM is its ability to perform high-fidelity, interpretable counterfactual reasoning. We acknowledge that the underlying LLM inference mentioned in §3.4 carries a substantial latency cost, making it unsuitable for execution on every game frame. To address this critical concern, we propose a two-pronged strategy: (1) a dual-system deployment architecture and (2) knowledge distillation for scalable deployment.

C.1 Dual-System Deployment Architecture

We do not propose running the full WiA-LLM simulation process for low-level, high-frequency actions (e.g., movement, ability targeting). Instead, the agent operates on a dual-system architecture that decouples the slow, deliberative reasoning from fast, reactive execution.

System 1 (Reactive Policy): A lightweight, model-free neural network handles the low-latency, real-time control of the hero (i.e., movement and immediate tactical skill use). This policy can operate very fast at the required environment frequency (e.g., $\sim 30\text{ms}$ updates).




Figure 6: Demonstration of GRPO training with Game State. Given the player’s action and the current game state, the model is asked to forecast the potential changes to the entire game state once the player takes the action, and provide the thinking process as the analysis of this what-if scenario. We then use the predicted game state changes to compare with ground-truth values using a rule-based verifier to update the policy model. This process enables the model to perform what-if analysis (forecasting) by simulating action outcomes and refining its decision-making accordingly.




Figure 7: Demonstration: Adaptation of WiA-LLM to downstream action prediction task.

System 2 (WiA-LLM Planner). WiA-LLM serves as the deliberative strategic layer. The planner is invoked only at predefined strategic decision points that require long-horizon reasoning. Typical calls include: (i) **objective selection**, such as deciding whether to contest Dragon/Baron, push a high-ground tower, or rotate to another lane; (ii) **rallying and grouping**, such as deciding whether to commit to a team fight; and (iii) **recall and resurrection planning**, such as choosing the hero’s path and next objective after death or a fountain return. This design reduces the LLM’s inference frequency from every game frame to roughly once every 5–10 seconds, or to major game-state transitions (e.g., an enemy hero death). In this way, the agent obtains the benefits of high-quality strategic planning without sacrificing real-time control.

C.2 Knowledge Distillation from WiA-LLM

The primary value of WiA-LLM lies in its ability to internalize complex game dynamics and predict strategic outcomes with high precision. This foresight is computationally expensive. Therefore, we can utilize knowledge distillation to transfer the high-quality strategic understanding into a much smaller, faster student model suitable for production. This can be achieved by first using WiA-LLM (the Teacher Model) to generate a massive, high-quality dataset of reasoning-augmented trajectories.

This dataset includes the current state, the optimal high-level action chosen (derived from the what-if analysis), and the textual justification. A much smaller, computationally efficient neural network (the Student Model) is then trained on this data to mimic the strategic decisions of the Teacher. **However**, while we present this method as the clear path to production deployment, the detailed implementation of the knowledge distillation process **are beyond the scope of this work**. We focus here on demonstrating the foundational capability of the WiA-LLM to successfully learn and execute explicit world modeling. We leave the knowledge distillation for real deployment as future work.

D Difference between WIA & Time-Series Forecasting

Time Series Forecasting (TSF) is another task that has some overlap with WIA, which focuses on predicting future values of target variables based on historical data patterns over time (Tang et al., 2025; Shi et al., 2022). Its goal is to extrapolate trends or behaviors from past observations to future timesteps (Jin et al., 2024). However, WIA focuses on understanding the causal impact of specific actions or interventions on the future state of the environment. Rather than predicting what will happen next, WIA actively evaluates multiple potential actions to determine which choice leads to

Dataset	URL
Ape210K (Zhao et al., 2020)	https://github.com/Chenny0808/ape210k
MMLU (Hendrycks et al., 2021)	https://huggingface.co/datasets/cais/mmlu
CEval (Huang et al., 2023)	https://github.com/hkust-nlp/ceval
School-Chinese (lanhin, 2018)	https://github.com/lanhin/SchoolChinese
BBH (Suzgun et al., 2023)	https://github.com/suzgunmirac/BIG-Bench-Hard
IFEval (Zhou et al., 2023)	https://huggingface.co/datasets/google/IFEval
CharacterEval (Tu et al., 2024)	https://github.com/morecry/charactereval

Table 6: Source Link for the Benchmarks

the most beneficial outcome. In other words, TSF forecasts the natural progression of a system, while WIA simulates hypothetical scenarios to inform decision-making by assessing the consequences of different actions. This capability could be very useful for complex decision-making, especially in a dynamic environment.

E Benchmarks for Testing

We evaluate our models on several different benchmarks that target various capabilities of large language models, including reasoning (math), memorization, domain-specific knowledge (subject examination), dialogue, logical reasoning, and instruction following, etc. The details of the benchmarks are as follows. To facilitate the reproduction of our work, we provide the source link of these benchmarks in the Table 6.

