

SLEA-RL : Step-Level Experience Augmented Reinforcement Learning for Multi-Turn Agentic Training

Prince Zizhuang Wang
Carnegie Mellon University
princewang@cmu.edu

Shuli Jiang
Carnegie Mellon University
shulij@andrew.cmu.edu

Abstract

Large Language Model (LLM) agents have shown strong results on multi-turn tool-use tasks, yet they operate in isolation during training, failing to leverage experiences accumulated across episodes. Existing experience-augmented methods address this by organizing trajectories into retrievable libraries, but they retrieve experiences only once based on the initial task description and hold them constant throughout the episode. In multi-turn settings where observations change at every step, this static retrieval becomes increasingly mismatched as episodes progress. We propose SLEA-RL (Step-Level Experience-Augmented Reinforcement Learning), a framework that retrieves relevant experiences at each decision step conditioned on the current observation. SLEA-RL operates through three components: (i) step-level observation clustering that groups structurally equivalent environmental states for efficient cluster-indexed retrieval; (ii) a self-evolving experience library that distills successful strategies and failure patterns through score-based admission and rate-limited extraction; and (iii) policy optimization with step-level credit assignment for fine-grained advantage estimation across multi-turn episodes. The experience library evolves alongside the policy through semantic analysis rather than gradient updates. Experiments on long-horizon multi-turn agent benchmarks demonstrate that SLEA-RL achieves superior performance compared to various reinforcement learning baselines. Our code is available at <https://github.com/kingofspace0wzz/slea-rl/>.

1 Introduction

Large language model (LLM) agents (Yao et al., 2022b; Shinn et al., 2023) have demonstrated remarkable capabilities across complex tasks such as web navigation (Yao et al., 2022), embodied planning (Shridhar et al., 2021), and tool-integrated reasoning (Jin et al., 2025). Reinforcement learn-




Figure 1: Validation success rate on WebShop (Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct). SLEA-RL achieves faster convergence and higher asymptotic performance compared to GiGPO and GRPO. Training curves are included in Appendix E.

ing (RL) has become a key paradigm for training these agents, with group-based algorithms such as GRPO (Guo et al., 2025) and Dr. GRPO (Liu et al., 2025) proving especially effective. Despite these advances, each task execution remains largely episodic: current LLM agents operate in isolation, unable to learn from past successes or failures across episodes, which significantly hinders their evolution.

Multi-turn tool-use tasks—such as ALF-World (Shridhar et al., 2021), WebShop (Yao et al., 2022), and interactive web search—present a fundamentally different challenge than single-turn reasoning (Achiam et al., 2023; Hui et al., 2024; Team et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2024). Unlike static settings where the context remains fixed throughout generation, multi-turn environments change at every step: each action reveals a new room configuration, each click surfaces new listings. The agent must continuously adapt its reasoning to an ever-changing world state across dozens of sequential decisions. Standard RL approaches (Schulman et al., 2017;

Ahmadian et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2025; Zheng et al., 2025a; Feng et al., 2025) face three compounding challenges in this setting. First, each training rollout acts in isolation: episodes begin from scratch with no memory of prior interactions, causing the agent to repeat mistakes and discard successful strategies across thousands of rollouts. Second, most multi-turn environments provide only *sparse, outcome-level rewards*, leaving dozens of intermediate steps without learning signal and making credit assignment difficult. Third, RL training proceeds purely through *weight updates*, discarding the structured, interpretable knowledge that accumulates across episodes in a form that could directly guide future behavior.

Recent work on experience-augmented agents (Xia et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2026; Cai et al., 2025b) addresses the first limitation by organizing successful trajectories into retrievable libraries. However, these methods perform *task-level* retrieval: a fixed set of experiences is fetched once based on the initial task description and held constant for the entire episode. In multi-turn settings, this provides increasingly stale context as the environment state diverges from the original task prompt. Hence, these limitations raise a core question:

Can LLM agents learn to leverage step-specific accumulated experience throughout an episode, matching retrieved strategies to the current observation at every decision point?

The key insight is that relevant accumulated experience is *state-dependent*: the strategies useful when a WebShop agent first navigates to a product category differ fundamentally from those needed when comparing two specific items at checkout twenty steps later. This state-dependence connects naturally to step-level credit assignment:

How does agent determine which intermediate actions causally contributed to the final outcome particularly when episodes span dozens of steps?

Just as not all intermediate actions deserve equal credit for the episode outcome, not all steps benefit equally from the same retrieved experiences. Step-level retrieval addresses both dimensions simultaneously: by conditioning retrieved experiences on

the current observation, agents receive targeted support at exactly the steps where it matters, improving the quality of the exploratory actions that receive fine-grained credit.

To this end, we propose **SLEA-RL (*Step-Level Experience-Augmented Reinforcement Learning*)**, a multi-turn RL framework that integrates step-level experience retrieval directly into the training loop. At each decision step, SLEA-RL retrieves relevant experiences from a structured experience library conditioned on the current observation, injecting them via format-preserving augmentation. To enable efficient retrieval at scale, SLEA-RL clusters structurally equivalent observations into equivalence classes, so that experiences proven effective at one state immediately benefit all similar states across trajectories. The experience library self-evolves through quality-controlled semantic analysis of the best and worst trajectories each epoch, with score-based admission and rate-limited extraction maintaining quality under continuous update pressure. Crucially, experiences are used during both training and inference, ensuring that the policy learns to effectively leverage retrieved experiences rather than treating them as a test-time artifact. Our main contributions are:

- **Step-level experience retrieval with observation clustering.** Unlike existing methods that retrieve experiences once per task, SLEA-RL retrieves at each decision step conditioned on the current observation, and clusters structurally similar observations for efficient retrieval and automatic cross-trajectory generalization.
- **Quality-controlled self-evolving experience library.** We introduce score-based admission with rate-limited extraction that prevents degradation under continuous update pressure, enabling the experience library to co-evolve with the policy through semantic analysis rather than gradient updates.
- **Empirical validation on long-horizon benchmarks.** SLEA-RL achieves strong results on ALFWorld, WebShop, and seven search-augmented QA tasks, outperforming many standard RL and experience-augmented baselines.




Figure 2: Overview of SLEA-RL compared to standard GRPO. **Left:** the LLM agent interacts with the environment in a multi-turn loop; an experience library E (comprising strategy zone E^+ and warning zone E^-) provides step-level guidance. **Center:** GRPO (top, gray) samples G trajectories without experience augmentation, while SLEA-RL (bottom, orange) retrieves experiences $\varepsilon_t^{(i)}$ at each step via cluster-indexed lookup over observation clusters C .

2 Preliminaries

2.1 LLM Agent Framework

We consider an LLM agent operating in an interactive environment \mathcal{E} . At each timestep t , the agent observes a state $o_t \in \mathcal{O}$, selects an action $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$, and receives a reward r_t and next observation o_{t+1} . A trajectory $\tau = (o_0, a_0, r_0, \dots, o_T, a_T, r_T)$ captures one episode of interaction. Tasks are specified by natural language descriptions d . An LLM-based agent parameterized by θ implements a policy $\pi_\theta(a_t | o_{\leq t}, d, c)$ where c represents additional context (e.g., retrieved experiences). Our goal is to learn a policy that maximizes expected return $\max_\theta \mathbb{E}_{\tau \sim \pi_\theta} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \gamma^t r_t \right]$ subject to context length constraints $|c| \leq L_{\max}$. In many environments, the agent receives only a sparse terminal reward $R(\tau) \in \{0, 1\}$ indicating task success or failure, with intermediate rewards $r_t = 0$ for all $t < T$. In this setting, the discounted return from step t reduces to $\hat{R}_t = \gamma^{T-t} R(\tau)$. Our framework accommodates both sparse and dense reward settings; we use r_t in full generality and specialize where needed. This sparse reward structure makes step-level credit assignment particularly challenging, as the agent must determine which intermediate actions causally contributed to the final outcome

across episodes spanning dozens of steps.

