

# Training High-Level Schedulers with Execution-Feedback Reinforcement Learning for Long-Horizon GUI Automation

Zehao Deng<sup>1</sup>, Tianjie Ju<sup>2</sup>, Zheng Wu<sup>2</sup>, Zhuosheng Zhang<sup>2\*</sup>, Gongshen Liu<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Computer Science and Technology, Soochow University

<sup>2</sup>School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

2327406010@stu.suda.edu.cn, {jometeorie,wzh815918208,zhangzs,lgshen}@sjtu.edu.cn

## Abstract

The rapid development of large vision-language model (VLM) has greatly promoted the research of GUI agent. However, GUI agents still face significant challenges in handling long-horizon tasks. First, single-agent models struggle to balance high-level capabilities and low-level execution capability, facing prevalent issues of responsibility coupling and capability conflicts. Second, agents lack awareness of the task state, leading to progress loss in long-horizon tasks. To address these challenges, we propose a staged execution-feedback reinforcement learning algorithm. Unlike training a unified policy model, we focus on training high-level scheduling models. Specifically, we propose and train two agents: a Coordinator, responsible for the strategic planning and task decomposition; and a State Tracker, responsible for context compression and information management to maintain the task’s state and coherence. Based on this, we built the Coordinator-Executor-State Tracker (CES) multi-agent framework, which can be integrated with any low-level Executor model, assisting the Executor in solving long-horizon tasks through task scheduling and state management. Experiments on long-horizon task benchmarks demonstrate that CES significantly enhances the system’s planning and state management capabilities. Furthermore, analysis confirms that our trained high-level scheduling module is a generalizable, plug-and-play module that significantly enhances the long-horizon capabilities of various Executors. Code can be available at <https://github.com/hehehahi4/CES>

## 1. Introduction

Graphical User Interface (GUI) agents play a crucial role in automating complex tasks [1, 4, 14, 25, 28, 31, 37, 40]. Traditional training paradigm for GUI agents primarily relies

\*Corresponding author




Figure 1. (a) Difference between simple tasks and long-horizon tasks. A simple task only involves a single action on one screen driven by atomic instruction, whereas a long-horizon task requires a complex trajectory driven by ambiguous, high-level user instruction. (b) Comparison of how existing methods and our method address long-horizon challenges. Left (Responsibility Coupling and Capability Conflict): A single agent is overloaded by coupling high-level capability and low-level execution. Our method resolves this by decoupling these roles into high-level and low-level components. Right (Lack of Task State Awareness): A single agent loses context on ambiguous screens like the Home screen. Our State Tracker provides high-semantic memory, enabling correct, context-aware decisions.

on Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT), where the model learns the mapping from environmental states to actions through imitation learning [24, 35, 48]. However, SFT heavily depends on large-scale, costly, and meticulously annotated high-quality trajectory data, and often exhibits poor generalization capability in unseen environments [12, 21, 23, 33].

Recent studies [16, 23, 34, 47] have largely focused

on using rule-based Reinforcement Learning (RL) to train agents. They utilize verifiable reward functions, supplanting the need for expensive manual annotations and human feedback. RL has been demonstrated as an efficient alternative to SFT in GUI tasks, as it requires only a relatively small number of high-quality training data to achieve significant performance gains [23]. While existing methods have achieved commendable results in simple tasks [18, 21, 23], they still face two fundamental problems when confronted with long-horizon tasks, illustrated in Figure 1:

(i) **Responsibility Coupling and Capability Conflict in Single-Agent Architectures.** Current mainstream end-to-end model attempts to couple heterogeneous capabilities, such as long-term task planning, multi-step reasoning, GUI element grounding, and precise action execution, within a unified policy network. This design in optimization presents fundamental difficulties: a model with finite parameters struggles to simultaneously master high-level abilities, such as decomposing complex instructions, tracking task progress, alongside low-level abilities like grounding and execution. As task complexity increases, this coupling may lead to a catastrophic collapse of the model’s diverse capabilities.

(ii) **Lack of Task State Awareness.** In long-horizon tasks, an accurate awareness of the current progress is crucial for making correct decisions. Most methods rely on historical action sequences (e.g., `Click(x, y)`), but these low-level actions provide almost no task state information or semantic context. Therefore, the agent has to primarily rely on the visual information from screenshots to infer its progress. However, screenshots are an insufficient and unreliable representation of task progress. This limitation makes it difficult for the agent to determine its current position in a long task, leading to errors and progress loss.

To address the challenges above, we propose a staged execution-feedback RL algorithm, where the insight is to resolve responsibility coupling and conflicting optimization objectives. To support this algorithmic paradigm, we built a Coordinator-Executor-State Tracker (CES) framework, which structurally decouples the complex automation process into three specialized agents. Unlike training a unified and overloaded policy model, our algorithm is designed to optimize specific high-level scheduling models. Specifically, we treat the low-level Executor as a frozen, plug-and-play component to provide verifiable feedback, and focus our training exclusively on the Coordinator and State Tracker. Through our staged optimization strategy, the Coordinator is trained to handle strategic planning and task decomposition, effectively decoupling high-level reasoning from low-level execution; meanwhile, the State Tracker is trained to act as dynamic memory, directly solving the lack of task state awareness by maintaining a high-semantic state summary in natural language.

In summary, our main contributions are as follows:

- We build CES multi-agent framework, featuring general-purpose, plug-and-play high-level components (Coordinator and State Tracker) that can integrate with various Executors and enhance their abilities.
- We introduce a State Tracker, whose core task is dynamic context compression and state summarization, effectively resolving the state unawareness problem and maintaining the agent’s logical coherence in long-horizon tasks.
- We propose a staged execution-feedback RL strategy. The core of this algorithm is to decouple high-level capabilities from low-level execution: it freezes a pre-trained Executor and uses the reward signals it generates to exclusively train the high-level Coordinator and State Tracker.
- Extensive experiments demonstrate that our method significantly enhances the long-horizon scheduling and state management capabilities of various Executor models and surpasses existing baselines.

## 2. Related Work

### 2.1. GUI Agent

Traditional mobile intelligent assistants primarily relied on rule-based or intent-driven API calls or structured text representations [6, 13, 44]. However, these methods are often platform-specific [32], difficult to generalize [23]. With the development of VLMs, research has shifted towards pure-vision settings [13, 40, 42]. In this pure-vision paradigm, the agent receives only screenshots and task descriptions as input, generating coordinate-based actions directly in pixel space [4, 8, 10, 44].

Early methods [4, 25, 28, 35] commonly relied on the SFT paradigm, training models via imitation learning. However, the SFT paradigm has two major limitations: dependency on large-scale annotated data and poor generalization [23, 27, 29, 33, 47].

### 2.2. RL-Based GUI Agent

To enable agents to learn more strategic decision-making, recent research has gradually shifted to RL, which is a key paradigm for enhancing the planning and decision-making capabilities of GUI agents in difficult task scenarios [13, 21, 27]. RL involves fine-tuning pretrained VLMs using relatively small-scale, high-quality interaction trajectories, thereby enhancing their specialized reasoning and decision-making skills without compromising their original capabilities [14, 39, 43]. Inspired by the success of DeepSeek-R1 [5], the Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) [26] algorithm has been widely adopted in the GUI agent domain. GUI-R1 [23] is a representative model that applies R1-style reinforcement learning to enhance the capabilities of VLMs in high-level, real-world GUI tasks.

However, these RL-based single-agent methods [18, 21–

23, 27, 29, 30], while improving the decision-making algorithm, fail to address a fundamental problem: the capability overload of a single policy network. We argue that whether using SFT or RL, coupling heterogeneous abilities like high-level strategic planning with low-level visual perception and precise execution into the same model inevitably leads to optimization conflicts and role confusion. Therefore, we innovate through architecture, thoroughly decoupling different responsibilities to enhance all facets of the agent’s capabilities via specialized division of labor and collaboration.

### 2.3. Multi-agent Framework

Multi-agent systems represent a key trend in the development of LLM-driven agents [45], overcoming the inherent limitations of single agents in handling complex, dynamic, and long-horizon tasks through specialized division of labor and intelligent collaboration [15, 38]. For example, Mobile-Agent-v3 [43] coordinates four agents to achieve robust, adaptive task automation with knowledge evolution capabilities. MobiAgent [45] adopts a Planner-Decider-Grounder multi-agent architecture, combined with an acceleration framework to improve execution accuracy.

However, existing works [9, 17, 43] often use general VLMs, employing prompt engineering to make models play different roles. This collaboration lacks deep optimization for each role, making it difficult to achieve optimal efficiency and specialized capability. Furthermore, existing research often overlooks the importance of task state management and information compression in long-horizon tasks, merely using historical actions [20, 27] or passively storing large amounts of redundant information [7, 11]. Our CES framework, by introducing a dedicated State Tracker and an execution-feedback RL strategy, provides specialized and efficient optimization paths for each multi-agent role.

### 3. Preliminary Experiment

In the Introduction, we posited a key hypothesis: GUI agents fail in long-horizon tasks due to a lack of task state awareness, arguing that screenshots are an insufficient and unreliable representation of task progress.

To empirically validate this specific hypothesis, we designed a temporal reasoning experiment. This experiment is built upon a key logic: if a screenshot were a sufficient representation of state, an agent should be able to reliably determine its relative position in a task’s timeline. Our experiment directly tests this ability by tasking three powerful GUI agents to determine the correct temporal order of two screenshots sampled from the same task trajectory.

Results in Figure 2, reveal a clear dichotomy. The model’s accuracy is high for adjacent steps, but drops dramatically as the step interval between the screenshots increases. This failure occurs for two primary reasons: First,




Figure 2. Temporal Judgement Accuracy. While accuracy is high for adjacent steps, it drops dramatically as the step interval increases. This result empirically demonstrates that screenshots fail to represent task state sufficiently and we need a mechanism to record progress for long-horizon tasks.

a long-horizon task often involves repeating screenshots, such as the Home screen or going back to an interface, leading to confusion about its true progress. Second, tasks frequently navigate into Out-of-Distribution (OOD) interfaces [36], such as deep, specialized menus that the model has not encountered during training. When faced with an unfamiliar OOD screen, the model has no prior knowledge or context to determine its state in the overall task.

