

MobileForge: Annotation-Free Adaptation for Mobile GUI Agents with Hierarchical Feedback-Guided Policy Optimization

Guangyi Liu^{1,2,*}, Pengxiang Zhao^{1,2,*}, Gao Wu^{1,2,*}, Yiwen Yin^{2,3,*}, Mading Li^{2,†}
 Liang Liu¹, Congxiao Liu^{1,2}, Zhang Qi², Mengyan Wang², Liang Guo², Yong Liu^{1,§}

¹Zhejiang University ²Kuaishou Technology ³Tsinghua University

Project Page: mobile-forge.github.io
 Code: github.com/kwai/MobileForge

Datasets: [lgy0404/mobileforge-datasets](https://github.com/lgy0404/mobileforge-datasets)
 Models: [lgy0404/mobileforge-models](https://github.com/lgy0404/mobileforge-models)

Abstract

MLLM-based mobile GUI agents have made substantial progress in UI understanding and action execution, but adapting them to real target apps remains costly because mobile apps are numerous, frequently updated, and hard to cover with human-written tasks, demonstrations, or reward labels. Existing annotation-free GUI learning reduces manual supervision, yet lacks a unified substrate connecting target-app exploration, curriculum mining, rollout execution, and feedback, while policy optimization often relies on isolated rollouts and coarse rewards that are hard to convert into reliable improvement signals. We present **MobileForge**, an annotation-free adaptation system for mobile GUI agents. MOBILEFORGE consists of **MobileGym**, which grounds task generation and rollout evaluation in real mobile app interaction, and **Hierarchical Feedback-Guided Policy Optimization (HiFPO)**, which turns trajectory outcomes, step-level process feedback, and corrective hints into hint-contextualized step-level GRPO updates. Using only automatically generated annotation-free adaptation data, MOBILEFORGE adapts Qwen3-VL-8B to 67.2% Pass@3 on AndroidWorld, close to the closed-data GUI-specialized GUI-Owl-1.5-8B base model at 69.0%. The MobileForge-adapted ForgeOwl-8B further reaches 77.6% Pass@3 on AndroidWorld and 41.0% success on the out-of-domain MobileWorld GUI-only split, establishing the strongest open-data mobile GUI agent in our evaluation. Code, data, and trained models will be released at <https://mobile-forge.github.io/>.




Figure 1 Main performance of MobileForge. MOBILEFORGE scales with generated AndroidWorld tasks, improves in-domain AndroidWorld performance, and transfers to the MobileWorld GUI-only split.

*Equal contribution. †Project lead.
 §Corresponding author.




Figure 2 Motivation and overview of MobileForge. Existing annotation-free GUI learning lacks a unified adaptation substrate and relies on isolated sparse-reward rollouts. MOBILEFORGE combines MOBILEGYM for target-app exploration, task mining, and hierarchical feedback with HiFPO for hint-guided rollout, step selection, and hint-contextualized GRPO.

1 Introduction

MLLM-based mobile GUI agents have made substantial progress in UI understanding and action execution [4, 5, 7, 19, 23]. However, real deployment requires adaptation beyond fixed benchmarks. Mobile apps are numerous and fast-changing, making human-written tasks, expert demonstrations, and manual reward labels costly and quickly stale [13, 16, 21, 22]. This motivates annotation-free adaptation, where an agent discovers target-app functions, attempts executable tasks, evaluates behavior, and improves from the experience.

Recent annotation-free GUI agent work has reduced human supervision. TongUI mines supervision from web tutorials [22], MobileA3gent uses decentralized user-phone trajectories [16], OS-Genesis synthesizes GUI tasks through reverse task construction [13], and GUI-explorer mines transition-aware interaction knowledge through autonomous exploration [18]. ZeroGUI and MobileGUI-RL study automatic reward estimation and online reinforcement learning [12, 21], while SEAgent, ACuRL, and UI-Oceanus explore self-evolving, continual, or synthetic-environment scaling for broader computer-use agents [14, 17, 20]. Appendix A provides a taxonomy.

Despite these advances, two bottlenecks still limit mobile target-app adaptation. **(I)** Existing methods **lack a unified mobile substrate** connecting target-app exploration, curriculum mining, rollout execution, and feedback, so generated tasks may be weakly grounded and evaluator feedback may remain detached from policy learning. **(II)** Policy optimization often treats rollouts as **isolated experiences with sparse reward**; even with step-level assessment, current loops rarely combine outcomes, process feedback, and corrective hints to accumulate reusable experience beyond the initial policy’s capability boundary. Figure 2 illustrates these bottlenecks and our solution.