2.2 Group Relative Policy Optimization

Group Relative Policy Optimization (GRPO) (Guo et al., 2025) is a reinforcement learning method that avoids training a critic by using intra-group relative rewards to optimize the policy. For each query x , the model samples G responses $\{y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(G)}\}$, which are scored to obtain rewards $\{R^{(1)}, \dots, R^{(G)}\}$, where $i \in [G]$ indexes the trajectory within the sampled group. GRPO computes normalized advantages and updates the policy with a PPO-style clipped objective (Schulman et al., 2017):

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{GRPO}}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{x, \{y^{(i)}\}} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \min \left(\rho^{(i)} A^{(i)}, \text{clip}(\rho^{(i)}, 1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon) A^{(i)} \right) - \beta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\theta \| \pi_{\text{ref}}) \right],$$

where $\rho^{(i)} = \frac{\pi_\theta(y^{(i)}|x)}{\pi_{\text{old}}(y^{(i)}|x)}$ is the importance ratio and $A^{(i)} = \frac{R^{(i)} - \text{mean}\{R^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^G}{\text{std}\{R^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^G}$ is the normalized advantage, with ϵ and β as hyperparameters, π_{old} the policy before the current update, and π_{ref} the reference policy for KL regularization. This formulation eliminates value network training while

providing automatic baseline subtraction and variance normalization. A critical property for time efficiency is that sampling G trajectories in parallel using modern inference engines incurs wall-clock time similar to sampling a single trajectory, making group-based methods highly practical.

3 SLEA-RL

We propose SLEA-RL, a multi-turn reinforcement learning framework that integrates step-level experience retrieval into agent training. The framework contains three interleaved components: (i) Self-evolving experience library, which distills reusable strategies and warnings from successful and failed trajectories through quality-controlled semantic analysis. (ii) Step-level observation clustering with cluster-indexed retrieval, enabling efficient retrieval of relevant past experiences. (iii) Experience-augmented rollouts with policy optimization, where retrieved experiences are incorporated into the agent context during training to guide decision-making.

3.1 Experience Library

The experience library $E = E^+ \cup E^-$ is a structured repository of textual experiences accumulated during training. Each entry $e \in E$ is represented as a tuple $e = (s_e, l_e, z_e)$, where s_e is a natural-language description of a strategy or warning, $l_e \in \{\text{principle, pattern, example}\}$ denotes its abstraction level, and $z_e \in \mathbb{R}$ is a quality score derived from the reward of the trajectory from which the experience is extracted. The library is divided into two zones: a *strategy zone* E^+ , which stores successful strategies organized hierarchically into principles, reasoning patterns, and concrete examples; and a *warning zone* E^- , which records failure knowledge such as common mistakes and recurring failure patterns. To control growth, the library capacity is limited to C entries per level in each zone.

We use $\varepsilon_t \subset E$ to denote the subset of experiences retrieved at step t for a given observation. The library evolves through semantic analysis rather than gradient updates (Section 3.4), providing interpretable knowledge structures that can be inspected and transferred across agents.

3.2 Step-level Observation Clustering

Next, we introduce the observation clustering mechanism to enable efficient experience retrieval and consistent step-level credit assignment. In

multi-turn environments, many observations are semantically similar; clustering allows such states to share both advantages and retrieved experiences. Prior work groups similar observations for advantage normalization (Feng et al., 2025). SLEA-RL extends this idea by using the same structure to index reusable experiences.

We maintain a cluster index $\mathcal{C} = \{c_1, \dots, c_M\}$, where each cluster c_i is represented by a prototype observation $\text{rep}(c_i)$ and stores associated experience pools $E_{c_i}^+ \subseteq E^+$ and $E_{c_i}^- \subseteq E^-$. Given a new observation o_t , we assign it to an existing cluster or create a new one:

$$c(o_t) = \begin{cases} c_i & \text{if } \exists c_i : \text{sim}(o_t, \text{rep}(c_i)) \geq \delta \\ \text{new cluster} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where $\text{sim}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a sequence similarity function and δ is the similarity threshold.

If the assigned cluster already contains experiences, retrieval is performed directly from its pools:

$$\varepsilon_t = \text{TopK}(E_{c(o_t)}^+, k^+) \cup \text{TopK}(E_{c(o_t)}^-, k^-), \quad (1)$$

where k^+ and k^- control the number of retrieved strategies and warnings. This cluster-indexed retrieval avoids scanning the full library while ensuring both positive and cautionary guidance.

If the cluster has no associated experiences, the method falls back to library-wide semantic retrieval:

$$\varepsilon_t = \text{TopK}(\{e \in E : \text{sim}(o_t, e) > \delta\}, k), \quad (2)$$

and the retrieved experiences are linked to the cluster for future reuse.

As training progresses, most observations match existing clusters, making retrieval increasingly efficient and targeted. During library evolution (Section 3.4), newly admitted experiences are associated with relevant clusters, while score-based admission replaces lower-quality entries, allowing cluster pools to improve alongside the policy.

3.3 Experience-Augmented Rollout

Building the observation clustering, SLEA-RL performs *step-level experience retrieval* during rollout. At step t in a trajectory, the agent observes o_t and retrieves relevant experiences ε_t using the cluster-indexed mechanism (Eq. 1–2). To avoid injecting low-quality experiences early in training, retrieval is activated only after a warmup of W epochs and when the library size exceeds $|E| > C_{\min}$.

When retrieval is enabled, the policy conditions on both the current observation and retrieved experiences:

$$a_t \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot \mid \text{augment}(o_t, \varepsilon_t)), \quad (3)$$

where experiences are inserted into the prompt via format-preserving augmentation (Appendix A).

The key distinction from prior work (Zhang et al., 2025; Cai et al., 2025b) is that experience retrieval occurs *at every step* based on the current observation, rather than once from the initial task description. This design allows experience guidance to adapt to evolving agent states and ensures that the model learns to utilize retrieved experiences during training under the same conditions used at inference.

3.4 Self-Evolving Experience Library

The experience library evolves through *quality-controlled semantic analysis* rather than gradient updates. Naively extracting experiences from all trajectories would generate hundreds of candidates per step, causing eviction churn and unstable retrieval. SLEA-RL addresses this with three controls: outcome partitioning, selective extraction, and score-based admission.

Outcome partitioning. After rollout, trajectories are split by reward. Let $r_j = R(\tau_j)$ denote the reward of trajectory τ_j . Using a threshold η (typically the batch median), we form

$$\mathcal{T}^+ = \{\tau_j : r_j > \eta\}, \quad \mathcal{T}^- = \{\tau_j : r_j \leq \eta\},$$

where successes provide strategy signals and failures reveal pitfalls.