This failure highlights the critical need for a mechanism to explicitly maintain high-level semantic state. To address both this critical state awareness bottleneck and the challenge of responsibility coupling outlined in our introduction, we then introduce our CES framework and the staged execution-feedback RL algorithm in the subsequent section.

## 4. Methodology

### 4.1. Preliminary

We define the GUI task as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), characterized by the tuple  $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}, R \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space containing all possible GUI environment states;  $\mathcal{A}$  is the action space representing all executable atomic actions;  $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  is the state transition function; and  $R : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is the reward function. At each timestep  $t$ , the agent’s policy  $\pi$  generates a chain of thought  $th^t$  and an action  $a^t \in \mathcal{A}$  based on the user-specified natural language instruction  $q$ , the current screen state  $s^t \in \mathcal{S}$ , and the historical action information  $H^t$ , that is  $(th^t, a^t) \sim \pi(\cdot | q, s^t, H^t)$ . Our goal is to learn an optimal policy  $\pi^*$  that maximizes the cumulative reward. However, directly learning an end-to-end policy  $\pi$  faces significant challenges. Therefore, we decompose this decision-making process into a structured multi-agent collaborative loop, transforming the original MDP problem into a series of more manageable sub-problems.




Figure 3. The CES multi-agent loop framework. CES executes complex long-horizon tasks through the collaboration of three specialized agents. The Coordinator, as the task scheduling and decision-making core, combines the user’s high-level instruction and the current task state (provided by the State Tracker) to decompose the task into a clear atomic instruction. The Executor, acting as the tool, precisely executes this atomic instruction and interacts with the GUI environment. Finally, the State Tracker, as the memory, observes the Executor’s output and updates it into a high-semantic task state summary, which is then fed back to the Coordinator for the next step of decision-making.

## 4.2. CES Collaborative Loop

As shown in Figure 3, our CES framework operates as a loop information flow: the Coordinator plans based on the state from the State Tracker, the Executor executes the instruction, the State Tracker updates the state based on the execution result, and the Coordinator receives the new state for the next planning step. This division of labor is inspired by a modern operating system, where the Coordinator acts as the “CPU” (planning), the Executor as the “I/O Device” (action), and the State Tracker as the “Dynamic Memory” (state management). Through this OS-inspired design, we completely separate high-level strategic planning from low-level precise execution, allowing each agent to focus on its core capabilities and jointly accomplish complex long-horizon tasks through efficient collaboration.

### 4.2.1. Coordinator

The Coordinator is the strategic decision-making core of the task. Its primary responsibility is to translate the user’s high-level, often ambiguous, natural language instructions into a series of clear, executable steps. To make decisions that align with the long-term strategy yet adapt to the current situation, the Coordinator fuses three types of information at each timestep  $t$ : the user’s high-level instruction  $q$ , which serves as the global macro-objective, the compressed high-semantic state summary  $m^{t-1}$  provided by the

State Tracker, and the current screenshot  $s^t$ . Formally,

$$l^t = \pi_c(q, m^{t-1}, s^t), \quad (1)$$

where  $\pi_c$  denotes the Coordinator agent’s policy, and  $l^t$  is the generated atomic instruction, which focuses on guiding the Executor on the specific action to perform in the current environment. Furthermore, when exceptions or errors occur, the Coordinator can reflect and re-plan the task, guiding the Executor to take corrective actions and return to the correct path.

### 4.2.2. Executor

The Executor is the action endpoint in the CES framework. Its role is strictly limited to translating the atomic instruction  $l^t$  from the Coordinator into a physical operation on the interface. The core advantage of this design is the complete separation of cognitive load: the Executor does not need to understand the user’s long-term intent or maintain complex task context. Its sole task is to find the target element described by  $l^t$  on the current screen  $s^t$  and perform the corresponding action. Formally,

$$u^t = (th^t, a^t) = \pi_e(l^t, s^t), \quad (2)$$

where  $u^t$  is the Executor’s output, including the chain of thought  $th^t$  and the standardized action  $a^t$ , and  $\pi_e$  is the Executor’s policy.



### 4.2.3. State Tracker

The State Tracker is key to solving the long-horizon challenges for GUI agents. Its core function is dynamic context compression and state updating. It acts as the framework’s dynamic memory unit, shifting the agent’s state understanding task from processing high-dimensional, redundant historical screenshots to a low-dimensional, high-semantic natural language space. It is a language model that does not directly perceive the GUI environment but rather infers and generates the new state summary  $m^t$  by understanding the Executor’s output  $u^t$ , combined with the user intent  $q$  and the previous task state  $m^{t-1}$ :

$$m^t = \pi_s(q, m^{t-1}, u^t), \quad (3)$$

where  $\pi_s$  is the State Tracker’s policy. This natural language-based state evolution not only compresses information and filters visual noise but also provides an exceptionally clear and coherent basis for the Coordinator’s decisions, effectively solving context loss in long-horizon tasks.

### 4.3. Staged Execution-Feedback Reinforcement Learning

We post-train the Coordinator on multimodal large language model and post-train the State Tracker on large language model. Notably, in our framework, the Executor is designed as a frozen, swappable component. We do not train it, instead, we directly use a fixed, powerful pre-trained GUI model. This design allows us to focus our research on optimizing the Coordinator’s planning and the State Tracker’s state understanding, avoiding interference from low-level execution details. This also demonstrates the generality and plug-and-play nature of the CES framework, which can be combined with any powerful execution model as its brain to enhance long-horizon task capabilities.

#### 4.3.1. Warm-up SFT

Firstly, we perform a SFT warm-up for the Coordinator and State Tracker. This aims to let each agent learn its basic role, responsibilities, and strict output format. We use trajectories from existing datasets and through automated scripts, we construct high-quality (input, output) data pairs for the preliminary fine-tuning of both agents.

#### 4.3.2. Rule-based RL

**GRPO.** To further enhance the model’s generalization, we use RL to optimize the models, learning a planning policy that maximizes long-term task success. We use the GRPO algorithm [26]:

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \min(\rho_i(\theta) \hat{A}_i, \text{clip}(\rho_i(\theta), 1 \pm \epsilon) \hat{A}_i) \right] - \beta D_{KL}(\pi_\theta || \pi_{ref}), \quad (4)$$




Figure 4. Our proposed staged execution-feedback RL strategy. This strategy utilizes the Execution-Feedback Reward from a fixed Executor to sequentially optimize the Coordinator (Stage 1) and State Tracker (Stage 2) in two independent training phases.

where  $\rho_i(\theta) = \frac{\pi_\theta(o_i)}{\pi_{\theta_{old}}(o_i)}$  is the importance sampling ratio,  $\pi_\theta$  and  $\pi_{\theta_{old}}$  denote the current and previous policies, and  $o_i$  is the candidate output.  $\epsilon$  is the clipping hyperparameter, and  $\beta$  controls the KL penalty against a reference policy  $\pi_{ref}$ .

For each input, the model generates  $N$  candidate outputs  $\mathcal{O} = \{o_1, o_2, \dots, o_N\}$ , and each output is scored by a rule-based reward function to get  $\mathcal{R} = \{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N\}$ . The estimated relative advantage  $\hat{A}_i$  is then calculated as:

$$\hat{A}_i = \frac{r_i - \text{mean}(\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N\})}{\text{std}(\{r_1, r_2, \dots, r_N\})}. \quad (5)$$

**Execution-Feedback Reward.** Assigning rewards for agents responsible for abstract tasks (like planning) is difficult. Directly evaluating the quality of the Coordinator’s atomic instructions or the State Tracker’s state summaries lacks an objective standard and cannot guarantee their contribution to the final task success. To address this challenge, we do not directly evaluate the intermediate outputs. Instead, these outputs are passed through the CES loop to the Executor. The action output by the Executor is then objectively scored using a verifiable, rule-based reward function. This reward signal, originating from the final execution, is back-propagated to optimize the policies of the Coordinator and State Tracker.

Specifically, we design a rule-based reward function, termed the **Execution-Feedback Reward**:

$$R = \alpha_1 R_{format} + \alpha_2 R_{executor}, \quad (6)$$

Table 1. High-level task performance comparison on three benchmarks. **Bold** indicates the best, underline indicates the second best. \* indicates that the data of the benchmark is from GUI-R1’s original paper.

| Model               | Method      | AITZ         |              |              | AMEX         |              |              | GUI-Odyssey  |              |              |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                     |             | Type         | GR           | SR           | Type         | GR           | SR           | Type         | GR           | SR           |
| GPT-4o              | Zero Shot   | —            | —            | —            | —            | —            | —            | 37.50        | 14.17        | 5.36*        |
| Qwen2.5-VL-7B       | Zero Shot   | 34.23        | 55.27        | 18.11        | 59.52        | 48.24        | 35.10        | 55.60        | 37.78        | 34.37*       |
| OS-Atlas-7B         | SFT         | 38.52        | 44.14        | 25.97        | 55.11        | 40.30        | 33.89        | 60.42        | 39.74        | 26.96*       |
| UI-R1-3B            | RL          | 41.63        | 49.27        | 24.55        | 60.23        | 41.78        | 35.81        | 52.16        | 34.46        | 32.49*       |
| GUI-Owl-7B          | RL          | 53.86        | 52.08        | 32.70        | 61.56        | 48.38        | 40.48        | 60.60        | 45.96        | 35.82        |
| SWIRL               | Multi-Agent | —            | —            | —            | —            | —            | —            | <u>74.87</u> | <b>66.39</b> | <u>51.65</u> |
| GUI-R1-7B           | RL          | 52.73        | 54.92        | 30.59        | 67.26        | 57.12        | 43.69        | 65.49        | 43.64        | 38.79*       |
| + GPT-5             | Multi-Agent | <u>62.50</u> | <u>59.10</u> | 40.55        | <u>72.80</u> | 52.15        | 35.80        | 70.37        | 49.92        | 42.47        |
| <b>+ CES (Ours)</b> | Multi-Agent | <b>64.44</b> | <b>64.58</b> | <b>43.05</b> | <b>77.57</b> | <b>61.64</b> | <b>48.48</b> | <b>79.24</b> | <u>63.82</u> | <b>53.69</b> |