Research question. *Can we build an annotation-free adaptation system for mobile GUI agents that grounds tasks in target-app interaction, generates fine-grained feedback, and converts self-collected experience into policy-improvement signals without human-written tasks, demonstrations, or reward labels?*

We introduce **MobileForge**, an annotation-free adaptation system with hierarchical feedback-guided policy optimization. **(i) MobileGym** is the interaction and evaluation substrate: MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM mines executable tasks from target-app traces, while MOBILEGYM-CRITIC evaluates rollouts with outcome feedback, step-level feedback, and corrective hints. **(ii) Hierarchical Feedback-Guided Policy Optimization (HiFPO)** schedules hint-guided attempts, filters tasks and steps with hierarchical feedback, and trains the policy with hint-contextualized step-level GRPO.

We evaluate MOBILEFORGE on AndroidWorld [10] as the in-domain setting and MobileWorld GUI-only [6] as the out-of-domain setting, with no MobileWorld rollout used for training. As shown in Figure 1, annotation-free adaptation narrows the gap to closed-data GUI-specialized agents: Qwen3-VL-8B [1] reaches 67.2% Pass@3 on AndroidWorld using generated adaptation data, close to the GUI-Owl-1.5-8B [19] base model at 69.0%. MOBILEFORGE further improves GUI-Owl, yielding ForgeOwl-8B with 77.6% Pass@3 on AndroidWorld and 41.0% success on MobileWorld GUI-only, the strongest open-data mobile GUI agent in our evaluation.

Contributions. **(1)** We identify two bottlenecks in annotation-free mobile GUI adaptation: the lack of a unified target-app interaction and evaluation substrate, and isolated rollouts with coarse feedback for policy optimization. **(2)** We propose **MobileGym**, which grounds exploration, curriculum mining, rollout execution, and hierarchical evaluation in real mobile app interaction. **(3)** We propose **Hierarchical Feedback-Guided Policy Optimization (HiFPO)**, which transforms multi-attempt feedback and corrective hints into hint-contextualized step-level GRPO updates. **(4)** We show that MOBILEFORGE improves generalist and GUI-specialized agents, transfers from AndroidWorld to MobileWorld GUI-only, and yields ForgeOwl-8B, the strongest open-data mobile GUI agent in our evaluation.

2 MobileForge

MOBILEFORGE is an annotation-free adaptation system for mobile GUI agents. We consider a setting where target mobile apps and an initial GUI policy are available, but no human-written tasks, expert demonstrations, or reward labels are provided for those apps. The system therefore needs to ground task generation in real target-app interaction, collect rollout experience, evaluate its own behavior, and update the policy from the resulting feedback. Figure 3 illustrates the overall loop.

MobileForge = MobileGym + HiFPO




Figure 3 Overview of MobileForge.

2.1 Problem Setup

We model mobile GUI control as sequential decision making over observed GUI states. Let $x \in \mathcal{T}$ denote a generated task. For attempt k on task x and step t , the policy receives a *decision state*

$$s_k^{(t)} = (x, I_k^{(t)}, \mathcal{H}_k^{(t)}, \eta_{<k}), \quad (1)$$

where $I_k^{(t)}$ is the screenshot observation, $\mathcal{H}_k^{(t)}$ is the interaction history, and $\eta_{<k}$ is the corrective hint context accumulated from earlier attempts of the same task. The policy emits a structured GUI action

$$a_k^{(t)} = (\alpha_k^{(t)}, \psi_k^{(t)}) \sim \pi_\theta(\cdot | s_k^{(t)}), \quad (2)$$

where α is the action type, such as tap, swipe, type, wait, terminate, answer, or system navigation, and ψ contains the corresponding arguments, such as coordinates, direction, text, or termination status. A rollout attempt is the sequence

$$\tau_k = (s_k^{(1)}, a_k^{(1)}, \dots, s_k^{(T_k)}, a_k^{(T_k)}). \quad (3)$$

The environment does not provide a dense scalar reward during rollout. Instead, MOBILEGYM-CRITIC evaluates a completed attempt and returns labels and hints. We reserve R for the numeric action reward used later by GRPO, and use z and ℓ for evaluator feedback labels. This distinction is important: MOBILEFORGE first converts attempts into structured feedback, then converts selected steps into policy-optimization rewards.