Selective extraction. Only the top- K_{traj} trajectories from \mathcal{T}^+ and bottom- K_{traj} from \mathcal{T}^- are analyzed for experience extraction. An auxiliary LLM summarizes reusable strategies (from successes) or warnings (from failures). Each extracted experience inherits the episode reward of its source trajectory as its quality score $z_e = R(\tau)$. To limit growth, each evolution step generates at most K_{strat} strategies and K_{warn} warnings.

Score-based admission. Each library zone has capacity C . A candidate experience is admitted only if its quality score z_e exceeds the lowest-scoring entry in that zone; otherwise it is discarded. As the policy improves, higher-reward trajectories yield higher-quality experiences that replace older

ones, keeping the library aligned with the agent’s evolving capabilities. Accepted experiences are inserted into E^+ or E^- and associated with relevant observation clusters.

3.5 Policy Optimization

SLEA-RL combines episode-level and step-level credit assignment. For each task, we sample G trajectories with experience-augmented rollout and compute episode-level advantages following GRPO. To provide fine-grained credit, we introduce *step-level advantages* based on observation clusters (Section 3.2). For each cluster, we group steps with similar observations across trajectories and normalize their discounted returns within the group. This assigns different credit to actions taken under similar states but leading to different outcomes. The final advantage is a weighted combination:

$$\hat{A} = A_{\text{episode}} + w \cdot A_{\text{step}}, \quad (4)$$

where w controls the contribution of step-level credit. The policy is then optimized using the standard clipped GRPO objective with \hat{A} . Importantly, SLEA-RL requires no additional loss terms or auxiliary passes: experience-guided learning arises directly from rollout, where retrieved experiences influence actions and are reinforced through their impact on returns.

Step-level advantages provide fine-grained credit at individual decision points. For each timestep t across all G trajectories, we assign the observation $o_t^{(i)}$ to its nearest cluster in the embedding space (Section 3.2). Steps from different trajectories that map to the *same* cluster c form a step-level group: these are decisions made under similar states but potentially leading to different outcomes. Formally, we collect all (action, discounted return) pairs from steps assigned to c into $\mathcal{S}(c) = \{(a_t^{(i)}, \hat{R}_t^{(i)}) \mid c(o_t^{(i)}) = c\}$, where $\hat{R}_t^{(i)} = \sum_{k=t}^T \gamma^{k-t} r_k^{(i)}$ is the discounted return from step t , computed from per-step environment rewards $r_k^{(i)}$ (distinct from the episode-level reward $R^{(i)} = R(\tau^{(i)})$). Within each such group, we normalize the discounted returns to obtain per-step advantages:

$$A_{\text{step}}(a_t^{(i)}) = \frac{\hat{R}_t^{(i)} - \text{mean}(\{\hat{R}_t^{(j)} \mid (a_t^{(j)}, \hat{R}_t^{(j)}) \in \mathcal{S}(c)\})}{\text{std}(\{\hat{R}_t^{(j)} \mid (a_t^{(j)}, \hat{R}_t^{(j)}) \in \mathcal{S}(c)\})} \quad (5)$$

Actions taken at the same observation cluster but leading to different outcomes receive different

credit, enabling the policy to distinguish effective from ineffective decisions at each state. The combined advantage for each action $a_t^{(i)}$ is:

$$\hat{A}(a_t^{(i)}) = A_{\text{episode}}(\tau^{(i)}) + w \cdot A_{\text{step}}(a_t^{(i)}) \quad (6)$$

where w controls the relative weight of step-level credit assignment. The policy is updated using the clipped surrogate objective extended with the multi-level advantage:

$$\mathcal{J}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{d, \{\tau^{(i)}\}} \left[\frac{1}{G} \sum_{i=1}^G \frac{1}{T_i} \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \min \left(\rho_t^{(i)} \hat{A}_t^{(i)}, \text{clip}(\rho_t^{(i)}, 1-\epsilon, 1+\epsilon) \hat{A}_t^{(i)} \right) - \beta D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_\theta \| \pi_{\text{ref}}) \right], \quad (7)$$

where $\rho_t^{(i)} = \frac{\pi_\theta(a_t^{(i)} | o_{\leq t}^{(i)}, d, \epsilon_t)}{\pi_{\text{old}}(a_t^{(i)} | o_{\leq t}^{(i)}, d, \epsilon_t)}$ is the per-step importance ratio conditioned on the experience-augmented context.

4 Experiments

We present empirical evaluations of SLEA-RL across a variety of agentic tasks. Our experiments aim to answer the following questions: **(1)** How does SLEA-RL compare to state-of-the-art RL and experience-augmented baselines? **(2)** What is the contribution of each component (step-level retrieval, observation clustering, self-evolving library)? **(3)** How does step-level retrieval compare to task-level retrieval? **(4)** How does the experience library scale with training?

4.1 Experimental Setup

Benchmarks. We evaluate on two multi-turn agent benchmarks, *ALFWorld* (Shridhar et al., 2021) and *WebShop* (Yao et al., 2022), as well as search-augmented QA tasks covering both single-hop and multi-hop settings. See Appendix A for details.

Baselines. For ALFWorld and WebShop, we compare against: (a) *closed-source LLMs* (GPT-4o, Gemini-2.5-Pro); (b) *prompt-based and memory methods* that guide behavior via in-context reasoning or external memory without parameter updates (ReAct, Reflexion, Mem0, ExpeL, MemP, SimpleMem); (c) *RL methods* with trajectory-level or group-based advantage estimation (RLOO, GRPO, GiGPO, R³L, IGPO); and (d) *experience-augmented RL* that integrates persistent memory

into the RL loop (MemRL, Mem0+GRPO, SimpleMem+GRPO, SkillRL). For search-augmented QA, we compare against R1-Instruct, Search-R1, ZeroSearch, StepSearch, EvolveR, and RL baselines PPO, Reinforce++, GSPO, and GiGPO.

Implementation details. We use Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct as the primary base model, and additionally evaluate Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct to study scaling. RL training uses a learning rate of 1×10^{-6} , batch size 16, group size $G=8$, and 4 gradient accumulation steps, with clipping $\epsilon=0.2$ and KL coefficient $\beta=0.01$. The step-level advantage weight is $w=1.0$.

For the experience library, we set the similarity threshold $\delta=0.85$, warmup $W=5$ epochs, and retrieve top-2 strategies and top-1 warnings per step. Experience extraction and semantic analysis are performed by the same base model used for rollout, requiring no additional model deployment. Per-step retrieval adds minimal overhead: cluster-indexed lookup uses string similarity ($O(|\mathcal{C}|)$ comparisons) rather than neural embeddings, and the retrieved text is prepended to the existing prompt without additional forward passes. The main computational addition is the auxiliary LLM call for experience extraction, which runs once per training batch. For search-augmented QA, we follow the same setup as Search-R1, using E5 as the retriever with group size $G=5$. Full details are provided in Appendix D.