Table 2. Main results evaluating CES framework’s Effectiveness and Generalization. **Baseline**: The model is used directly. **CES-P**: The same base model acts as all three roles within the CES framework via Prompting. **CES**: Our full framework, using our specialized Coordinator and State Tracker, with the base model serving as the Executor. **Bold** indicates the best.

| Model       | Setting    | AMEX                  |                       |                       | GUI-Odyssey           |                       |                       |
|-------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
|             |            | Type                  | GR                    | SR                    | Type                  | GR                    | SR                    |
| UI-R1-3B    | Baseline   | 60.23                 | 41.78                 | 35.81                 | 52.16                 | 34.46                 | 32.49                 |
|             | CES-P      | 42.52 (-17.71)        | 52.15 (+10.37)        | 29.12 (-6.69)         | 25.81 (-26.35)        | 53.05 (+18.59)        | 14.44 (-18.05)        |
|             | <b>CES</b> | <b>70.39 (+10.16)</b> | <b>66.28 (+24.50)</b> | <b>43.38 (+7.57)</b>  | <b>66.37 (+14.21)</b> | <b>64.29 (+29.83)</b> | <b>38.04 (+5.55)</b>  |
| GUI-Owl-7B  | Baseline   | 61.56                 | 48.38                 | 40.48                 | 60.60                 | 45.96                 | 35.82                 |
|             | CES-P      | 69.18 (+7.62)         | 53.05 (+4.67)         | 44.91 (+4.43)         | 66.03 (+5.43)         | 52.15 (+6.19)         | 37.53 (+1.71)         |
|             | <b>CES</b> | <b>75.72 (+14.16)</b> | <b>61.19 (+12.81)</b> | <b>47.24 (+6.76)</b>  | <b>74.87 (+14.27)</b> | <b>61.39 (+15.43)</b> | <b>46.65 (+10.83)</b> |
| GUI-Owl-32B | Baseline   | 69.13                 | 53.24                 | 43.16                 | 67.15                 | 47.33                 | 39.60                 |
|             | CES-P      | <b>81.02 (+11.89)</b> | <b>63.80 (+10.56)</b> | <b>56.34 (+13.18)</b> | 76.90 (+9.75)         | 65.10 (+17.77)        | 53.88 (+14.28)        |
|             | <b>CES</b> | 78.55 (+9.42)         | 63.11 (+9.87)         | 52.05 (+8.89)         | <b>79.58 (+12.43)</b> | <b>65.42 (+18.09)</b> | <b>56.75 (+17.15)</b> |

where  $R_{format}$  is the format reward, rewarding the model for outputting in the  $\langle think \rangle$  and  $\langle answer \rangle$  tags,  $R_{executor}$  is the executor reward, and  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  are coefficients. By passing the Coordinator’s output and the current screenshot  $s^t$  to the executor, we derive the executor reward from its action:

$$R_{executor} = \gamma_1 R_{type} + \gamma_2 R_{param}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  are coefficients,  $R_{type}$  rewards the correct action type, and  $R_{param}$  rewards the correct action parameters, more details can be found at Appendix A.

**Staged Optimization.** Based on the GRPO algorithm and the Execution-Feedback Reward, we optimize the Coordinator and State Tracker in two distinct stages, as shown in Figure 4. This strategy ensures that high-level planning and state tracking are always optimized towards goals that are verifiably effective and easily understood by the Executor.

Stage 1: Optimizing the Coordinator’s Planning Capability. In this stage, we use a frozen Executor model and

calculate the reward based on its execution results to update the Coordinator’s policy network. Since we do not yet have a trained State Tracker, the required task state  $m^{t-1}$  is sourced directly from the ground-truth annotated states in our preprocessed dataset. This ensures the Coordinator focuses on learning the mapping from a “perfect” state to the optimal atomic instruction.

Stage 2: Optimizing the State Tracker’s State Evolution Capability. After the Coordinator is trained, we freeze its parameters. In this stage, the State Tracker’s capability is the focus of optimization. The task state  $m^{t-1}$  it generates is passed through the fixed Coordinator and Executor, influencing the entire decision chain. The final Execution-Feedback Reward from the Executor is used exclusively to optimize the State Tracker, teaching it to generate the most valuable state information that helps the Coordinator make optimal decisions. In this way, the State Tracker is explicitly trained to produce state summaries that are maximally useful to the fixed Coordinator’s policy, effectively learning to generate what the Coordinator understands best.

## 5. Experiments

### 5.1. Settings

**Training Details.** We choose Qwen2.5-VL-7B [2] as the base model for the Coordinator and Qwen3-4B [41] for the State Tracker. For the warm-up SFT, we use the LLaMA Factory framework and trained for 1 epoch with a learning rate of  $5e-5$  to prevent overfitting. For RL, we use the Verl framework to train the Coordinator for 10 epochs with a learning rate of  $1e-6$  and State Tracker for 5 epochs. We use GUI-R1-7B [23] as the Executor to calculate the reward function when training. For the reward coefficients, we set  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  to 0.1 and 0.9, respectively, and  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  to 0.2, and 0.8, respectively. All experiments are conducted on  $8 \times 80G$  GPUs.

**Benchmarks.** To thoroughly evaluate our framework’s ability to solve long-horizon tasks, we leverage three benchmarks for long-horizon, complex tasks, including AITZ [46], AMEX [3] and GUI-Odyssey [19], with an average steps of 7.5, 12.8 and 15.3 respectively. We only use the high-level instructions provided by the datasets, not the low-level ones.

**Evaluation Metrics.** Following previous work [20, 23, 35], we use three common metrics for GUI agent evaluation: (i) **Type**, the prediction accuracy of the action type. (ii) **GR** (Grounding), the click point prediction accuracy, where a prediction is considered correct if the point falls within the ground-truth bounding box. (iii) **SR** (Success Rate), correct only if both action type and parameters are correct. Parameter correctness includes: the point being in the bounding box, correct scroll direction, or an F1 similarity  $> 0.5$  for input text.

### 5.2. Main Results

#### 5.2.1. Long-Horizon Task Performance

As shown in Table 1, CES achieves compelling performance on complex GUI tasks by implementing atomic instruction and progress state management. On top of the GUI-R1-7B executor baseline, our method improves the Type accuracy by an average of 10.38% across all benchmarks. This significant gain strongly validates the effectiveness of our decoupled design: by having the Coordinator bear the cognitive load of high-level planning and generate clear atomic instructions, the Executor no longer needs to reason about complex task context and can focus on simple perception and localization, thereby greatly enhancing its execution accuracy and stability.

Furthermore, when we use GPT-5 via prompting as the Coordinator and State Tracker, the performance only shows a minor improvement exemplified by an average increase

of only 4% in Type accuracy, while some metrics even degrade. This indicates that while powerful general-purpose models can offer some improvement through prompt engineering, the effect is unstable. In contrast, our CES framework, through targeted execution-feedback reinforcement learning, enables the Coordinator and State Tracker to learn planning and state understanding strategies that are much better aligned with GUI tasks, thus achieving stable and significant performance superiority.

#### 5.2.2. Effectiveness and Generalization

To validate the efficiency and generality of our CES framework, we conducted a further experiment using three models of varying sizes. For each model, we tested three distinct configurations: (i) **Baseline**: The model is used directly. (ii) **CES-P**: The same base model acts as all three roles within the CES framework via prompting. (iii) **CES**: Our full framework, using our specialized Coordinator and State Tracker, with the base model serving as the Executor. We conducted extensive evaluations on two AMEX and GUI-Odyssey with long average task steps, with the results shown in Table 2.

From these results, we derive several key insights:

(i) **Architectural Superiority: Solving State Awareness and Cognitive Load.** A consistent finding across all model sizes is that the CES-P setup significantly outperforms the baseline. The baseline model fails in long-horizon tasks because it lacks a mechanism to manage task state, forcing it to infer progress from ambiguous screenshots. The CES framework solves this by introducing a State Tracker, which provides explicit, high-semantic memory, and a Coordinator, which decouples the cognitive load of planning from the immediate burden of execution.

(ii) **Validating the Capability Conflict Hypothesis.** While CES-P helps all models, the magnitude of the improvement reveals evidence capability conflict while training. For the small UI-R1-3B, the CES-P setup actually resulted in a performance degradation, with a significant drop of 18.05% in SR on the GUI-Odyssey. In contrast, the large GUI-Owl-32B sees a massive improvement of 13.18% on AMEX. This suggests that the 3B model, due to its limited parameter capacity, struggled to learn these distinct of planning and execution capabilities. The training-time conflict was too severe for it to overcome. Conversely, the 32B model learned planning, execution and state understanding abilities during training, even though these abilities remained coupled. The CES-P setup reveals the latent high-level skills that the 32B model had already acquired tentatively. This validates our hypothesis that it is extremely difficult to train these conflicting capabilities within a single policy network, and this challenge is magnified in models with smaller parameter counts.

(iii) **The Efficacy of Specialized, Trained Components.** Comparing the CES-P to CES highlights the signif-

Table 3. Ablation study on components and training stages.

| Model             | AMEX         |              |              | GUI-Odyssey  |              |              |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                   | Type         | GR           | SR           | Type         | GR           | SR           |
| CES               | <b>77.57</b> | <b>61.64</b> | <b>48.48</b> | <b>79.24</b> | <b>63.82</b> | <b>53.69</b> |
| w/o Coordinator   | 62.63        | 50.57        | 33.27        | 70.11        | 48.03        | 39.15        |
| w/o State Tracker | 70.62        | 55.70        | 42.08        | 73.34        | 45.10        | 42.52        |
| w/o RL (SFT only) | 72.37        | 53.47        | 36.54        | 72.18        | 51.33        | 42.89        |

icant value of our training strategy. For instance, on GUI-Odyssey, our specialized training boosts the Gui-Owl-32B’s SR from 39.60% to 56.75%, and the GUI-Owl-7B’s SR from 37.53% to 46.65%. This demonstrates that our Coordinator and State Tracker via staged execution-feedback RL are highly effective and vastly superior to simply prompting a non-specialized model for these roles. Even, we can get the comparable effect as the Gui-Owl-32B model just by using 7B Coordinator and 4B State Tracker. This also proves the effectiveness of decoupling training.