MOBILEFORGE contains the two coupled components introduced in Section 1. MOBILEGYM is the interaction and evaluation substrate: it explores target apps, mines executable tasks, executes rollouts, and evaluates completed rollouts through a hierarchical critic. HiFPO is the adaptation algorithm: it schedules hint-guided attempts over the MobileGym curriculum, filters tasks and steps with hierarchical feedback, and updates the policy with hint-contextualized step-level GRPO. The loop can be summarized as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{Z} &\leftarrow \text{Explore}(\mathcal{E}), \\
 \mathcal{T} &\leftarrow \text{Curriculum}(\mathcal{Z}), \\
 \{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^K &\leftarrow \text{Rollout}(\pi_\theta, x, \eta_{<k}), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{T}, \\
 \mathcal{F}_k &\leftarrow \text{Critic}(x, \tau_k), \\
 \mathcal{D} &\leftarrow \text{HiFPO}(\mathcal{T}, \tau, \mathcal{F}), \\
 \theta' &\leftarrow \text{GRPO}(\theta, \mathcal{D}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4}$$

Here \mathcal{Z} is exploration evidence, \mathcal{T} is the generated curriculum, \mathcal{F}_k is hierarchical feedback for attempt τ_k on task x , and \mathcal{D} is the filtered step-level training set. Appendix B provides the full notation table (Table 9) and a compact pseudocode summary of the adaptation loop (Algorithm 1).

2.2 MobileGym: Building an Adaptation Substrate

MOBILEGYM answers the question: *where do executable tasks and rollout feedback come from without human-written tasks, demonstrations, or reward labels?* It turns target-app interaction into three artifacts needed by policy learning: exploration evidence, executable tasks, and hierarchical evaluation of completed rollouts. Figure 4 summarizes this substrate. Importantly, MOBILEGYM is the substrate and evaluator; the strategy for running multiple attempts and reusing hints belongs to HiFPO.




Figure 4 MobileGym as the annotation-free adaptation substrate. MOBILEGYM grounds adaptation in real target-app interaction: it explores reachable GUI states, mines trajectory-grounded tasks through MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM, and evaluates completed attempts with MOBILEGYM-CRITIC to produce trajectory-level outcomes, step-level process feedback, and corrective hints.

2.2.1 Target-App Exploration

MOBILEFORGE first explores each target app directly. We use a function-aware exploration strategy inspired by GUI-explorer [18]: app-level structural anchors, such as activities declared in the APK, are combined with the current screenshot to generate goal-oriented exploration tasks. The explorer then pursues these goals

with depth-first traversal, restoring parent states when branching and recording the resulting interactions. Exploration is not treated as expert demonstration. Its role is to discover reachable screens, UI affordances, and app functions, giving the system an app-grounded basis for task generation instead of relying on generic assumptions about what an app might support. Appendix F provides more details.

Each explored transition records the before/after screens, executed action, target element, and a short natural-language summary. These transition records form \mathcal{Z} , the evidence pool used by the curriculum stage.

2.2.2 MobileGym-Curriculum

MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM converts exploration evidence into executable tasks. For each explored trajectory, it checks whether the observed behavior is coherent and whether the intended function appears completed. It then generates task variants grounded in the same reachable app states and functions.

We write a generated task as

$$x = (\iota, B, c, v, p), \quad (5)$$

where ι is the instruction, B is an estimated step budget, c is the core functionality, v is the variation type, and p describes prerequisites. The schema is lightweight by design; the key property is that each task is grounded in observed app behavior. The curriculum prompt jointly evaluates the explored trajectory and asks for self-contained task variants; Appendix G.1 shows the core template.

2.2.3 Hierarchical Rollout Evaluation

Given a completed rollout attempt τ_k for task x , MOBILEGYM-CRITIC produces hierarchical feedback:

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \left(z_k, \{\ell_k^{(t)}\}_{t=1}^{T_k}, h_k \right). \quad (6)$$

MOBILEGYM-CRITIC is implemented as an agentic hierarchical evaluator rather than a learned reward model. It first converts the raw execution log into visual action traces: each step is rendered as an action-centered screenshot, and a VLM describes the performed action and task-relevant screen evidence. A final decision model then receives the task, raw action logs, step descriptions, and a stitched view of the last screenshots, and returns a structured JSON verdict. Appendix G.2 shows the core prompts.