- **Ape210K** (Zhao et al., 2020): A large-scale and template-rich math word problem dataset. For our experiments, we randomly sample 200 examples from the test set.
- **MMLU** (Hendrycks et al., 2021): A comprehensive benchmark covers knowledge from 57 subjects across STEM, the humanities, the social sciences, etc. It ranges in difficulty from an elementary level to an advanced professional level, and it tests both world knowledge and problem solving ability. We sample the first 50 examples from each subject and collect $50 * 57 = 2850$ cases for our experiments.
- **CEval** (Huang et al., 2023): Similar to MMLU, CEval is a Chinese-language benchmark comprising 52 subtasks across four categories: STEM, social sciences, humanities, and others. We consider it as an additional testbed to evaluate language mixing challenges mentioned in (DeepSeek-AI et al., 2025).
- **School-Chinese** (lanhin, 2018): This benchmark assesses memorization capabilities of LLMs on classical Chinese poems by requiring the model to predict subsequent content given introductory

text. We collect these datasets manually from the public data repository and construct a benchmark covering 269 samples.

- **BBH** (Suzgun et al., 2023): A subset of the BIG-Bench (Srivastava et al., 2023) focusing on a suite of 23 challenging tasks that require multi-step reasoning. It is widely regarded as a standard evaluation set for assessing the logical reasoning abilities of language models.
- **IFEval** (Zhou et al., 2023): A standard benchmark for evaluating instruction following capabilities of LLMs. It contains approximately 500 verifiable instructions, such as "write more than 400 words" or "mention the keyword 'AI' at least three times," which can be automatically checked using heuristics.

E.1 Metrics for IFEval.

We use IFEval benchmark (Zhou et al., 2023) to evaluate the instruction following capabilities of WiA-LLM in Table 5. The evaluation is based on four key metrics, which differ in two main ways: **granularity** (whether we evaluate the entire prompt or each instruction separately) and **verification strictness** (how strictly we check the model’s output).

For the granularity, we consider two dimensions: (1) *Prompt-Level*: Evaluates the entire prompt (which may contain multiple instructions) as one unit. All instructions must be correct for the prompt to pass. (2) *Instruction-Level*: Evaluates each instruction individually, regardless of the prompt it belongs to. For the verification strictness, we consider two levels: (1) *Strict*: Requires the output to match the instructions exactly, including both content and formatting. Even a small mistake (e.g., missing bold text) causes failure. (2) *Loose*: Allows flexibility by applying transformations to the output (e.g., removing markdown or ignoring extra text) before checking. This focuses on the main intent of the instruction. The definition of each metric is below:

- **Prompt-Level Strict-Accuracy**: The percentage of entire prompts where every instruction is followed exactly as written, with no deviations in content or formatting. If a prompt has multiple instructions, all must be perfectly executed for the prompt to count as correct. If even one instruction is wrong, the prompt fails.

- **Instruction-Level Strict-Accuracy:** The percentage of individual instructions across all prompts that are followed exactly as specified. Each instruction is checked on its own, and the metric counts how many are perfectly executed, even if other instructions in the same prompt fail.
- **Prompt-Level Loose-Accuracy:** A more lenient version of prompt-level accuracy. It adjusts the output (e.g., removes markdown or extra text) and checks if all instructions are satisfied after these changes. The entire prompt passes if every instruction meets the requirements after adjustments.
- **Instruction-Level Loose-Accuracy:** A lenient version of instruction-level accuracy. It adjusts the output and evaluates each instruction separately. An instruction passes if it meets the requirements after adjustments, even with minor formatting differences.

F Prompting List

Training Prompt. To train WiA-LLM, we start by crafting a simple template that directs the initial LLM to follow our predefined instructions. As shown in Table E.1, this template structures the model’s output into a reasoning process and the final answer. We deliberately limit our constraints

to this structural format following (Jin et al., 2025), avoiding any content-specific biases, such as enforcing reflective reasoning and search engine calling or endorsing specific problem-solving approaches. This ensures that the model’s natural learning dynamics during the RL process remain observable and unbiased.

Training Prompt

You are an AI assistant for the Honor of Kings game. As the main player's assistant, you need to analyze the potential battlefield changes `#time_gap#` seconds after the main player's action.

The current game state is: `<game_state>GAME_STATE</game_state>`, and the main player's executed action is `<action>ACTION</action>`.

Please consider the following four aspects when analyzing the potential game state change:

- 1. Minion Wave Changes: Analyze changes in minion wave pushing status (e.g., whether a lane's minions enter or exit enemy turret range) and changes in wave-clearing heroes (e.g., heroes joining or leaving to clear waves).
- 2. Turret Changes: Analyze changes in turret HP (e.g., a turret's HP decreasing) and changes in turret attack status (e.g., a turret switching from non-attacking to attacking). Note that turret protection mechanics do not grant invincibility; turrets still lose HP when attacked.
- 3. Hero Changes: Analyze hero deaths (e.g., a hero being eliminated).
- 4. Dragon Status Changes: Analyze whether the Lord, Turtle, or Storm Dragon is being attacked. Note that any HP reduction is considered an attack (e.g., Dark Turtle is being attacked).