(iv) **Generality of the CES Framework.** Finally, our full framework, CES, provides a substantial and consistent performance improvement over the baseline for every executor model tested. This confirms that CES is a robust and generalizable plug-and-play solution that can effectively enhance any underlying executor, dramatically improving its long-horizon task automation capabilities.

### 5.3. Analysis

**Component and Training Ablation.** We removed the Coordinator, State Tracker, and the RL stage from our framework to observe the effects. As shown in Table 3, when we remove the Coordinator and feed the user’s high-level instruction directly to the Executor, performance drops significantly, such as SR drops by 12.77% on GUI-Odyssey. This indicates that the Executor still struggles to understand high-level instructions and make current decisions, proving the necessity of decoupling planning from execution. When the State Tracker is removed, where we instead record the last four action histories as most method and input them to the Coordinator, performance also drops significantly. This shows the critical role of information compression and state management in long-horizon tasks; without the concise, high-semantic summary from the State Tracker, the Coordinator cannot make correct plans. Finally, when we test the model using only SFT warm-up, its performance is far below the final RL-optimized model. This demonstrates that while SFT allows agents to learn basic roles and output formats, execution-feedback RL is an indispensable step to acquire a generalizable, optimal planning policy.

**Failure Case Analysis.** To understand the source of our CES framework’s advantages, we conducted a detailed failure case analysis, with results shown in Figure 5. Specif-




Figure 5. Failure Case Analysis. Compared to the baseline, our CES framework almost completely eliminates cognitive errors like State Loss and Planning Error.

ically, the CES framework almost completely eliminated State Loss errors, reducing the count from 14% to 2% and significantly reduced Planning Error from 12% to 4%. This result demonstrates that our framework’s performance gain stems precisely from our specially trained Coordinator and State Tracker, which successfully solve the core challenges of planning and state management. In contrast, the low-level errors attributable to the frozen Executor, namely Perception Error and Generalization Failure, remained largely unchanged. The performance bottleneck has now effectively shifted to the inherent perceptual limitations of the Executor itself. More case study can be found in Appendix D.

### 6. Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a staged execution-feedback RL strategy to address the core challenges of long-horizon GUI automation. Our algorithm confronts the capability overload and lack of task progress awareness by shifting the training strategy. Instead of training a unified policy, our method thoroughly decouples high-level strategic planning from low-level precise execution. It leverages verifiable results to efficiently optimize high-level agents responsible for scheduling. Critically, our algorithm trains a dedicated State Tracker that resolves the agent’s difficulties in long-horizon tasks via dynamic context compression and high-semantic state summarization. This algorithmic approach is instantiated in our CES framework. Extensive experiments on challenging long-horizon GUI benchmarks demonstrate that our trained high-level modules are a generalizable, plug-and-play solution that significantly enhances the long-horizon planning and state management capabilities of various Executor models. In the future, synergetic evolution and joint training of multi-agent system for GUI tasks may be a promising direction.



## References

- [1] Saaket Agashe, Kyle Wong, Vincent Tu, Jiachen Yang, Ang Li, and Xin Eric Wang. Agent S2: A Compositional Generalist-Specialist Framework for Computer Use Agents, 2025. 1
- [2] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, Humen Zhong, Yuanzhi Zhu, Mingkun Yang, Zhao-hai Li, Jianqiang Wan, Pengfei Wang, Wei Ding, Zheren Fu, Yiheng Xu, Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Tianbao Xie, Zesen Cheng, Hang Zhang, Zhibo Yang, Haiyang Xu, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-VL Technical Report, 2025. 7
- [3] Yuxiang Chai, Siyuan Huang, Yazhe Niu, Han Xiao, Liang Liu, Dingyu Zhang, Shuai Ren, and Hongsheng Li. AMEX: Android Multi-annotation Expo Dataset for Mobile GUI Agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 2138–2156, 2025. 7
- [4] Pengzhou Cheng, Zheng Wu, Zongru Wu, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Gongshen Liu. OS-Kairos: Adaptive Interaction for MLLM-Powered GUI Agents, 2025. 1, 2
- [5] DeepSeek-AI, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shitong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jia Shi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Meng Li, Miaojuan Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wan-jia Zhao, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yuduan Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing Reasoning Capability in LLMs via Reinforcement Learning, 2025. 2
- [6] Jingru Fan, Yufan Dang, Jingyao Wu, Huatao Li, Runde Yang, Xiyuan Yang, Yuheng Wang, Zhong Zhang, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, et al. Appcopilot: Toward general, accurate, long-horizon, and efficient mobile agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.02444*, 2025. 2
- [7] Xinzge Gao, Chuanrui Hu, Bin Chen, and Teng Li. Chain-of-Memory: Enhancing GUI Agents for Cross-Application Navigation, 2025. 3
- [8] Zhangxuan Gu, Zhengwen Zeng, Zhenyu Xu, Xingran Zhou, Shuheng Shen, Yunfei Liu, Beitong Zhou, Changhua Meng, Tianyu Xia, Weizhi Chen, Yue Wen, Jingya Dou, Fei Tang, Jinzhen Lin, Yulin Liu, Zhenlin Guo, Yichen Gong, Heng Jia, Changlong Gao, Yuan Guo, Yong Deng, Zhenyu Guo, Liang Chen, and Weiqiang Wang. UI-Venus Technical Report: Building High-performance UI Agents with RFT, 2025. 2
- [9] Yuan Guo, Tingjia Miao, Zheng Wu, Pengzhou Cheng, Ming Zhou, and Zhuosheng Zhang. Atomic-to-Compositional Generalization for Mobile Agents with A New Benchmark and Scheduling System, 2025. 3
- [10] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Jiazheng Xu, Wenmeng Yu, Junhui Ji, Yan Wang, Zihan Wang, Yuxuan Zhang, Juanzi Li, Bin Xu, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. CogAgent: A Visual Language Model for GUI Agents, 2024. 2
- [11] Yi Kong, Dianxi Shi, Guoli Yang, Zhang ke-di, Chenlin Huang, Xiaopeng Li, and Songchang Jin. MapAgent: Trajectory-Constructed Memory-Augmented Planning for Mobile Task Automation, 2025. 3
- [12] Hanyu Lai, Xiao Liu, Yanxiao Zhao, Han Xu, Hanchen Zhang, Bohao Jing, Yanyu Ren, Shuntian Yao, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. ComputerRL: Scaling End-to-End Online Reinforcement Learning for Computer Use Agents, 2025. 1
- [13] Jiahao Li and Kaer Huang. A Survey on GUI Agents with Foundation Models Enhanced by Reinforcement Learning, 2025. 2
- [14] Ning Li, Qiqiang Lin, Zheng Wu, Xiaoyun Mo, Weiming Zhang, Yin Zhao, Xiangmou Qu, Jiamu Zhou, Jun Wang, Congmin Zheng, Yuanyi Song, Hongjiang Chen, Heyuan Huang, Jihong Wang, Jiaxin Yin, Jingwei Yu, Junwei Liao, Qiuying Peng, Xingyu Lou, Jun Wang, Weiwen Liu, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Weinan Zhang. ColorAgent: Building A Robust, Personalized, and Interactive OS Agent, 2025. 1, 2
- [15] Ning Li, Xiangmou Qu, Jiamu Zhou, Jun Wang, Muning Wen, Kounianhua Du, Xingyu Lou, Qiuying Peng, Jun Wang, and Weinan Zhang. MobileUse: A GUI Agent with Hierarchical Reflection for Autonomous Mobile Operation, 2025. 3