The trajectory outcome label $z_k \in \{0, 1\}$ is the final decision field: $z_k = 1$ means that the attempt completed the task, while $z_k = 0$ means failure. The evaluator also reports task feasibility, a failure step when applicable, and a natural-language reason. The step-level process label $\ell_k^{(t)}$ summarizes the local quality of step t . We represent it as

$$\ell_k^{(t)} = (v_k^{(t)}, e_k^{(t)}), \quad (7)$$

where $v_k^{(t)} \in \{0, 1\}$ is derived from the evaluator’s reasonable/unreasonable step tag, and $e_k^{(t)}$ is the step-level rationale. The corrective hint h_k is generated when an attempt fails or contains unreasonable steps; it summarizes key mistakes, what to avoid, suggested alternatives, and important task insights. HiFPO decides how to reuse this hint in later rollouts and training prompts.

This hierarchy separates three roles that are often collapsed into one signal. Outcome labels decide whether a task is solved. Process labels identify useful local decisions inside both successful and failed attempts. Hints carry reusable failure information across attempts and into training prompts.




Figure 5 HiFPO converts hierarchical feedback into policy updates. HiFPO performs hint-guided multi-attempt rollout, removes mastered all-success tasks, retains difficult and partially solved tasks, extracts reasonable local steps from hierarchical feedback, and trains the policy with hint-contextualized step-level GRPO.

2.3 HiFPO: Feedback-Guided Policy Optimization

HiFPO answers the question: *how can self-collected rollout experience become effective policy-improvement signals instead of isolated attempts with sparse feedback?* Figure 5 shows the pipeline. HiFPO first runs hint-guided multi-attempt rollouts over the MOBILEGYM curriculum, calls MOBILEGYM-CRITIC to evaluate completed attempts, removes tasks already mastered by the current policy, selects informative attempts and reasonable local steps, and finally trains with hint-contextualized step-level GRPO.

2.3.1 Hint-Guided Multi-Attempt Rollout

For each generated task, HiFPO runs K attempts. Attempts of the same task are serialized so that feedback from earlier attempts can condition later attempts, while different tasks can be collected in parallel. Before attempt k , HiFPO builds a hint context $\eta_{<k}$ from corrective hints produced by MOBILEGYM-CRITIC on attempts $1, \dots, k-1$:

$$\eta_{<k} = \text{Aggregate}(h_1, \dots, h_{k-1}). \quad (8)$$

The next attempt is sampled as

$$\tau_k \sim \text{Rollout}(\pi_\theta, x, \eta_{<k}). \quad (9)$$

MOBILEGYM provides the interaction substrate and MOBILEGYM-CRITIC evaluation for each completed attempt; HiFPO controls the repeated-attempt protocol and decides how hints are accumulated and reused. This separation keeps MOBILEGYM focused on target-app interaction and hierarchical evaluation, while HiFPO defines the feedback-guided optimization behavior. Figure 6 illustrates how corrective hints from earlier attempts are reused to guide later attempts.

In implementation, the hint context is appended to the task instruction before the next attempt, while the agent’s ordinary screenshot and history fields remain unchanged. For Qwen3-VL, the step prompt follows this protocol:

```
The user query: {task instruction}
{evaluation hints from previous attempts}
Task progress: {previous step conclusions}
<image>
```

Instruction: Using the Audio Recorder app, create a new recording named 'To Be Restored'. Delete the recording, then navigate to the trash and restore it to the main recordings list.




Figure 6 Example of corrective hints improving rollout. A failed or partial attempt can still expose useful app knowledge. MOBILEGYM-CRITIC summarizes the failure as a compact hint, and later attempts use the hint to avoid repeated mistakes and complete the task more reliably.

Appendix G.3 gives the core rollout prompt templates for Qwen3-VL and GUI-Owl.

2.3.2 Task Filtering by Multi-Attempt Success

For each task, HiFPO computes the empirical success rate across attempts:

$$\text{SR}(x) = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K z_k. \quad (10)$$

Tasks with $\text{SR}(x) = 1$ are removed because the current policy already solves them consistently. Tasks with $\text{SR}(x) = 0$ or $0 < \text{SR}(x) < 1$ are retained. This choice is deliberate: all-fail tasks can still contain correct local navigation or UI-recognition steps, while partially solved tasks expose unstable decisions that are valuable for adaptation.