4.2 Main Results

ALFWorld and WebShop. Table 1 reports results on ALFWorld and WebShop. SLEA-RL achieves 93.5% on ALFWorld and 76.3% on WebShop, consistently outperforming all baselines. Prompt-based methods plateau well below RL approaches (e.g., ExpeL at 46.3% on ALFWorld), highlighting the limits of in-context learning for distilling actionable knowledge. Compared to the strongest RL baseline GiGPO (90.8% ALFWorld, 72.8% WebShop), SLEA-RL shows gains that are particularly pronounced on harder subtasks requiring multi-step reasoning—Heat improves by 10.1% and Pick2 by 11.2%. Among experience-augmented RL methods, SLEA-RL outperforms SkillRL (+3.6% on both benchmarks), validating that step-level retrieval conditioned on the current observation provides more targeted guidance than task-level skill retrieval. The gains are consistent across model sizes: on Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct, SLEA-RL achieves 87.5% on ALFWorld and 75.4%




Figure 3: Ablation studies on ALFWorld and WebShop (Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct). GRPO is shown as the vanilla RL baseline. (a) Step-level retrieval consistently outperforms task-level retrieval across all subtasks. (b) Removing step-level advantage ($\omega=0$) degrades performance below GRPO on several metrics.

on WebShop, with the WebShop improvement (+10.4% over GiGPO) suggesting that experience augmentation particularly benefits smaller models with less internalized knowledge.

Search-augmented QA. Table 2 shows results on search-augmented QA tasks. SLEA-RL achieves the best average score of 60.9%, outperforming the strongest baseline IGPO (58.7%). The gains are most apparent on multi-hop tasks requiring iterative information synthesis—SLEA-RL improves over IGPO by 2.3% on 2Wiki and 9.0% on MuSiQue (77.2 vs. 31.4)—indicating that step-level experiences effectively guide multi-step reasoning. Despite training on only NQ and HotpotQA, SLEA-RL generalizes well to out-of-domain benchmarks (81.8% on TriviaQA, 55.2% on PopQA). We note that IGPO achieves strong performance on Bamboogle (74.9%), where SLEA-RL (33.2%) lags behind; we attribute this to the dataset’s small size and distinctive reasoning patterns that favor IGPO’s information-theoretic grouping. Compared to SkillRL, which achieves the best PopQA performance (73.8%) through task-specific skill retrieval but degrades sharply on multi-hop tasks (20.2% on MuSiQue), SLEA-RL provides more balanced improvements across both single-hop and multi-hop settings.

4.3 Ablation Studies

Task-level vs. step-level retrieval. Figure 3a compares step-level retrieval (ours) with task-level retrieval, where experiences are retrieved once from the initial task and kept fixed. Step-level retrieval consistently outperforms task-level retrieval across all ALFWorld subtasks, with the largest gains on Look (+11.1%) and Pick2 (+4.4%), which require adapting to evolving states. On WebShop, it improves score (87.6 vs. 84.8) and success rate




Figure 4: Effect of per-zone capacity (C) of the experience library on WebShop. Performance peaks at the default $C=100$ and slightly degrades at $C=200$. All configurations outperform GRPO (dashed lines).

(76.3% vs. 72.0%). Both variants significantly outperform GRPO (77.6% on ALFWorld, 66.1% on WebShop), showing that experience augmentation is beneficial, while step-level conditioning provides additional gains. Methodology-wise, the task-level retrieval setting is equivalent to SkillRL.

Step-level advantage. Figure 3b evaluates the impact of step-level credit assignment by comparing $w=1$ (full method) and $w=0$ (episode-level only). Removing step-level advantage reduces ALFWorld performance from 93.5% to 87.8%, with larger drops on Look (85.1% \rightarrow 77.8%) and Heat (93.8% \rightarrow 86.5%), and lowers WebShop success from 76.3% to 70.8%. While $w=0$ still outperforms GRPO, step-level advantage provides additional gains (+5.7% on ALFWorld, +5.5% on WebShop), indicating that fine-grained credit assignment complements experience retrieval.

Experience library capacity. Figure 4 studies the effect of the per-zone capacity C (strategy and warning) on WebShop. Performance improves

Table 1: Performance on ALFWorld and WebShop. We report average success rate (%) for ALFWorld subtasks and overall, and both average score and success rate (%) for WebShop. *: results from Feng et al. (2025). Best and second best in **bold** and underline. The full table including the prompt-based models is included in Appendix I.

Type	Method	ALFWorld						WebShop		
		Pick	Look	Clean	Heat	Cool	Pick2	All	Score	Succ.
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct: RL Methods</i>										
	RLOO*	87.6	78.2	87.3	81.3	71.9	48.9	75.5	80.3	65.7
	GRPO*	90.8	66.1	89.3	74.7	72.5	64.7	77.6	79.3	66.1
	GiGPO*	<u>97.7</u>	82.7	<u>98.8</u>	83.7	89.3	79.2	90.8	84.4	72.8
	MemRL	62.8	38.5	<u>22.2</u>	12.5	8.00	0.00	21.4	29.5	9.20
	Mem0+GRPO	78.1	54.8	56.1	31.0	65.0	26.9	54.7	58.1	37.5
	SimpleMem+GRPO	89.5	36.3	60.0	50.0	64.9	26.3	62.5	67.8	46.9
	SkillRL	97.9	71.4	90.0	90.0	<u>95.5</u>	<u>87.5</u>	89.9	85.2	72.7
	SLEA-RL	98.5	85.1	99.0	93.8	96.4	90.4	93.5	87.6	76.3
<i>Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct</i>										
	GRPO*	85.3	53.7	84.5	78.2	59.7	53.5	72.8	75.8	56.8
	GiGPO*	94.4	67.5	<u>94.8</u>	<u>94.4</u>	79.8	<u>76.4</u>	86.7	83.1	65.0
	SLEA-RL	92.6	80.0	96.2	94.7	95.0	76.5	87.5	88.7	75.4

Table 2: Performance on search-augmented QA tasks. SLEA-RL is trained on NQ and HotpotQA. †: in-domain datasets. Best and second best among RL methods in **bold** and underline.

Type	Method	Single-Hop QA				Multi-Hop QA			Avg.
		NQ†	TriviaQA	PopQA	HotpotQA†	2Wiki	MuSiQue	Bamboogle	
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct</i>									
	RLOO	40.7	72.5	43.1	49.6	55.0	62.2	24.8	49.7
	PPO	38.7	75.4	48.7	48.6	59.7	63.4	26.2	51.5
	GRPO	40.3	77.0	49.6	48.9	57.7	65.1	25.0	51.9
	Reinforce++	34.3	67.5	44.3	45.9	54.5	61.2	23.7	47.3
	GSPO	41.5	77.7	45.4	46.3	60.1	67.6	25.4	52.0
	GiGPO	46.4	64.7	46.1	41.6	43.6	18.9	68.9	47.2
	IGPO	46.7	<u>80.1</u>	52.5	<u>57.2</u>	<u>68.2</u>	31.4	74.9	<u>58.7</u>
	SkillRL	45.9	63.3	73.8	45.9	43.2	20.2	40.3	47.1
	SLEA-RL	48.5	81.8	<u>55.2</u>	59.8	70.5	77.2	33.2	60.9

from $C=25$ (84.5 / 71.8%) to $C=100$ (87.6 / 76.3%), then slightly declines at $C=200$ (87.1 / 75.6%). This suggests that overly large libraries admit lower-quality experiences that reduce retrieval precision. All settings outperform GRPO (79.3 / 66.1%), indicating robustness to C . We use $C=100$ as the default choice.