- [16] Weizhen Li, Jianbo Lin, Zhuosong Jiang, Jingyi Cao, Xinpeng Liu, Jiayu Zhang, Zhenqiang Huang, Qianben Chen, Weichen Sun, Qiexiang Wang, Hongxuan Lu, Tianrui Qin, Chenghao Zhu, Yi Yao, Shuying Fan, Xiaowan Li, Tiannan Wang, Pai Liu, King Zhu, He Zhu, Dingfeng Shi, Piaohong Wang, Yeyi Guan, Xiangru Tang, Minghao Liu, Yuchen Eleanor Jiang, Jian Yang, Jiaheng Liu, Ge Zhang, and Wangchunshu Zhou. Chain-of-Agents: End-to-End Agent Foundation Models via Multi-Agent Distillation and Agentic RL, 2025. 1
- [17] Yanda Li, Chi Zhang, Wenjia Jiang, Wanqi Yang, Bin Fu, Pei Cheng, Xin Chen, Ling Chen, and Yunchao Wei. AppAgent v2: Advanced Agent for Flexible Mobile Interactions, 2025. 3
- [18] Yuhang Liu, Pengxiang Li, Congkai Xie, Xavier Hu, Xiaotian Han, Shengyu Zhang, Hongxia Yang, and Fei Wu. InfiGUI-R1: Advancing Multimodal GUI Agents from Reactive Actors to Deliberative Reasoners, 2025. 2
- [19] Quanfeng Lu, Wenqi Shao, Zitao Liu, Lingxiao Du, Fanqing Meng, Boxuan Li, Botong Chen, Siyuan Huang, Kaipeng Zhang, and Ping Luo. GUIOdyssey: A Comprehensive Dataset for Cross-App GUI Navigation on Mobile Devices, 2024. 7
- [20] Quanfeng Lu, Zhantao Ma, Shuai Zhong, Jin Wang, Dahai Yu, Michael K. Ng, and Ping Luo. SWIRL: A Staged Workflow for Interleaved Reinforcement Learning in Mobile GUI Control, 2025. 3, 7
- [21] Zhengxi Lu, Yuxiang Chai, Yaxuan Guo, Xi Yin, Liang Liu, Hao Wang, Han Xiao, Shuai Ren, Guanqing Xiong, and Hongsheng Li. UI-R1: Enhancing Efficient Action Prediction of GUI Agents by Reinforcement Learning, 2025. 1, 2
- [22] Zhengxi Lu, Jiabo Ye, Fei Tang, Yongliang Shen, Haiyang Xu, Ziwei Zheng, Weiming Lu, Ming Yan, Fei Huang, Jun Xiao, et al. Ui-s1: Advancing gui automation via semi-online reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.11543*, 2025.
- [23] Run Luo, Lu Wang, Wanwei He, and Xiaobo Xia. GUI-R1: A Generalist R1-Style Vision-Language Action Model For GUI Agents, 2025. 1, 2, 3, 7
- [24] Yujia Qin, Yining Ye, Junjie Fang, Haoming Wang, Shihao Liang, Shizuo Tian, Junda Zhang, Jiahao Li, Yunxin Li, Shijue Huang, Wanjun Zhong, Kuanye Li, Jiale Yang, Yu Miao, Woyu Lin, Longxiang Liu, Xu Jiang, Qianli Ma, Jingyu Li, Xiaojun Xiao, Kai Cai, Chuang Li, Yaowei Zheng, Chaolin Jin, Chen Li, Xiao Zhou, Minchao Wang, Haoli Chen, Zhaojian Li, Haihua Yang, Haifeng Liu, Feng Lin, Tao Peng, Xin Liu, and Guang Shi. UI-TARS: Pioneering Automated GUI Interaction with Native Agents, 2025. 1
- [25] Christopher Rawles, Sarah Clinckemaillie, Yifan Chang, Jonathan Waltz, Gabrielle Lau, Marybeth Fair, Alice Li, William Bishop, Wei Li, Folawiyi Campbell-Ajala, Daniel Toyama, Robert Berry, Divya Tyamagundlu, Timothy Lillcrap, and Oriana Riva. AndroidWorld: A Dynamic Benchmarking Environment for Autonomous Agents, 2025. 1, 2
- [26] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the Limits of Mathematical Reasoning in Open Language Models, 2024. 2, 5
- [27] Yucheng Shi, Wenhao Yu, Zaitang Li, Yonglin Wang, Hongming Zhang, Ninghao Liu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. MobileGUI-RL: Advancing Mobile GUI Agent through Reinforcement Learning in Online Environment, 2025. 2, 3
- [28] Qiushi Sun, Kanzhi Cheng, Zichen Ding, Chuanyang Jin, Yian Wang, Fangzhi Xu, Zhenyu Wu, Chengyou Jia, Liheng Chen, Zhoumianze Liu, et al. Os-genesis: Automating gui agent trajectory construction via reverse task synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5555–5579, 2025. 1, 2
- [29] Zeyi Sun, Ziyu Liu, Yuhang Zang, Yuhang Cao, Xiaoyi Dong, Tong Wu, Dahua Lin, and Jiaqi Wang. SEAgent: Self-Evolving Computer Use Agent with Autonomous Learning from Experience, 2025. 2, 3
- [30] Fei Tang, Zhangxuan Gu, Zhengxi Lu, Xuyang Liu, Shuheng Shen, Changhua Meng, Wen Wang, Wenqi Zhang, Yongliang Shen, Weiming Lu, et al. Gui-g<sup>2</sup>: Gaussian reward modeling for gui grounding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.15846*, 2025. 3
- [31] Fei Tang, Haolei Xu, Hang Zhang, Siqi Chen, Xingyu Wu, Yongliang Shen, Wenqi Zhang, Guiyang Hou, Zeqi Tan, Yuchen Yan, Kaitao Song, Jian Shao, Weiming Lu, Jun Xiao, and Yueting Zhuang. A survey on (m)llm-based gui agents, 2025. 1
- [32] Haoming Wang, Haoyang Zou, Huatong Song, Jiazhan Feng, Junjie Fang, Juntong Lu, Longxiang Liu, Qinyu Luo, Shihao Liang, Shijue Huang, Wanjun Zhong, Yining Ye, Yujia Qin, Yuwen Xiong, Yuxin Song, Zhiyong Wu, Aoyan Li, Bo Li, Chen Dun, Chong Liu, Daoguang Zan, Fuxing Leng, Hanbin Wang, Hao Yu, Haobin Chen, Hongyi Guo, Jing Su, Jingjia Huang, Kai Shen, Kaiyu Shi, Lin Yan, Peiyao Zhao, Pengfei Liu, Qinghao Ye, Renjie Zheng, Shulin Xin, Wayne Xin Zhao, Wen Heng, Wenhao Huang, Wenqian Wang, Xiaobo Qin, Yi Lin, Youbin Wu, Zehui Chen, Zihao Wang, Baoquan Zhong, Xinchun Zhang, Xujing Li, Yuanfan Li, Zhongkai Zhao, Chengquan Jiang, Faming Wu, Haotian Zhou, Jinlin Pang, Li Han, Qi Liu, Qianli Ma, Siyao Liu, Songhua Cai, Wenqi Fu, Xin Liu, Yaohui Wang, Zhi Zhang, Bo Zhou, Guoliang Li, Jiajun Shi, Jiale Yang, Jie Tang, Li Li, Qihua Han, Taoran Lu, Woyu Lin, Xiaokang Tong, Xinyao Li, Yichi Zhang, Yu Miao, Zhengxuan Jiang, Zili Li, Ziyuan Zhao, Chenxin Li, Dehua Ma, Feng Lin, Ge Zhang, Haihua Yang, Hangyu Guo, Hongda Zhu, Jiaheng Liu, Junda Du, Kai Cai, Kuanye Li, Lichen Yuan, Meilan Han, Minchao Wang, Shuyue Guo, Tianhao Cheng, Xiaobo Ma, Xiaojun Xiao, Xiaolong Huang, Xinjie Chen, Yidi Du, Yilin Chen, Yiwen Wang, Zhaojian Li, Zhenzhu Yang, Zhiyuan Zeng, Chaolin Jin, Chen Li, Hao Chen, Haoli Chen, Jian Chen, Qinghao Zhao, and Guang Shi. UI-TARS-2 Technical Report: Advancing GUI Agent with Multi-Turn Reinforcement Learning, 2025. 2
- [33] Zhepei Wei, Wenlin Yao, Yao Liu, Weizhi Zhang, Qin Lu, Liang Qiu, Changlong Yu, Puyang Xu, Chao Zhang, Bing Yin, Hyokun Yun, and Lihong Li. WebAgent-R1: Train-

- ing Web Agents via End-to-End Multi-Turn Reinforcement Learning, 2025. 1, 2
- [34] Qinzhuo Wu, Pengzhi Gao, Wei Liu, and Jian Luan. BacktrackAgent: Enhancing GUI Agent with Error Detection and Backtracking Mechanism, 2025. 1
- [35] Zhiyong Wu, Zhenyu Wu, Fangzhi Xu, Yian Wang, Qiushi Sun, Chengyou Jia, Kanzhi Cheng, Zichen Ding, Liheng Chen, Paul Pu Liang, and Yu Qiao. OS-ATLAS: A Foundation Action Model for Generalist GUI Agents, 2024. 1, 2, 7
- [36] Zheng Wu, Pengzhou Cheng, Zongru Wu, Lingzhong Dong, and Zhuosheng Zhang. Gem: Gaussian embedding modeling for out-of-distribution detection in gui agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.12842*, 2025. 3
- [37] Zheng Wu, Heyuan Huang, Xingyu Lou, Xiangmou Qu, Pengzhou Cheng, Zongru Wu, Weiwen Liu, Weinan Zhang, Jun Wang, Zhaoxiang Wang, and Zhuosheng Zhang. VeriOS: Query-Driven Proactive Human-Agent-GUI Interaction for Trustworthy OS Agents, 2025. 1
- [38] Zhe Wu, Hongjin Lu, Junliang Xing, Changhao Zhang, Yin Zhu, Yuhao Yang, Yuheng Jing, Kai Li, Kun Shao, Jianye Hao, Jun Wang, and Yuanchun Shi. Hi-Agent: Hierarchical Vision-Language Agents for Mobile Device Control, 2025. 3
- [39] Yifan Xu, Xiao Liu, Xinghan Liu, Jiaqi Fu, Hanchen Zhang, Bohao Jing, Shudan Zhang, Yuting Wang, Wenyi Zhao, and Yuxiao Dong. MobileRL: Online Agentic Reinforcement Learning for Mobile GUI Agents, 2025. 2
- [40] Yiheng Xu, Zekun Wang, Junli Wang, Dunjie Lu, Tianbao Xie, Amrita Saha, Doyen Sahoo, Tao Yu, and Caiming Xiong. Aguviz: Unified Pure Vision Agents for Autonomous GUI Interaction, 2025. 1, 2
- [41] 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, Jiayi 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. Qwen3 Technical Report, 2025. 7
- [42] Chenyu Yang, Shiqian Su, Shi Liu, Xuan Dong, Yue Yu, Weijie Su, Xuehui Wang, Zhaoyang Liu, Jinguo Zhu, Hao Li, Wenhai Wang, Yu Qiao, Xizhou Zhu, and Jifeng Dai. ZeroGUI: Automating Online GUI Learning at Zero Human Cost, 2025. 2
- [43] Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Junyang Wang, Zhaoqing Zhu, Ziwei Zheng, Feiyu Gao, Junjie Cao, Zhengxi Lu, et al. Mobile-agent-v3: Fundamental agents for gui automation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.15144*, 2025. 2, 3
- [44] Chaoyun Zhang, Shilin He, Jiaxu Qian, Bowen Li, Liqun Li, Si Qin, Yu Kang, Minghua Ma, Guyue Liu, Qingwei Lin, et al. Large language model-brained gui agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18279*, 2024. 2
- [45] Cheng Zhang, Erhu Feng, Xi Zhao, Yisheng Zhao, Wangbo Gong, Jiahui Sun, Dong Du, Zhichao Hua, Yubin Xia, and Haibo Chen. MobiAgent: A Systematic Framework for Customizable Mobile Agents, 2025. 3
- [46] Jiwen Zhang, Jihao Wu, Yihua Teng, Minghui Liao, Nuo Xu, Xiao Xiao, Zhongyu Wei, and Duyu Tang. Android in the Zoo: Chain-of-Action-Thought for GUI Agents, 2024. 7
- [47] Zijing Zhang, Ziyang Chen, Mingxiao Li, Zhaopeng Tu, and Xiaolong Li. RLVMR: Reinforcement Learning with Verifiable Meta-Reasoning Rewards for Robust Long-Horizon Agents, 2025. 1, 2
- [48] Zhong Zhang, Yaxi Lu, Yikun Fu, Yupeng Huo, Shenzhi Yang, Yesai Wu, Han Si, Xin Cong, Haotian Chen, Yankai Lin, Jie Xie, Wei Zhou, Wang Xu, Yuanheng Zhang, Zhou Su, Zhongwu Zhai, Xiaoming Liu, Yudong Mei, Jianming Xu, Hongyan Tian, Chongyi Wang, Chi Chen, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. AgentCPM-GUI: Building Mobile-Use Agents with Reinforcement Fine-Tuning, 2025. 1

## A. Details of Staged Execution-Feedback Reinforcement Learning

### A.1. Staged Optimization

The core idea of our algorithm is to completely decouple the training of the Coordinator, denoted as  $\pi_c$ , and the State Tracker, denoted as  $\pi_s$ . This is achieved through two independent optimization stages, each with a specifically defined objective function. We use parameters  $\theta_c$  and  $\theta_s$  to denote the trainable parameters of the Coordinator and State Tracker, respectively.