2.3.3 Trajectory and Step Selection

For every step, we define a reasonable-step indicator from the process label:

$$\chi_k^{(t)} = \mathbb{I}[v_k^{(t)} = 1]. \quad (11)$$

The local quality score of an attempt is the fraction of reasonable steps:

$$Q_k = \frac{1}{T_k} \sum_{t=1}^{T_k} \chi_k^{(t)}. \quad (12)$$

For a retained task, HiFPO selects one informative attempt:

$$k^*(x) = \begin{cases} \arg \max_{k: z_k=1} Q_k, & \exists k, z_k = 1, \\ \arg \max_k Q_k, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Thus, if any attempt succeeds, training uses the successful attempt with the cleanest local process feedback; if all attempts fail, training still uses the failure with the highest fraction of locally reasonable steps.

The step-level training set keeps only reasonable local decisions from the selected attempt:

$$\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{T} \\ \text{SR}(x) < 1}} \{(s_{k^*(x)}^{(t)}, a_{k^*(x)}^{(t)}) \mid \chi_{k^*(x)}^{(t)} = 1\}. \quad (14)$$

Within each set in the union, $s_k^{(t)}$, $a_k^{(t)}$, and $\chi_k^{(t)}$ refer to the rollouts of the current task x . This converts long-horizon mobile trajectories into dense step-level supervision while avoiding the mistake of reinforcing every action in a failed rollout.

2.3.4 Hint-Contextualized Step-Level GRPO

After task and step filtering, each training example is a selected local decision rather than a full trajectory. We write it as $d_j = (s_j, a_j^*) \in \mathcal{D}$, where $a_j^* = (\alpha_j^*, \psi_j^*)$ is the target GUI action selected from a rollout by hierarchical feedback. GRPO was originally introduced as a critic-free policy optimization method that normalizes rewards within a group of responses to the same prompt [11]. Several recent GUI-agent studies adapt this recipe to GUI action prediction by sampling multiple action responses and scoring them with rule-based GUI rewards [9, 12]. HiFPO keeps this group-relative optimization principle, but changes the state on which GRPO operates: the policy is trained on a GUI step augmented with the corrective hint context that was available to the corresponding attempt.

For each sample, the decision state s_j contains the generated task, screenshot observation, interaction history, and corrective hint context η_j . We render it into a hint-contextualized prompt

$$\tilde{s}_j = \text{Prompt}(s_j). \quad (15)$$

If no earlier hint exists, $\eta_j = \emptyset$ and \tilde{s}_j reduces to the ordinary step prompt. Otherwise, the prompt exposes compact feedback about what was missed, what should be avoided, or what should be tried next.

The hint is an input condition, not an additional reward term. Thus all responses in the same GRPO group are compared under the same feedback-aware state \tilde{s}_j , and the group comparison asks which action is best *given the available correction*. In contrast, a standard step-level GRPO update for GUI action prediction compares actions only under the current screenshot, task, and history. HiFPO therefore makes the group-relative comparison conditional on reusable feedback accumulated across attempts.

For each hint-contextualized step, the old policy samples a group of G candidate responses:

$$\hat{o}_{j,g} \sim \pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\cdot \mid \tilde{s}_j), \quad g = 1, \dots, G. \quad (16)$$

Each response is parsed into a structured GUI action $\hat{a}_{j,g} = \text{Parse}(\hat{o}_{j,g}) = (\hat{\alpha}_{j,g}, \hat{\psi}_{j,g})$. Unparseable responses receive zero action reward. For parseable responses, we use an adaptive GUI action reward that separates action type from action arguments:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{j,g}^{\text{type}} &= \mathbb{I}[\hat{\alpha}_{j,g} = \alpha_j^*], \\ r_{j,g}^{\text{arg}} &= r_{j,g}^{\text{type}} S_{\alpha_j^*}(\hat{\psi}_{j,g}, \psi_j^*), \\ R_{j,g} &= \lambda_{\text{type}} r_{j,g}^{\text{type}} + \lambda_{\text{arg}} r_{j,g}^{\text{arg}}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $\lambda_{\text{type}}, \lambda_{\text{arg}} \geq 0$ are reward weights. The type score checks whether the predicted action belongs to the same canonical mobile action as the selected step. The argument score $S_{\alpha_j} \in [0, 1]$ is evaluated only when the type is correct, which prevents a wrong action type from receiving credit through accidentally similar parameters. We instantiate S_{α} according to the action semantics: point-in-box or distance-based coordinate matching for click and long-press actions, direction matching for swipes, token-level text similarity for typing or answering, button identity for system actions, status matching for termination actions, and name matching for app-opening or key actions. Wait actions receive full parameter credit after the action type is correct because their training targets do not require an additional argument. Appendix H provides the concrete rule-based scoring details. The scalar $R_{j,g}$ is the reward optimized by GRPO; it is distinct from the evaluator labels z, ℓ and from the hint context η_j .