5 Related Work

Reinforcement learning for LLM agents. RL has become the dominant paradigm for post-training of LLMs (Schulman et al., 2017; Bai et al., 2022; Rafailov et al., 2023), with recent work extending these techniques to multi-turn agentic settings. Group-based methods avoid training a separate critic: RLOO (Ahmadian et al., 2024) uses leave-one-out baselines, GRPO (Guo et al., 2025) computes group-relative advantages, and GSPO (Zheng et al., 2025a) and Reinforce++ (Hu et al., 2025) further refine variance reduction. For multi-turn tasks, GiGPO (Feng et al., 2025) provides step-level credit assignment by grouping similar observations, SPEAR (Qin et al., 2025) em-

ploys self-imitation learning, Turn-PPO (Li et al., 2025) applies per-turn optimization, R³L (Shi et al., 2026) introduces retrospective reward redistribution, and IGPO (Wang et al., 2025) uses information-theoretic grouping.

Experience-augmented methods for LLM agents. Retrieval-augmented generation (Lewis et al., 2020) enhances LLMs by conditioning on retrieved content. For agentic tasks, prompt-based methods such as ReAct (Yao et al., 2022b), Reflexion (Shinn et al., 2023), and ExpeL (Zhao et al., 2024) leverage in-context reasoning or external memory without parameter updates, while Mem0 (Chhikara et al., 2025), MemP (Fang et al., 2025), and SimpleMem (Liu et al., 2026) maintain persistent memory stores. Training-free experience-based approaches (Cai et al., 2025a,b) achieve agent adaptation through semantically evolving experience libraries without gradient computation. More recently, methods integrating experience with RL training have emerged: Zhang et al. (2025) introduce experience replay during

RL, MemRL (Zhang et al., 2026) couples memory updates with policy optimization, and SkillRL (Xia et al., 2026) retrieves task-level skills to augment rollouts. However, these approaches retrieve experiences at the task level—once per episode based on the initial description—which becomes stale as observations evolve across steps. A more comprehensive discussion of baseline comparisons is provided in Appendix G.

6 Conclusion

We propose SLEA-RL, a multi-turn reinforcement learning framework that integrates step-level experience retrieval with quality-controlled experience evolution. By combining a self-evolving experience library, cluster-indexed retrieval, and multi-level credit assignment, SLEA-RL enables agents to reuse and refine turn-level knowledge throughout training. Experiments across multiple benchmarks demonstrate consistent improvements over strong baselines.

Limitations

SLEA-RL introduces additional computational overhead due to step-level experience retrieval and prompt augmentation at each decision step, increasing both training and inference cost compared to standard RL. The framework also relies on an external LLM for experience extraction, whose quality can affect the usefulness of the learned experience library; poor extraction may introduce noisy or suboptimal guidance. Moreover, maintaining and updating the experience library adds system complexity, and the benefits may depend on the quality and diversity of collected trajectories. Improving the efficiency and robustness of experience extraction and retrieval remains an important direction for future work.

References

Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, and 1 others. 2023. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.

Arash Ahmadian, Chris Cremer, Matthias Gallé, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, Olivier Pietquin, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. 2024. Back to basics: Revisiting reinforce-style optimization for learning from human feedback in llms. In *Proceedings of the*

62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 12248–12267.

Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, and 1 others. 2022. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*.

Yuzheng Cai, Siqi Cai, Yuchen Shi, Zihan Xu, Lichao Chen, Yulei Qin, Xiaoyu Tan, Gang Li, Zongyi Li, Haojia Lin, and 1 others. 2025a. Training-free group relative policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.08191*.

Zhicheng Cai, Xinyuan Guo, Yu Pei, Jiangtao Feng, Jinsong Su, Jiangjie Chen, Ya-Qin Zhang, Wei-Ying Ma, Mingxuan Wang, and Hao Zhou. 2025b. Flex: Continuous agent evolution via forward learning from experience. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.06449*.

Prateek Chhikara, Dev Khant, Saket Aryan, Taranjeet Singh, and Deshraj Yadav. 2025. Mem0: Building production-ready ai agents with scalable long-term memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19413*.

Runnan Fang, Yuan Liang, Xiaobin Wang, Jialong Wu, Shuofei Qiao, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, Hua-jun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. 2025. Memp: Exploring agent procedural memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.06433*.

Lang Feng, Zhenghai Xue, Tingcong Liu, and Bo An. 2025. Group-in-group policy optimization for LLM agent training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.10978*.

Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shitong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, and 1 others. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in LLMs via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*.

Xanh Ho, Anh-Khoa Duong Nguyen, Saku Sugawara, and Akiko Aizawa. 2020. Constructing a multi-hop QA dataset for comprehensive evaluation of reasoning steps. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 6609–6625.

Jian Hu, Jason Klein Liu, Haotian Xu, and Wei Shen. 2025. REINFORCE++: Stabilizing critic-free policy optimization with global advantage normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.03262*.

Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, and 1 others. 2024. Qwen2.5-coder technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12186*.

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*.
- Mandar Joshi, Eunsol Choi, Daniel S. Weld, and Luke Zettlemoyer. 2017. Triviaqa: A large scale distantly supervised challenge dataset for reading comprehension. In *Proceedings of the 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1601–1611.
- Tom Kwiatkowski, Jennimaria Palomaki, Olivia Redfield, Michael Collins, Ankur Parikh, Chris Alberti, Danielle Epstein, Illia Polosukhin, Jacob Devlin, Kenton Lee, and 1 others. 2019. Natural questions: A benchmark for question answering research. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 7:452–466.
- Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, and Douwe Kiela. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 9459–9474.
- Junbo Li, Peng Zhou, Rui Meng, Meet P Vadera, Lihong Li, and Yang Li. 2025. Turn-ppo: Turn-level advantage estimation with ppo for improved multi-turn rl in agentic llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.17008*.
- Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, and 1 others. 2024. Deepseek-v3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.19437*.
- Jiaqi Liu, Yaofeng Su, Peng Xia, Siwei Han, Zeyu Zheng, Cihang Xie, Mingyu Ding, and Huaxiu Yao. 2026. Simplemem: Efficient lifelong memory for LLM agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.02553*.
- Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Penghui Qi, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. 2025. Understanding rl-zero-like training: A critical perspective. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.20783*.
- Alex Mallen, Akari Asai, Victor Zhong, Rajarshi Das, Daniel Khashabi, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. 2023. When not to trust language models: Investigating effectiveness of parametric and non-parametric memories. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9802–9822.
- Ofir Press, Muru Zhang, Sewon Min, Ludwig Schmidt, Noah A. Smith, and Mike Lewis. 2023. Measuring and narrowing the compositionality gap in language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 5687–5711.
- Yulei Qin, Xiaoyu Tan, Zhengbao He, Gang Li, Haojia Lin, Zongyi Li, Zihan Xu, Yuchen Shi, Siqi Cai, Renting Rui, and 1 others. 2025. Learn the ropes, then trust the wins: self-imitation with progressive exploration for agentic reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22601*.
- 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. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:53728–53741.
- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Weijie Shi, Yanxi Chen, Zexi Li, Xuchen Pan, Yuchang Sun, Jiajie Xu, Xiaofang Zhou, and Yaliang Li. 2026. R³L: Reflect-then-retry reinforcement learning with language-guided exploration, pivotal credit, and positive amplification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.03715*.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2023. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 8634–8652.
- Mohit Shridhar, Xingdi Yuan, Marc-Alexandre Côté, Yonatan Bisk, Adam Trischler, and Matthew Hausknecht. 2021. *ALFWorld: Aligning Text and Embodied Environments for Interactive Learning*. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Hao Sun, Zile Qiao, Jiayan Guo, Xuanbo Fan, Yingyan Hou, Yong Jiang, Pengjun Xie, Fei Huang, and Yan Zhang. 2025. Zerosearch: Incentivize the search capability of LLMs without searching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.04588*.
- Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, and 1 others. 2023. Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*.
- Harsh Trivedi, Niranjan Balasubramanian, Tushar Khot, and Ashish Sabharwal. 2022. MuSiQue: Multi-hop questions via single-hop question composition. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 10:539–554.
- Guoqing Wang, Sunhao Dai, Guangze Ye, Zeyu Gan, Wei Yao, Yong Deng, Xiaofeng Wu, and Zhenzhe Ying. 2025. Information gain-based policy optimization: A simple and effective approach for multi-turn llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.14967*.
- Rong Wu, Xiaoman Wang, Jianbiao Mei, Pinlong Cai, Daocheng Fu, Cheng Yang, Licheng Wen, Xuemeng Yang, Yufan Shen, Yuxin Wang, and Botian Shi. 2025. Evolver: Self-evolving LLM agents through an experience-driven lifecycle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.16079*.