#### Stage 1: Optimizing the Coordinator

The Coordinator's optimization objective,  $\mathcal{J}(\theta_c)$ , is to maximize the following expectation:

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta_c) = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(q,s^t,m_{gt}^{t-1},a_{gt}^t) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ \mathcal{L} \sim \pi_{\theta_{c,old}}}} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \min(\rho_i^{t,(c)}(\theta_c) \hat{A}_i^{t,(c)}, \text{clip}(\rho_i^{t,(c)}(\theta_c), 1 \pm \epsilon) \hat{A}_i^{t,(c)}) \right] - \beta D_{KL}(\pi_{\theta_c} \parallel \pi_{c,ref}). \quad (8)$$

We firstly sample  $N$  candidate atomic instructions  $\mathcal{L} = \{l_1^t, \dots, l_N^t\}$  using the old Coordinator policy  $\pi_{\theta_{c,old}}$ :

$$l_i^t \sim \pi_{\theta_{c,old}}(\cdot | q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, s^t), \quad (9)$$

where  $q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, s^t$  are sampled from the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ . For each candidate instruction  $l_i^t$ , obtain the executed action  $a_i^t$  via the frozen Executor  $\pi_e$ :

$$a_i^t = \pi_e(l_i^t, s^t). \quad (10)$$

The  $a_i^t$  are used to calculate reward as:

$$r_i^{t,(c)} = \alpha_1 R_{format}(l_i^t) + \alpha_2 R_{executor}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t). \quad (11)$$

Based on the rewards of the  $N$  candidates  $\{r_1^{(c)}, \dots, r_N^{(c)}\}$ , calculate the relative advantage:

$$\hat{A}_i^{t,(c)} = \frac{r_i^{t,(c)} - \text{mean}(\{r_1^{t,(c)}, r_2^{t,(c)}, \dots, r_N^{t,(c)}\})}{\text{std}(\{r_1^{t,(c)}, r_2^{t,(c)}, \dots, r_N^{t,(c)}\})}. \quad (12)$$

At the same time, we calculate the probability ratio between the new Coordinator policy  $\pi_{\theta_c}$  and the old policy  $\pi_{\theta_{c,old}}$ :

$$\rho_i^{t,(c)}(\theta_c) = \frac{\pi_{\theta_c}(l_i^t | q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, s^t)}{\pi_{\theta_{c,old}}(l_i^t | q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, s^t)}. \quad (13)$$

After calculating the above items, we can calculate the gradient of  $\mathcal{J}(\theta_c)$  and update the strategy  $\theta_c$ .

#### Stage 2: Optimizing the State Tracker

With  $\pi_c$  and  $\pi_e$  frozen, train the State Tracker  $\pi_s$  to generate the state  $m^t$  that guides the fixed  $\pi_c$  to make an optimal decision.

The State Tracker's optimization objective,  $\mathcal{J}(\theta_s)$ , is to maximize the following expectation :

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta_s) = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{(q,s^t,m_{gt}^{t-1},u_{gt}^{t-1},a_{gt}^t) \sim \mathcal{D} \\ \mathcal{M} \sim \pi_{\theta_{s,old}}}} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \min(\rho_i^{t,(s)}(\theta_s) \hat{A}_i^{t,(s)}, \text{clip}(\rho_i^{t,(s)}(\theta_s), 1 \pm \epsilon) \hat{A}_i^{t,(s)}) \right] - \beta D_{KL}(\pi_{\theta_s} \parallel \pi_{s,ref}). \quad (14)$$

We firstly sample  $N$  candidate state summaries  $\mathcal{M} = \{m_1^t, \dots, m_N^t\}$  using the old State Tracker policy  $\pi_{\theta_{s,old}}$ :

$$m_i^t \sim \pi_{\theta_{s,old}}(\cdot | q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, u_{gt}^{t-1}) \quad (15)$$

This begins a chained evaluation process. For each candidate state  $m_i^t$ , we first obtain the instruction  $l_i^t$  via the **frozen** Coordinator  $\pi_c$ :

$$l_i^t = \pi_c(q, m_i^t, s^t). \quad (16)$$



The instruction  $l_i^t$  is passed to the frozen Executor  $\pi_e$  to obtain the action  $a_i^t$  :

$$a_i^t = \pi_e(l_i^t, s^t). \quad (17)$$

Finally,  $a_i^t$  is used to calculate the reward  $r_i^{t,(s)}$  for the state  $m_i^t$ , which includes a format reward for the state and the final executor reward :

$$r_i^{t,(s)} = \alpha_1 R_{format}(m_i^t) + \alpha_2 R_{executor}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t). \quad (18)$$

Based on the rewards of the N candidates  $\{r_1^{t,(s)}, \dots, r_N^{t,(s)}\}$ , we calculate the relative advantage :

$$\hat{A}_i^{t,(s)} = \frac{r_i^{t,(s)} - \text{mean}(\{r_1^{t,(s)}, r_2^{t,(s)}, \dots, r_N^{t,(s)}\})}{\text{std}(\{r_1^{t,(s)}, r_2^{t,(s)}, \dots, r_N^{t,(s)}\})}. \quad (19)$$

At the same time, we calculate the probability ratio between the new State Tracker policy  $\pi_{\theta_s}$  and the old policy  $\pi_{\theta_{s,old}}$  :

$$\rho_i^{t,(s)}(\theta_s) = \frac{\pi_{\theta_s}(m_i^t | q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, u_{gt}^{t-1})}{\pi_{\theta_{s,old}}(m_i^t | q, m_{gt}^{t-1}, u_{gt}^{t-1})}. \quad (20)$$

## A.2. Reward Function

The total reward  $R$  is defined as a weighted sum of the format reward and the executor reward:

$$R = \alpha_1 R_{format} + \alpha_2 R_{executor}. \quad (21)$$

The  $R_{format}$  component is a binary reward that encourages the model to generate outputs in the specified format.

$$R_{format}(o) = \mathbb{I}(\text{CheckFormat}(o)), \quad (22)$$

where  $\text{CheckFormat}(\cdot)$  is a function that returns 1 if the output  $o$  strictly adheres to the  $\langle \text{think} \rangle$  and  $\langle \text{answer} \rangle$  tag format, and 0 otherwise.

$R_{executor}$  evaluates the contribution of the high-level agent's decision to the downstream Executor's actual execution result, based on the  $i$ -th candidate's action  $a_i^t$  and the ground-truth action  $a_{gt}^t$ . It is defined as a weighted sum of a type reward and a parameter reward:

$$R_{executor}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t) = \gamma_1 R_{type}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t) + \gamma_2 R_{param}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t), \quad (23)$$

where  $R_{type}$  evaluates if the Executor's predicted action type matches the ground-truth. Let  $a_i^{t,type}$  be the predicted action type and  $a_{gt}^{t,type}$  be the ground-truth action type:

$$R_{type}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t) = \mathbb{I}(a_i^{t,type} = a_{gt}^{t,type}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a_i^{t,type} = a_{gt}^{t,type} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function.

Parameter Reward  $R_{param}$  evaluates the correctness of the predicted action parameters, consistent with the Success Rate (SR) metric. Its definition depends on the predicted action type  $a_i^{t,type}$ :

$$R_{param}(a_i^t, a_{gt}^t) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}(p_i^{t,param} \in p_{gt}^{t,bbox}) & \text{if } a_i^{t,type} \in \{\text{'click'}, \text{'long\_press'}\} \\ \mathbb{I}(F1(p_i^{t,param}, p_{gt}^{t,text}) > 0.5) & \text{if } a_i^{t,type} = \text{'type'} \\ \mathbb{I}(p_i^{t,param} = p_{gt}^{t,dir}) & \text{if } a_i^{t,type} = \text{'scroll'} \\ \mathbb{I}(a_i^{t,type} = a_{gt}^{t,type}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

where  $p_i^{t,param}$  is the parameters of the action,  $p_{gt}^{t,bbox}$  is the ground-truth bounding box,  $F1(\cdot)$  is the F1 similarity function for text. For actions without parameters (e.g.,  $\text{'press\_home'}$ ), the reward is based on type correctness.

## B. Experiment Details

### B.1. Data Collection

**SFT** For the warm-up SFT stage, we randomly selected 1K samples from the GUI-Odyssey training set due to its rich semantic annotations. This dataset includes: `description`: A description of the current screen; `intention`: The intent of the action to be taken, similar to a chain of thought; `low_level_instruction`: The specific low-level instruction for the step; `context`: A summary of actions taken before the current step. For the Coordinator, we constructed the ground truth as: `<think>description.intention</think><answer>low_level_instruction</answer>`. For the State Tracker, we used the `context` of the next step as its ground truth.

**Staged Execution-Feedback Reinforcement Learning** For the RL stage, rich semantic annotations are no longer required; only an execution result for the reward signal is needed. We randomly selected 3K samples from the GUI-Odyssey training set to serve as the task pool. The ground truth was the fixed action and parameters for reward calculation.

### B.2. Experiment Settings

**SFT** We trained the Coordinator (Qwen2.5-VL-7B) and State Tracker (Qwen3-4B) using the LLaMA-Factory framework. Both models were trained for one epoch with a learning rate of  $5e-5$ . We used LoRA for fine-tuning, with a rank of 8 and alpha of 16.

**Staged Execution-Feedback Reinforcement Learning** We used a total of  $8 \times 80G$  GPUs. In Stage 1, 4 GPUs were used to deploy the fixed Executor via vLLM for reward calculation. In Stage 2, 2 GPUs were used to deploy the Coordinator and Executor respectively. For the reward coefficients, we set  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  to 0.1 and 0.9, respectively, and  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  to 0.2, and 0.8, respectively. Detailed hyperparameters are provided in Table 4.