Rewards are normalized within the response group of the same hint-contextualized step. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_j &= \frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G R_{j,g}, \\ \sigma_j &= \sqrt{\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G (R_{j,g} - \mu_j)^2}.\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

The group-relative advantage is

$$A_{j,g} = \frac{R_{j,g} - \mu_j}{\sigma_j + \epsilon_{\text{std}}}.\tag{19}$$

HiFPO then applies a clipped GRPO update with KL regularization to a reference policy. The response-level importance ratio is

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{j,g}(\theta) &= \frac{\pi_{\theta}(\hat{o}_{j,g} | \tilde{s}_j)}{\pi_{\theta_{\text{old}}}(\hat{o}_{j,g} | \tilde{s}_j)}, \\ \bar{\rho}_{j,g}(\theta) &= \text{clip}(\rho_{j,g}(\theta), 1 - \epsilon_{\text{clip}}, 1 + \epsilon_{\text{clip}}).\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

The resulting loss is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{HiFPO}}(\theta) &= -\mathbb{E}_{j,g} [\min(\rho_{j,g} A_{j,g}, \bar{\rho}_{j,g} A_{j,g})] \\ &\quad + \beta \mathbb{E}_j [D_j^{\text{KL}}(\theta)].\end{aligned}\tag{21}$$

Here $D_j^{\text{KL}}(\theta)$ denotes $D_{\text{KL}}(\pi_{\theta}(\cdot | \tilde{s}_j) \| \pi_{\text{ref}}(\cdot | \tilde{s}_j))$, and $\rho_{j,g}, \bar{\rho}_{j,g}$ abbreviate the ratios in Equation 20. In short, HiFPO does not replace GRPO with a new optimizer. It makes GRPO step-aware and feedback-aware: trajectory and process feedback choose which local actions become training targets, corrective hints define the conditioning context, and the adaptive GUI reward supplies a verifiable group-relative signal for the sampled actions.

3 Experiments

3.1 Experimental Protocol

Benchmarks. We evaluate annotation-free adaptation in two settings. AndroidWorld [10] is the in-domain setting: MOBILEFORGE explores the AndroidWorld app ecosystem, mines adaptation tasks, collects HiFPO rollouts, and evaluates on 116 AndroidWorld tasks with Pass@1, Pass@2, and Pass@3. MobileWorld GUI-only [6] is the out-of-domain setting: we evaluate on its 117-task split and use no MobileWorld rollout, task, or feedback for adaptation.

Base agents and adaptation data. We use two 8B-scale instruct base agents: the open generalist Qwen3-VL-8B and the GUI-specialized GUI-Owl-1.5-8B [1, 19]. MOBILEFORGE generates 3,249 AndroidWorld-side candidate tasks grounded in 527 source trajectory identifiers from 20 apps. To study scaling under realistic compute constraints, we train with 200-, 400-, and 900-task subsets. The main 900-task 8B runs use eight NVIDIA 80GB GPUs and take roughly 80 hours. Appendix E gives the annotation-free adaptation data details, including the generated-task distribution, and Appendix I gives training hyperparameters and reward curves.

Table 1 AndroidWorld in-domain adaptation and scaling results. Pass@ k is computed over 116 tasks. Easy/Medium/Hard report single-attempt success rates by task difficulty. Overall Avg. is the mean of Pass@1/2/3 and Easy/Medium/Hard. Within each base-agent block, best values are bolded and second-best values are underlined. Relative-gain rows compare the 900-task model with the corresponding base agent.