- Peng Xia, Jianwen Chen, Hanyang Wang, Jiaqi Liu, Kaide Zeng, Yu Wang, Siwei Han, Yiyang Zhou, Xujiang Zhao, Haifeng Chen, and 1 others. 2026. Skillrl: Evolving agents via recursive skill-augmented reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.08234*.
- Zhilin Yang, Peng Qi, Saizheng Zhang, Yoshua Bengio, William W. Cohen, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Christopher D. Manning. 2018. HotpotQA: A dataset for diverse, explainable multi-hop question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2369–2380.
- Shunyu Yao, Howard Chen, John Yang, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2022. Webshop: Towards scalable real-world web interaction with grounded language agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:20744–20757.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2022b. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Hongzhi Zhang, Jia Fu, Jingyuan Zhang, Kai Fu, Qi Wang, Fuzheng Zhang, and Guorui Zhou. 2025. Rlep: Reinforcement learning with experience replay for llm reasoning. *Preprint*, arXiv:2507.07451.
- Shengtao Zhang, Jiaqian Wang, Ruiwen Zhou, Junwei Liao, Yuchen Feng, Zhuo Li, Yujie Zheng, Weinan Zhang, Ying Wen, Zhiyu Li, and 1 others. 2026. Memrl: Self-evolving agents via runtime reinforcement learning on episodic memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.03192*.
- Andrew Zhao, Daniel Huang, Quentin Xu, Matthieu Lin, Yong-Jin Liu, and Gao Huang. 2024. Expel: LLM agents are experiential learners. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19632–19642.
- Chujie Zheng, Shixuan Liu, Mingze Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Kai Dang, Yuqiong Liu, Rui Men, An Yang, and 1 others. 2025a. Group sequence policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.18071*.
- Xuhui Zheng, Kang An, Ziliang Wang, Yuhang Wang, and Yichao Wu. 2025b. StepSearch: Igniting LLMs search ability via step-wise proximal policy optimization. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 21816–21841.

A Format-Preserving Prompt Augmentation

A critical implementation detail concerns how retrieved experiences are incorporated into the prompt. Naively prepending experience text directly into the observation content disrupts the format the model expects, causing progressive degradation of valid action generation as the library grows. The policy π_θ is well-calibrated for observations in the expected clean format (i.e., the observation distribution $\mathcal{O}_{\text{clean}}$ seen during pretraining and supervised fine-tuning); when the observation is corrupted with arbitrary preamble text, the distribution shift increases with the length of the injected text, producing increasingly malformed actions.

SLEA-RL addresses this through format-preserving augmentation. When experiences ε_t are available, the prompt is constructed as:

$$\text{augment}(o_t, \varepsilon_t) = [\text{sys}(\varepsilon_t), \text{obs}(o_t)] \quad (8)$$

where $\text{sys}(\varepsilon_t)$ places the retrieved strategies and warnings in the system role and $\text{obs}(o_t)$ preserves the observation in the user role exactly as the model expects. This separation ensures that experience injection acts as a small perturbation to the policy rather than a format-breaking corruption. The experience text is constrained to a token budget B_{max} to avoid consuming excessive prompt context.

B Analysis: Step-Level vs. Task-Level Retrieval

The experience library reduces uncertainty about optimal actions at each decision point. Letting $H(a_t^* | o_t)$ denote the entropy of the optimal action distribution at step t given observation o_t , access to relevant experiences ε provides information gain:

$$I(a_t^*; \varepsilon | o_t) = H(a_t^* | o_t) - H(a_t^* | o_t, \varepsilon) > 0 \quad (9)$$

The key distinction lies in what experiences are retrieved. Task-level retrieval conditions on the initial task description d , retrieving $\varepsilon_{\text{task}} = \text{retrieve}(E, d)$ once for the entire episode. Step-level retrieval conditions on the current observation, retrieving $\varepsilon_t = \text{retrieve}(E, o_t)$ at each step. Since o_t provides more specific context about the agent’s current situation than the initial task description, step-level retrieval is expected to yield more relevant experiences:

$$I(a_t^*; \varepsilon_t | o_t) \geq I(a_t^*; \varepsilon_{\text{task}} | o_t) \quad (10)$$

This advantage becomes increasingly pronounced as the episode progresses and o_t diverges from the initial context. By step 20 of a household navigation task, the agent’s current room and available objects bear little resemblance to the original goal specification, rendering task-level experiences increasingly irrelevant. We validate this hypothesis empirically through ablation studies comparing step-level, task-level, and hybrid retrieval modes.

C More About Benchmarks

ALFWorld (Shridhar et al., 2021) is an embodied decision-making benchmark where agents must complete multi-step household tasks through textual interactions with a simulated environment. Tasks require long-horizon planning, state tracking, and grounding actions in partially observable settings.

WebShop (Yao et al., 2022) is a web-based interactive environment that evaluates agents in realistic online shopping scenarios. The agent navigates a simulated HTML interface to search for, filter, and purchase products based on natural language instructions. The environment contains over 1.1M products and 12K instructions, yielding a large and diverse action space.

We further evaluate on *search-augmented QA tasks*, which require agents to iteratively retrieve and reason over external information. These include *single-hop* datasets (NQ (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019), TriviaQA (Joshi et al., 2017), PopQA (Mallen et al., 2023)), where answers can typically be found within a single document, and *multi-hop* datasets (HotpotQA (Yang et al., 2018), 2Wiki (Ho et al., 2020), MuSiQue (Trivedi et al., 2022), Bamboogle (Press et al., 2023)), which require aggregating evidence across multiple sources. These benchmarks test both retrieval quality and multi-step reasoning.

D Hyperparameter Configuration

Table 3 lists the full hyperparameter configuration for SLEA-RL.

E Training curves.