Table 4. Hyperparameters for Staged RL Training

| HyperParameter      | Coordinator | State Tracker |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------|
| lr                  | 1e-6        | 1e-6          |
| epochs              | 10          | 5             |
| optimizer           | AdamW       | AdamW         |
| train_batch_size    | 32          | 32            |
| clip_ratio          | 0.2         | 0.2           |
| rollout_n           | 4           | 4             |
| max_prompt_length   | 8192        | 8192          |
| max_response_length | 256         | 512           |

### B.3. Benchmarks

AMEX is a large-scale, multi-level annotated Android GUI data set, designed to provide support for general mobile GUI control agents. It is committed to providing multi-level understanding of mobile GUI, including more than 104k high-resolution screenshots and about 3000 unique complex instructions, with an average of 12.8 steps per instruction. AITZ (Android in the Zoo) is a refined data set built for the Android GUI navigation field. It is the first time to connect the perception of screen layout/ui elements with the cognition of action decision-making. It contains 2504 unique instructions and 18643 screen action pairs, covering more than 70 Android Applications. GUI-Odyssey is a comprehensive data set that focuses on cross application GUI navigation on mobile devices. This data set aims to solve the complexity of cross application workflow. Tasks usually need to integrate multiple applications and transfer context and data between applications. It contains 8334 task tracks, with an average of 15.3 steps per track, which is the longest average step in the mobile GUI navigation dataset.

### B.4. Visualization

Figure 6 illustrates the progression of various variables throughout the training process.




Figure 6. Coordinator (left) and State Tracker (right) training process.

### B.5. Model Scaling Analysis

To explore how model capacity influences the CES framework, we conducted a scaling analysis by retraining the Coordinator and State Tracker with varying parameter sizes.

For Coordinator, we investigated the trade-off between model size and planning capability by replacing the Qwen-2.5-VL-7B backbone with the compact Qwen-2.5-VL-3B. The results demonstrate a significant performance degradation across




Figure 7. Model scaling analysis.

all metrics with the 3B model. This decline suggests that the smaller model lacks the capacity for complex instruction decomposition and fine-grained visual understanding required for the Coordinator role. Moreover, a weaker Coordinator creates a bottleneck that propagates to the second training stage, hindering the State Tracker’s ability to learn effective state representations.

For State Tracker, we performed Qwen3 models with varying sizes (0.6B, 1.7B, 4B, and 8B) to determine the optimal configuration. As illustrated in the Figure 7, performance improves markedly as the model scales from 0.6B to 4B. However, increasing the size further to 8B yields only marginal gains. Therefore, we identify Qwen3-4B as the optimal choice for the State Tracker, offering a favorable balance between performance and computational efficiency.

## C. Prompt

### Coordinator

You are a GUI task coordinator Agent. Your role is to actively collaborate with the Executor Agent to complete complex GUI navigation tasks. Given a high-level task description and the current state of the task, your goal is to provide a clear and precise fine-grained instruction for the Executor Agent to help accomplish the task.

Screenshot: `<image>`

High-level task: `{high_level_instruction}`

Current state: `{current_state}`

First, think step-by-step. Put your reasoning within `<think>` tags. After your reasoning, provide the instruction within `<answer>` tags.

### Executor

You are GUI executor Agent, a reasoning GUI Agent Assistant. In this UI screenshot `<image>`, I want you to execute the command `{instruction}`. Please provide the action to perform (enumerate from [complete, close, press home, click, press back, type, select, scroll, enter]), the point where the cursor is moved to (integer) if a click is performed, and any input text required to complete the action.

Output the thinking process in `<think>` `</think>` tags, and the final answer in `<answer>` `</answer>` tags as follows: `<think>...</think>` `<answer>[‘action’: enum[complete, close, press home, click, press back, type, select, scroll, enter], ‘point’: [x, y], ‘input_text’: ‘no input text [default]’]</answer>`



### State Tracker

You are a GUI task State Tracker Agent. Your core function is dynamic context compression and state updating. You will receive the high-level user instruction, the previous task state (a summary of progress up to the last step), and the latest output of executor agent. Your task is to generate the new task state. This should be a high-semantic natural language summary that updates the previous state based on the latest action, maintaining a coherent record of the task’s progress.

High-level user instruction: {high\_level\_instruction}

Latest output of executor agent: {executor\_output}

Previous Task State: {current\_state}

These prompt are also used in +GPT-5 setting (in Table 1) and CES-P setting (in Table 2).

## D. Case Study

Figure 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 show a scenario where our CES framework solves a complete long-horizon task.

### D.1. Overall Analysis

The trajectory demonstrates the CES framework’s ability of solving long-horizon task, driven primarily by the State Tracker’s pivotal role in bridging cross-application context gaps. For instance, after the Executor copied the meeting link in Zoom at Step 9, the agent transitioned to a completely different environment, Tumblr, in Step 12. Crucially, the State Tracker maintained a high-semantic summary: “The meeting information was copied ... to facilitate sharing”, explicitly carrying this hidden state to Step 18 to guide the message sending, effectively preventing the context loss often seen in single-agent baselines during app switching. Complementing this memory retention, the Coordinator provided the necessary strategic backbone by decomposing the dense, high-level user instruction into a strictly ordered sequence: finalizing the meeting setup first, handling the information transfer second, and finally configuring the Clock in Step 28, ensuring the system maintained both logical continuity and procedural order throughout the complex workflow.

### D.2. Failure Case Analysis

Step 3 in Figure 8 shows a failure case. The true action should be `TYPE:Business`, but predicted action is `SCROLL:DOWN`. While the user’s high-level instruction explicitly requested to “Organize a business meeting”, the Coordinator failed to translate the adjective “business” into the specific atomic action of renaming the meeting topic. As observed in the Coordinator’s output, the agent prioritized procedural configurations, such as “setting the meeting time” and “enabling security features”, instead of noticing topic, which leads to faulty atomic instruction.

Step 12 in Figure 9 shows another failure case. In this step, the Coordinator correctly issued the atomic instruction “Open the messaging section”. However, the Executor failed to ground this instruction to the correct pixel coordinates. A closer look at Executor’s output shows that, it even correctly said “The messages icon is typically represented by a bubble with an smiling face in the bottom of the screen”, but when he answer it, he chose another bubble without smiling face in the middle of screen.

## User Instruction

Organize a business meeting with saltyfunsweets using ZOOM Cloud Meetings, send out the meeting invitations via Tumblr, and set an alarm clock for the meeting time using the Clock app.





Figure 8. An example of long-horizon task (Part 1 of 5).

## User Instruction

Organize a business meeting with saltyfunsweets using ZOOM Cloud Meetings, send out the meeting invitations via Tumblr, and set an alarm clock for the meeting time using the Clock app.



Step 7




<think>I am selecting the Zoom app to ensure that the business meeting details with saltyfunsweets are finalized and to proceed with sending out invitations via Tumblr. This action is appropriate as it confirms the meeting setup before moving on to the next task of sending invitations.</think>  
<answer>Open the Zoom app.</answer>



<think>The user wants to open the Zoom app. The Zoom app icon is visible on the screen, so the next step is to click on it to open the app.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (669, 976)</answer>



The Zoom app has been accessed, and a business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been scheduled, with all necessary details confirmed and saved. The process has progressed to the point where the meeting setup is complete.



Step 8




<think>I am choosing to click on the 'Invite' button to send out the meeting invitations for the business meeting with saltyfunsweets. By doing this, I am progressing towards completing the task of organizing the meeting and sending out invitations.</think>  
<answer>Select the 'Invite' option.</answer>



<think>The user wants to Select the 'Invite' option. The 'Invite' button is visible on the screen, which is the appropriate action to share the meeting details with the necessary participants. This aligns with the goal of organizing the meeting and ensuring all participants receive the invitation to join the Zoom meeting.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (546, 1616)</answer>



The business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been organized using the Zoom app. The meeting details have been scheduled and saved, and the process of sending out invitations via Tumblr has been initiated by selecting the 'Invite' option.



Step 9




This is a screenshot of a Zoom meeting details screen showing options to add invitees via different apps or copy the meeting link to the clipboard. The user is prompted to choose how to send the meeting invitation. I am choosing to copy the meeting link to the clipboard so I can easily paste it into the Tumblr app to send out the meeting invitations. This allows me to efficiently share the meeting details with the intended recipients.</think>  
<answer>Copy the meeting link to the clipboard.</answer>



<think>The user wants to copy the meeting link to the clipboard. The current screen shows a pop-up with options to add invitees via Gmail, Messages, or to copy the link to the clipboard. The 'Copy to clipboard' option is available, which is the action needed to fulfill the user's request.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (525, 1476)</answer>



The Zoom app has been used to schedule a business meeting with saltyfunsweets, ensuring all necessary details are finalized. The meeting setup has been confirmed and saved, and the meeting details have been copied to the clipboard for sharing via Tumblr.



Step 10




<think>I am pressing the home button to exit the Zoom app and proceed to the next steps of the task. By doing this, I can open the Tumblr app to send out the meeting invitations and then set an alarm using the Clock app. This ensures that I efficiently manage my time and complete all necessary preparations for the meeting.</think>  
<answer>Return to the home screen.</answer>



<think>The user wants to return to the home screen. The current screen shows a Zoom meeting details page showing the meeting time, topic, ID, duration, and passcode, with options to start, chat, add to calendar, invite, or delete the meeting. I should directly return home.</think>  
<answer>PRESS\_HOME</answer>



The business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been scheduled using the Zoom app, with the meeting details confirmed and saved. The meeting information has been copied to the clipboard in preparation for sharing via Tumblr.



Step 11




<think>I am opening the Tumblr app to send out the meeting invitations for the business meeting with saltyfunsweets. This action is appropriate because I have already copied the meeting link and now need to use Tumblr to distribute the invitations. By opening Tumblr, I can paste the link and send it to the intended recipients, ensuring they receive the meeting details promptly.</think>  
<answer>Open the Tumblr app.</answer>



<think>The user wants to open the Tumblr app to send out meeting invitations. The Tumblr app icon is visible on the screen, and the next step is to click on it to open the app.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (161, 357)</answer>



The Zoom app has been used to schedule a business meeting with saltyfunsweets, and the meeting details have been saved. The meeting details are copied to the clipboard in preparation for sharing on Tumblr, and the Tumblr app has been accessed to proceed with sending out the meeting invitations.