Base Agent	Tasks	Pass@ k Level			Task Difficulty Level			Overall Avg.
		Pass@1	Pass@2	Pass@3	Easy	Medium	Hard	
Qwen3-VL-8B	0	47/116 (40.5%)	57/116 (49.1%)	64/116 (55.2%)	44.8%	35.2%	19.3%	40.7%
Qwen3-VL-8B	200	55/116 (47.4%)	64/116 (55.2%)	71/116 (61.2%)	59.0%	32.4%	12.3%	44.6%
Qwen3-VL-8B	400	61/116 (52.6%)	69/116 (59.5%)	73/116 (62.9%)	59.0%	38.9%	14.0%	47.8%
Qwen3-VL-8B	900	<u>59/116 (50.9%)</u>	70/116 (60.3%)	78/116 (67.2%)	61.2%	41.7%	<u>17.5%</u>	49.8%
<i>Rel. gain (900 vs. base)</i>		+25.7%	+22.8%	+21.9%	+36.6%	+18.5%	-9.3%	+22.4%
GUI-Owl-1.5-8B	0	65/116 (56.0%)	79/116 (68.1%)	80/116 (69.0%)	66.7%	50.0%	19.3%	54.9%
GUI-Owl-1.5-8B	200	<u>75/116 (64.7%)</u>	85/116 (73.3%)	86/116 (74.1%)	<u>73.2%</u>	51.4%	<u>28.1%</u>	60.8%
GUI-Owl-1.5-8B	400	<u>75/116 (64.7%)</u>	86/116 (74.1%)	90/116 (77.6%)	73.8%	59.3%	26.3%	<u>62.6%</u>
GUI-Owl-1.5-8B	900	78/116 (67.2%)	87/116 (75.0%)	90/116 (77.6%)	<u>73.2%</u>	<u>57.4%</u>	29.8%	63.4%
<i>Rel. gain (900 vs. base)</i>		+20.0%	+10.1%	+12.5%	+9.7%	+14.8%	+54.4%	+15.5%

Ablation protocol. The ablations isolate corrective hints during rollout, hint-contextualized GRPO versus SFT, task-level success-rate filtering, final-decision evaluator choice, and trajectory-grounded curriculum coverage.

3.2 Overall Performance

In-Domain Adaptation on AndroidWorld. Table 1 combines the main AndroidWorld results with the 200/400/900-task scaling study, and Figure 1(a) visualizes the same scaling trend. The headline result is that annotation-free adaptation brings the generalist Qwen3-VL-8B close to the closed-data GUI-specialized GUI-Owl-1.5-8B: the adapted model, ForgeQwen3-8B, reaches 67.2% Pass@3, nearly matching the GUI-Owl base result of 69.0%. The same loop also improves the stronger GUI-specialized agent. With 900 generated tasks, ForgeOwl-8B reaches 67.2% Pass@1 and 77.6% Pass@3. The difficulty columns show where the improvements come from: MOBILEFORGE consistently strengthens easy and medium tasks, and ForgeOwl-8B also improves hard-task single-attempt success from 19.3% to 29.8%.

Cross-Domain Generalization to MobileWorld. Table 2 reports out-of-domain MobileWorld GUI-only results. No MobileWorld rollout, task, or feedback is used for adaptation. ForgeOwl-8B reaches 41.0% success on the 117-task split, surpassing existing open-data mobile GUI agents and approaching much larger or closed-data GUI-specialized systems. ForgeQwen3-8B transfers more modestly, suggesting that out-of-domain generalization still depends strongly on the base agent’s mobile GUI competence.

Table 2 Out-of-domain MobileWorld GUI-only success rate on the 117-task split. External baseline numbers follow the GUI-only reporting protocol; MOBILEFORGE rows use AndroidWorld-derived adaptation data only. Within each method group, best values are bolded and second-best values are underlined. Relative-gain rows compare each adapted model with its corresponding 8B base agent.

Agent	GUI-Only SR (%)
Open-weight GUI / VLM agents	
GUI-Owl-1.5-32B [19]	43.9
MAI-UI-235B-A22B [23]	39.7
GUI-Owl-1.5-8B [19]	37.6
MAI-UI-32B [23]	36.2
GUI-Owl-1.5-2B [19]	32.2
MAI-UI-8B [23]	27.5
Qwen3-VL-235B-Thinking [1]	14.5
Qwen3-VL-235B [1]	12.8
Qwen3-VL-32B [1]	11.9
Qwen3-VL-8B [1]	7.6
Open-data mobile GUI agents	
OpenMobile-8B [2]	17.7
ClawGUI-2B [15]	17.1
OpenMobile-7B [2]	14.8
ScaleCUA-7B [8]	7.7
ForgeQwen3-8B (<i>Ours</i>)	10.3
<i>Rel. gain over Qwen3-VL-8B</i>	+35.5%
ForgeOwl-8B (<i>Ours</i>)	41.0
<i>Rel. gain over GUI-Owl-1.5-8B</i>	+9.0%

Insight 1. MOBILEFORGE improves both generalist and GUI-specialized agents. Its strongest checkpoint, ForgeOwl-8B, achieves the strongest open-data mobile GUI agent result in our evaluation while using only AndroidWorld-side annotation-free adaptation data.