Figure 5 shows the validation success rates on ALFWorld and WebShop with Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct. SLEA-RL achieves both faster convergence and higher final performance compared to GiGPO and GRPO. On ALFWorld, SLEA-RL begins to separate from GiGPO around step 50 and reaches over




Figure 5: Validation success rates on ALFWorld (left) and WebShop (right) with Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct. Faint traces show raw values; bold lines are smoothed. SLEA-RL achieves faster convergence and higher asymptotic performance than GiGPO and GRPO.

Hyperparameter	Value
<i>Step-Level Retrieval</i>	
Retrieval mode	clustered
Top- k golden strategies	2
Top- k warnings	1
Max experience tokens	200
Similarity threshold δ	0.85
<i>Warmup and Quality Gates</i>	
Warmup epochs W	5
Min library size C_{\min}	10
<i>Self-Evolving Experience</i>	
Golden capacity per level C	100
Warning capacity per level	50
Max strategies per step K_{strat}	10
Max warnings per step K_{warn}	5
Top- k trajectories K_{traj}	5
Novelty threshold	0.85
<i>Policy Optimization (GiGPO)</i>	
Step advantage weight w	1.0
Advantage mode	mean_norm


Table 3: SLEA-RL hyperparameter configuration.

85% success by step 140, while GiGPO plateaus near 63%. On WebShop, the separation is similarly pronounced: SLEA-RL converges to approximately 74% success, compared to 72% for GiGPO and 53% for GRPO.


Training episode success rate. Figures 6a and 6b show the training episode success rate on ALFWorld and WebShop. On ALFWorld, SLEA-

RL exhibits a steeper rise starting around step 60, reaching over 80% by step 130, while GiGPO trails by 10–15%. On WebShop, SLEA-RL pulls ahead around step 40 and reaches 70–75% success by step 140, compared to GiGPO’s 60%. The widening gap in the mid-to-late training regime confirms that experience retrieval provides increasingly useful guidance as the library accumulates higher-quality entries.

Episode length dynamics. Figures 6c and 6d show the mean episode length. A decreasing length indicates more efficient task completion. On ALFWorld, both methods begin near 48 steps (the maximum); SLEA-RL drops below 20 by step 140 while GiGPO remains around 25–30, suggesting that retrieved strategies help the agent avoid unnecessary exploration. On WebShop, both converge to 5–6 steps, but SLEA-RL reaches this efficiency earlier, particularly in the mid-training regime (steps 30–80).




(a) Training success rate (ALFWorld).



(b) Training success rate (WebShop).



(c) Mean episode length (ALFWorld).



(d) Mean episode length (WebShop).

Figure 6: Training dynamics on ALFWorld (left) and WebShop (right) with Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct. **Top row:** training episode success rate. SLEA-RL achieves higher success than GiGPO throughout training, with the gap widening as the experience library matures. **Bottom row:** mean episode length. SLEA-RL reduces episode length faster, indicating more efficient task completion via experience-guided action selection.

F System Prompts

Figure 7 presents the three system prompts used in the SLEA-RL pipeline. **Prompt A** is prepended to the agent’s observation at each step when experience retrieval is active, providing retrieved strategies and warnings via format-preserving augmentation (Section A). **Prompt B** is used during the experience evolution phase to extract reusable strategies from successful trajectories, organized into three abstraction levels (principles, methods, and concrete examples). **Prompt C** performs analogous failure diagnosis on unsuccessful trajectories, identifying root causes and formulating actionable warnings. Together, these prompts enable semantic library evolution without gradient updates.

SLEA-RL System Prompts

Prompt A: Step-Level Experience Augmentation (prepended to observation at each step)

Below are relevant strategies and warnings retrieved from past experience. Use them to inform your decisions, but always prioritize the current observation.

[Helpful Strategies]

{retrieved_golden_strategies}

[Common Pitfalls]

{retrieved_warnings}

Now proceed with the task. Your current observation follows:

{current_observation}

Prompt B: Strategy Extraction (applied to successful trajectories)

You are analyzing a **successful** agent trajectory. The agent completed the task and received a reward of {reward}.

Trajectory:

{trajectory_text}

Instructions:

1. Identify the key decisions that led to success.
2. Abstract them into reusable strategies at three levels:
 - **Principle:** High-level guideline (e.g., “Always check the most likely location first”)
 - **Method:** Reasoning pattern (e.g., “For heating tasks: find item → pick up → heat → place”)
 - **Example:** Concrete fact (e.g., “Eggs are commonly found in the fridge”)
3. Format each strategy as a concise, self-contained sentence.
4. Only extract strategies that would **generalize** to similar situations.

Prompt C: Failure Diagnosis (applied to failed trajectories)

You are analyzing a **failed** agent trajectory. The agent did not complete the task and received a reward of {reward}.

Trajectory:

{trajectory_text}

Instructions:

1. Identify **where** in the trajectory the agent went wrong.
2. Determine the **root cause** of the failure (e.g., inefficient search, wrong assumption, repeated action).
3. Formulate actionable warnings at three levels:
 - **Mistake:** Specific action to avoid (e.g., “Do not search cabinets exhaustively without checking fridge first”)
 - **Pattern:** Recurring failure mode (e.g., “Repeating the same failed action leads to step limit exhaustion”)
 - **Diagnostic:** Root cause insight (e.g., “Task failed because the agent lacked a mental model of common item locations”)
4. Each warning should be concise and self-contained.

Figure 7: System prompts used in the SLEA-RL pipeline. **Prompt A** augments each step’s observation with retrieved experiences. **Prompt B** extracts reusable strategies from successful trajectories into the strategy zone E^+ . **Prompt C** diagnoses failures and populates the warning zone E^- . These prompts enable semantic library evolution without gradient updates.

G Extended Related Work

This section provides a more comprehensive discussion of the relationship between SLEA-RL and existing methods.

Comparison with SkillRL. SkillRL (Xia et al., 2026) is the most closely related experience-augmented RL method. It maintains a skill library of reusable strategies and retrieves relevant skills to augment the agent’s prompt during RL training. However, SkillRL operates at the *task level*: skills are retrieved once based on the initial task description and held constant throughout the episode. This design is adequate for tasks where the context remains stable, but becomes a limitation in multi-turn environments where the agent’s observation evolves at each step. For instance, in ALF-World, the agent may begin in a kitchen but navigate to a bedroom mid-episode; task-level skills about “kitchen tasks” become irrelevant. SLEA-RL addresses this through step-level retrieval conditioned on the current observation o_t , ensuring that retrieved experiences remain relevant as the episode progresses. Additionally, SkillRL does not incorporate step-level credit assignment, relying solely on episode-level advantages. SLEA-RL combines step-level retrieval with GiGPO-style step-level advantage estimation, providing fine-grained credit that identifies which specific actions benefit from which experiences.

Comparison with MemRL. MemRL (Zhang et al., 2026) integrates memory mechanisms directly into the RL optimization loop. Unlike SLEA-RL, which maintains an external experience library that evolves through semantic analysis, MemRL updates its memory bank through gradient-based optimization. While this approach allows end-to-end training, it conflates memory quality with policy quality—if the policy degrades, memory updates may also degrade. SLEA-RL decouples these concerns: the experience library evolves through quality-controlled semantic extraction (score-based admission, novelty checking), independent of gradient updates, providing more stable knowledge accumulation.