Step 12



<think>This is a screenshot of the Tumblr app displaying the 'Following' feed, showing posts from users and options. The interface includes navigation icons at the bottom for different sections of the app. I am selecting the messaging icon to access the direct messages section of Tumblr.</think>  
<answer>Open the messaging section.</answer>



<think>The user wants to open the messages section. The messages icon is typically represented by a bubble with an smiling face in the bottom of the screen. I need to click on this icon to proceed with sending out the meeting.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (671, 1305)</answer>



The business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been scheduled using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been saved. The meeting information was copied to the clipboard to facilitate sharing via Tumblr, and the Tumblr app was accessed to send out the meeting invitations through direct messages.

Figure 9. An example of long-horizon task (Part 2 of 5).

## User Instruction

Organize a business meeting with saltyfunsweets using ZOOM Cloud Meetings, send out the meeting invitations via Tumblr, and set an alarm clock for the meeting time using the Clock app.





Figure 10. An example of long-horizon task (Part 3 of 5).



## User Instruction

Organize a business meeting with saltyfunsweets using ZOOM Cloud Meetings, send out the meeting invitations via Tumblr, and set an alarm clock for the meeting time using the Clock app.



Step 19




<think>This is a screenshot of a messaging app displaying a Zoom meeting invitation sent to 'saltyfunsweets'. The message includes the meeting topic, time, and details such as the Zoom link and passcode. I am pressing the home button to exit the messaging app and proceed to the Clock app. This action is necessary to set an alarm for the meeting time, ensuring I am reminded of the meeting at the specified time.</think>  
<answer>Return to the home screen.</answer>



<think>The user wants to return to the home screen. The current screen is a messaging app, and there is no direct button to return to the home screen visible on the screen. The most likely way to return to the home screen is by pressing the home button on the device.</think>  
<answer>PRESS\_HOME</answer>



The business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been organized using the Zoom app, with the meeting details copied and sent via Tumblr direct messages. The invitation has been successfully communicated, ensuring the recipient has the necessary information to join the meeting.



Step 20




<think>I am selecting the Clock app to proceed with setting an alarm for the business meeting. This action is necessary to ensure I am reminded of the meeting time, completing the final step of organizing the meeting after sending the invitation.</think>  
<answer>Open the Clock app.</answer>



<think>The user wants to open the Clock app. The Clock app is visible on the screen, which is the appropriate app to use for setting an alarm. The next step is to open the Clock app to proceed with setting the alarm.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (404, 663)</answer>



A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been organized using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been sent via direct message on Tumblr. The meeting has been scheduled, saved, and the necessary information has been communicated to the recipient, ensuring all participants have the required details for the meeting.



Step 21




<think>This is a screenshot of the Alarm section in the Clock app on an Android phone. It shows no alarms set, with a prominent plus button to add a new alarm. I am choosing to tap the plus button to set a new alarm for the business meeting. This action is appropriate because I need to ensure I am reminded of the meeting time, and adding an alarm is the next logical step after sending the meeting invitation.</think>  
<answer>Tap the plus button to add a new alarm.</answer>



<think>The user wants to add a new alarm. The screen shows a large blue plus button in the center, which is typically used to add new items, such as alarms. This button is the most likely target for the user's instruction to add a new alarm.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (532, 1963)</answer>



A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been organized using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been successfully sent via direct message on Tumblr. An alarm has also been set using the Clock app to ensure a reminder for the scheduled meeting time.



Step 22




<think>This is a screenshot of the Clock app on an Android phone, displaying the time selection interface for setting an alarm. The user is in the process of setting the hour for the alarm, with the current selection being 2:00 PM. I am selecting the hour for the alarm to ensure it is set correctly for the business meeting. By choosing the appropriate hour, I can finalize the alarm setup, which is crucial for timely reminders.</think>  
<answer>Select the hour for the alarm.</answer>



<think>The user wants to set the hour for the alarm. The current time is set to 02:00, and the user needs to change the hour. The clock interface allows for selecting the hour by tapping on the corresponding number on the clock face. The current hour is 2, and the user might want to change it to a different hour.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (318, 1498)</answer>



A business meeting has been successfully scheduled using the Zoom app, and the details have been shared with saltyfunsweets via direct message on Tumblr. An alarm has been set using the Clock app to ensure a timely reminder for the meeting.



Step 23




<think>This is a screenshot of the Clock app on an Android phone, displaying the time selection interface for setting an alarm. The user is adjusting the minute hand to set the alarm time. I am scrolling to adjust the minute hand on the clock interface to set the correct time for the alarm.</think>  
<answer>Adjust the minute hand on the clock interface.</answer>



<think>The user wants to adjust the minute hand on the clock interface. The current screen shows a circular dial with numbers representing minutes, and the minute hand is currently at 00. To adjust the minute hand, the user needs to interact with the circular dial. The numbers on the dial represent the minutes, and the user can click on the desired minute to set it.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (550, 1625)</answer>



A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been organized using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been successfully sent via direct message on Tumblr. An alarm has been set using the Clock app to ensure a timely reminder for the scheduled meeting.



Step 24



<think>This is a screenshot of the Clock app on an Android phone, showing the time selection interface for setting an alarm. The user is adjusting the minute hand to 55, with the time set to 12:55 PM. I am confirming the time setting for the alarm by clicking 'OK'. This action finalizes the alarm setup, ensuring it is set for the correct time, which is crucial for timely reminders for the business meeting.</think>  
<answer>Confirm the selected alarm time.</answer>



<think>The user wants to confirm the selected alarm time. The current screen shows a time picker with the time set to 12:55 PM. The 'OK' button at the bottom right of the time picker is likely the confirmation button for the selected time. Clicking this button will confirm the selected time and proceed with setting the alarm.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (873, 1833)</answer>




A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been successfully organized using the Zoom app. The meeting details were sent via direct message on Tumblr, ensuring the recipient received the necessary information. An alarm was set in the Clock app to provide a timely reminder for the meeting.

Figure 11. An example of long-horizon task (Part 4 of 5).

## User Instruction

Organize a business meeting with saltyfunsweets using ZOOM Cloud Meetings, send out the meeting invitations via Tumblr, and set an alarm clock for the meeting time using the Clock app.



Step 25



Coordinator

<think>This is a screenshot of the Clock app displaying an alarm set for 12:55 PM with options to schedule, vibrate, and set a Google Assistant Routine. The alarm is set for tomorrow, and the user is in the process of confirming the alarm settings. I am confirming the alarm settings to ensure that the alarm is correctly configured for the business meeting. By clicking 'OK', I finalize the alarm setup, which is necessary to ensure I am reminded of the meeting at the specified time.</think>  
<answer>Confirm the alarm settings.</answer>




Executor

<think>The user wants to confirm the alarm settings. The current screen shows the alarm details, including the time, date, and various settings. The three-dot menu at the top right might provide an option to confirm or save the settings.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (1036, 226)</answer>



State Tracker

A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been successfully organized using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been sent out via direct message on Tumblr. An alarm has been set using the Clock app to ensure a timely reminder for the meeting, with a label added to distinguish it from other alarms.



Step 26



Coordinator

<think>This is a screenshot of the alarm settings on an Android phone, showing a time set for 12:55 PM with options to add a label and confirm the time. The keyboard is visible, indicating that the user is in the process of labeling the alarm. I am labeling the alarm to ensure it is clearly identified as related to the business meeting with saltyfunsweets. This helps in quickly recognizing the purpose of the alarm when it goes off, ensuring I am prepared for the meeting.</think>  
<answer>Label the alarm with 'Meeting'.</answer>




Executor

<think>The user wants to label the alarm with 'Meeting'. The 'Label' field is currently empty, and the keyboard is active, indicating that the user can type a label. The next step is to input the desired label into the 'Label' field.</think>  
<answer>TYPE: 'Meeting'</answer>



State Tracker

A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been successfully organized using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been sent via direct message on Tumblr. An alarm has been set in the Clock app with a specific label to remind of the scheduled meeting, ensuring all necessary preparations are complete.



Step 27



Coordinator

<think>I am confirming the label for the alarm to ensure it is correctly set for the business meeting. By clicking 'OK', I finalize the label, which helps me easily identify the alarm's purpose and ensures I am reminded of the meeting at the right time. This step is crucial to complete the task of setting up the alarm for the meeting.</think>  
<answer>Confirm the alarm label.</answer>




Executor

<think>The user has already entered the label 'Meeting' for the alarm. The next step is to confirm this label by clicking the 'OK' button to finalize the alarm setup. This will ensure the alarm is correctly labeled and set for the business meeting.</think>  
<answer>CLICK: (850, 943)</answer>



State Tracker

A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been successfully organized using the Zoom app, and the meeting details have been sent via direct message on Tumblr. An alarm has been set in the Clock app with a specific label to remind of the scheduled meeting, ensuring all necessary preparations are complete.



Step 28



Coordinator

<think>This is a screenshot of the alarm settings on an Android phone, showing an alarm labeled 'Meeting' set for 12:55 PM. The alarm is scheduled for tomorrow with options to vibrate and set a Google Assistant Routine. I am confirming the alarm label 'Meeting' to ensure it is correctly set for the business meeting. This action finalizes the alarm setup, allowing me to proceed with organizing the meeting and sending out invitations.</think>  
<answer>Confirm the alarm.</answer>



Executor

<think>The user wants to confirm the alarm label 'Meeting'. I am setting an alarm to ensure I am reminded of the scheduled business meeting. The action of confirming the alarm setup is crucial to guarantee that I receive a timely notification, ensuring all preparations are complete for the meeting.</think>  
<answer>COMPLETE</answer>



State Tracker

A business meeting with saltyfunsweets has been organized using the Zoom app, with invitations sent out via Tumblr. An alarm has been set in the Clock app to ensure a timely reminder for the meeting, complete with a label for easy identification.

Figure 12. An example of long-horizon task (Part 5 of 5).