Please put your thinking process in `<think></think>`, and game state change in `<answer></answer>`. The answer should be formulated as a JSON object covering the following keys: (1) `minion_wave_changes`; (2) `turret_changes`; (3) `hero_changes` and (4) `dragon_status_changes`.

Distillation Prompt from DS-R1 In Table E.1, we demonstrate the prompt used to distill reasoning data from Deepseek-R1 as illustrated in the main body Section 4.2. In specific, we provide the ground truth of game state change and the instructions to the R1 model and let it generate the reasoning process, which leads to the final answer based on the given information. The distilled data is formatted as (game state: S_t , action: a_t , and thinking process: C_t). We consider this to be a

valuable resource for training smaller models to acquire R1-like deep reasoning capabilities.

During inference, `<game_state></game_state>` will be replaced with the real game state during inference, `<game_state_change></game_state_change>` will be replaced with the real game state change `#time_gap#` seconds after the main player taken `<action></action>`.

Distillation Prompt from DS-R1

You are an AI assistant for the Honor of Kings game. Your task is to analyze the given battlefield changes and generate the corresponding logical reasoning process explaining how these changes occurred based on the current game state.

Current game state: `<game_state>GAME_STATE</game_state>`; Main play's executed action: `<action>ACTION</action>`;

Game state changes after `#time_gap#`: `<game_state_change>STATE_CHANGE</game_state_change>`.

As a game assistant, you need to analyze the causes of the battlefield changes that occurred `#time_gap#` seconds after the main player's action and generate a reasoning process explaining how these changes happened based on the current game state.

Place your reasoning inside `<answer></answer>`.

Downstream Task Prompt. In Table E.1, we demonstrate the prompt used for the downstream task. It first predicts the top-4 potential actions $a_{t0}^*, a_{t1}^*, a_{t2}^*$ and a_{t3}^* , then analyzes the conse-

quences of each action to determine the best choice. We showcase the case study in Figure 5 in the main body.

Downstream Task Prompt

Given real-time game state information from an MOBA game, provide decision-making suggestions as an assistant to the main player.

Board State: `<game_state>GAME_STATE</game_state>`

Please firstly select 4 most probable actions from the candidate options set `<action_candidates>ACTION_CANDIDATES</action_candidates>`.

And then analyse the consequences of each action one by one.

In the last, select the action most beneficial to our team based on whether the consequences are favorable to our situation.

Please put your thinking process in `<think></think>`, and actions in `<answer></answer>`.

Action Space for Downstream Tasks

Category	Action	Explanation
None	None	No action triggered for a short period
Dragon	Lord	Deal damage to the Lord (Main Dragon)
	Tyrant	Deal damage to the Tyrant (Early Game Dragon)
	Dragon King	Deal damage to the Dragon King (Late Game Dragon)
Tower	Crystal	Deal damage to enemy Crystal (Nexus)
	Top Tower	Deal damage to Top Lane Tower
	Mid Tower	Deal damage to Mid Lane Tower
	Bot Tower	Deal damage to Bottom Lane Tower
Defense	Defend Crystal	Defend our Crystal
	Defend Top Tower	Defend Top Lane Tower
	Defend Mid Tower	Defend Mid Lane Tower
	Defend Bot Tower	Defend Bottom Lane Tower
Hero	Top Hero	Damage enemy heroes in Top Lane
	Mid Hero	Damage enemy heroes in Mid Lane
	Bot Hero	Damage enemy heroes in Bottom Lane
	River Top Hero	Damage enemies in Upper River (including dragon pit)
	River Bot Hero	Damage enemies in Lower River
	Allied Jungle Hero	Damage enemies in our Jungle
	Enemy Jungle Hero	Damage enemies in opponent's Jungle
	Ally High-ground Hero	Damage enemies on our High-ground
	Enemy High-ground Hero	Damage enemies on enemy High-ground
Line	Top Minions	Clear Top Lane minions
	Mid Minions	Clear Mid Lane minions (including super minions)
	Bot Minions	Clear Bottom Lane minions
	Ally High-ground Minions	Clear minions on our High-ground
	Enemy High-ground Minions	Clear minions on enemy High-ground
Buff	Allied Red	Take our Red Buff
	Enemy Red	Steal enemy Red Buff
	Allied Blue	Take our Blue Buff
	Enemy Blue	Steal enemy Blue Buff
Jungle	Allied Camps	Clear our Jungle camps (non-buff)
	Enemy Camps	Invade enemy Jungle camps
	Void Spirit (Top Crab)	Kill Void Spirit (River objective)
	Crimson Raptor (Bot Crab)	Kill Crimson Raptor (River objective)
Grouping	Top Grouping	Group in Top Lane
	Mid Grouping	Group in Mid Lane
	Bot Grouping	Group in Bottom Lane
	River Top Grouping	Group in Upper River
	River Bot Grouping	Group in Lower River
	Allied Jungle Group	Group in our Jungle
	Enemy Jungle Group	Group in enemy Jungle
	Ally High-ground Group	Group on our High-ground
	Enemy High-ground Group	Group on enemy High-ground
Recall	Recall	Hero at fountain (including walk-back)