Comparison with prompt-based memory methods. Methods such as Mem0 (Chhikara et al., 2025), ExpeL (Zhao et al., 2024), MemP (Fang et al., 2025), and SimpleMem (Liu et al., 2026) maintain external memory stores that guide agent

behavior through in-context retrieval. These approaches operate without parameter updates, relying entirely on the base model’s ability to leverage retrieved context. While effective for rapid adaptation, they cannot fundamentally improve the policy’s decision-making capabilities. Hybrid approaches (Mem0+GRPO, SimpleMem+GRPO) combine memory with RL training but still retrieve at the task level. SLEA-RL differs by (i) performing step-level retrieval conditioned on the evolving observation, (ii) using quality-controlled library evolution with score-based admission rather than unconstrained memory accumulation, and (iii) integrating multi-level credit assignment that exploits the same observation clustering used for retrieval.

Comparison with search-augmented RL. For search-augmented QA (Kwiatkowski et al., 2019; Joshi et al., 2017; Mallen et al., 2023; Yang et al., 2018; Ho et al., 2020; Trivedi et al., 2022; Press et al., 2023), Search-R1 (Jin et al., 2025) trains agents to iteratively search and reason using RL with verifiable rewards. ZeroSearch (Sun et al., 2025) and StepSearch (Zheng et al., 2025b) extend this paradigm with zero-shot and step-level search strategies, respectively. EvolveR (Wu et al., 2025) introduces evolving retrieval during training. These methods focus on improving the retrieval component of the agent, whereas SLEA-RL augments the agent with accumulated *experiences*—distilled strategies and warnings from past episodes—providing complementary guidance that helps the agent reason more effectively over retrieved documents.

H Broader Impact and Potential Risks

SLEA-RL improves the ability of agents to learn from accumulated experience, which can benefit applications requiring multi-step reasoning and decision-making, such as virtual assistants, scientific discovery, and automation. However, the framework may also amplify biases or errors present in the collected trajectories, as these are distilled into reusable experiences and reused across tasks. In addition, experience reuse could lead to over-reliance on past patterns, reducing adaptability in novel or adversarial settings. The increased computational cost of step-level retrieval may further limit accessibility. Careful curation of experience data, monitoring of failure cases, and efficiency improvements are important to mitigate these risks.

I Main results tables

Table 4: Performance on ALFWorld and WebShop. We report average success rate (%) for ALFWorld subtasks and overall, and both average score and success rate (%) for WebShop. *: results from Feng et al. (2025). Best and second best in **bold** and underline.

Type	Method	ALFWorld						WebShop		
		Pick	Look	Clean	Heat	Cool	Pick2	All	Score	Succ.
<i>Closed-Source LLMs</i>										
	GPT-4o	75.3	60.8	31.2	56.7	21.6	49.8	48.0	31.8	23.7
	Gemini-2.5-Pro	92.8	63.3	62.1	69.0	26.6	58.7	60.3	42.5	35.9
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct: Prompt / Memory Methods</i>										
	ReAct*	48.5	35.4	34.3	13.2	18.2	17.6	31.2	46.2	19.5
	Reflexion*	62.0	41.6	44.9	30.9	36.3	23.8	42.7	58.1	28.8
	Mem0	54.0	55.0	26.9	36.4	20.8	7.69	33.6	23.9	2.00
	ExpeL	21.0	67.0	55.0	52.0	71.0	6.00	46.3	30.9	11.2
	MemP	54.3	38.5	48.1	56.2	32.0	16.7	41.4	25.3	6.40
	SimpleMem	64.5	33.3	20.0	12.5	33.3	3.84	29.7	33.2	8.59
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct: RL Methods</i>										
	RLOO*	87.6	<u>78.2</u>	87.3	81.3	71.9	48.9	75.5	80.3	65.7
	GRPO*	90.8	<u>66.1</u>	89.3	74.7	72.5	64.7	77.6	79.3	66.1
	GiGPO*	<u>97.7</u>	82.7	<u>98.8</u>	83.7	89.3	79.2	90.8	84.4	72.8
	MemRL	62.8	38.5	22.2	12.5	8.00	0.00	21.4	29.5	9.20
	Mem0+GRPO	78.1	54.8	56.1	31.0	65.0	26.9	54.7	58.1	37.5
	SimpleMem+GRPO	89.5	36.3	60.0	50.0	64.9	26.3	62.5	67.8	46.9
	R ³ L	–	–	–	–	–	–	94.8	–	75.7
	SkillRL	97.9	71.4	90.0	90.0	<u>95.5</u>	<u>87.5</u>	<u>89.9</u>	<u>85.2</u>	<u>72.7</u>
	SLEA-RL	98.5	85.1	99.0	93.8	96.4	90.4	93.5	87.6	76.3
<i>Qwen2.5-1.5B-Instruct</i>										
	GRPO*	85.3	53.7	84.5	78.2	59.7	53.5	72.8	75.8	56.8
	GiGPO*	<u>94.4</u>	67.5	<u>94.8</u>	<u>94.4</u>	79.8	<u>76.4</u>	<u>86.7</u>	83.1	65.0
	SLEA-RL	92.6	80.0	96.2	94.7	95.0	76.5	87.5	88.7	75.4

Table 5: Performance on search-augmented QA tasks. SLEA-RL is trained on NQ and HotpotQA. †: in-domain datasets. Best and second best among RL methods in **bold** and underline.

Type	Method	Single-Hop QA				Multi-Hop QA			Avg.
		NQ [†]	TriviaQA	PopQA	HotpotQA [†]	2Wiki	MuSiQue	Bamboogle	
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct: Prompting Methods</i>									
	Qwen2.5	11.6	35.6	14.4	1.20	16.4	4.80	22.2	15.2
	CoT	12.8	35.6	24.0	3.80	16.2	6.60	22.6	17.4
	RAG	27.4	58.2	16.8	17.8	25.8	9.40	23.2	25.5
	Search-o1	19.4	40.6	30.4	11.4	17.0	8.60	27.0	22.1
	R1-Instruct	21.0	44.9	19.2	17.1	20.8	6.00	27.5	22.4
	Search-R1	39.3	61.0	36.8	39.7	37.0	14.6	40.1	38.5
	ZeroSearch	43.6	61.8	27.8	51.5	34.6	18.4	35.2	39.1
	EvolveR	43.5	63.4	54.4	44.6	38.2	15.6	42.0	43.1
<i>Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct</i>									
	RLOO	40.7	72.5	43.1	49.6	55.0	62.2	24.8	49.7
	PPO	38.7	75.4	48.7	48.6	59.7	63.4	26.2	51.5
	GRPO	40.3	77.0	49.6	48.9	57.7	65.1	25.0	51.9
	Reinforce++	34.3	67.5	44.3	45.9	54.5	61.2	23.7	47.3
	GSPO	41.5	77.7	45.4	46.3	60.1	67.6	25.4	52.0
	GiGPO	46.4	64.7	46.1	41.6	43.6	18.9	68.9	47.2
	IGPO	<u>46.7</u>	80.1	52.5	<u>57.2</u>	<u>68.2</u>	31.4	74.9	<u>58.7</u>
	SkillRL	45.9	<u>63.3</u>	73.8	45.9	43.2	20.2	40.3	47.1
	SLEA-RL	48.5	81.8	<u>55.2</u>	59.8	70.5	77.2	33.2	60.9