3.3 Ablation Analysis

Table 3 Trajectory-level rollout ablation on 200 generated tasks with Qwen3-VL-8B. Corrective hints are generated from previous attempts of the same task.

Metric	No Hint Context	With Corrective Hints	Gain
Overall success	52.0%	77.0%	+25.0 pp
Pass@1	30.5%	44.5%	+14.0 pp
Pass@2	42.5%	64.0%	+21.5 pp
Pass@3	49.0%	72.5%	+23.5 pp
Pass@4	52.0%	77.0%	+25.0 pp
Avg. steps / attempt	18.4	17.2	-1.2
Total steps (success only)	2,593	4,711	+2,118

Ablation on corrective rollout hints. We remove the corrective hint context from repeated rollout while keeping the same 200 generated tasks. As shown in Table 3, corrective hints improve overall rollout success from 52.0% to 77.0%, Pass@3 from 49.0% to 72.5%, and reduce the average steps per attempt. The ablation

confirms that multi-attempt rollout becomes useful because feedback accumulates across attempts, not merely because the policy samples more attempts.

Insight 2. Corrective hints are the bridge between repeated exploration and reusable experience.

Table 4 Training objective ablation with Qwen3-VL-8B. AndroidWorld numbers report Pass@1 over 116 tasks. The best result is bolded and second-best results are underlined.

Method	Tasks	AndroidWorld Pass@1
Base	0	47/116 (40.5%)
No-hint SFT	200	40/116 (34.5%)
Hint SFT	200	53/116 (45.7%)
Hint-contextualized GRPO	200	<u>55/116 (47.4%)</u>
No-hint SFT	900	<u>51/116 (44.0%)</u>
Hint SFT	900	55/116 (47.4%)
Hint-contextualized GRPO	900	59/116 (50.9%)

Ablation on the training objective. We compare SFT and hint-contextualized GRPO on the same generated data, with and without corrective hints. Table 4 shows that no-hint SFT is weak and can fall below the base model. Hint SFT is better, but hint-contextualized GRPO is strongest at both 200 and 900 tasks, reaching 50.9% Pass@1 in the 900-task setting. This isolates the value of step-level group-relative optimization after the feedback-guided filtering stage.

Insight 3. Hint-contextualized GRPO is more effective than direct SFT on the same annotation-free adaptation data.

Table 5 Task-level success-rate filtering ablation. The final MOBILEFORGE design removes mastered all-success tasks and retains all-fail plus mixed tasks. Best values in result columns are bolded and second-best values are underlined.

Filter	SR Range	Samples	Tasks	AW	MW-GUI
Medium only	[0.1, 0.9]	1193	105	48.3%	<u>12/117</u>
Medium + simple	[0.1, 1.0]	1288	120	<u>46.6%</u>	15/117
Medium + hard	[0.0, 0.9]	1910	167	48.3%	15/117
All tasks	[0.0, 1.0]	2137	200	48.3%	10/117

Ablation on task filtering. We vary the task-level success-rate range used before step extraction. Table 5 shows that keeping all-fail and mixed tasks, corresponding to the [0.0, 0.9] range, gives the strongest combined AndroidWorld and MobileWorld result among the tested filters. Keeping all tasks admits mastered all-success tasks, while removing all-fail tasks discards useful local progress from difficult attempts.

Insight 4. The right filtering rule is not to remove failures; it is to remove mastered tasks and let step feedback recover useful local actions.

Ablation on the evaluator model. We replace the final-decision model used by MOBILEGYM-CRITIC while keeping the step-description model fixed. Table 6 shows that Gemini 2.5 Pro [3] gives the strongest 200-task result, but Qwen3-VL-8B as the decision model still improves the base policy from 40.5% to 44.8% Pass@1 and from 55.2% to 60.3% Pass@3. Thus, the improvement is not tied to a single proprietary evaluator.

Table 6 Final-decision model ablation for Qwen3-VL-8B in the 200-task hint-contextualized GRPO setting. The step-description model is kept fixed. Best values are bolded and second-best values are underlined.

Decision Model	Pass@1	Pass@2	Pass@3	MW-GUI
Base, no training	47/116	57/116	64/116	9/117
Gemini 2.5 Pro	55/116	<u>64/116</u>	71/116	15/117
Gemini 3.1 Pro Preview	<u>52/116</u>	<u>62/116</u>	69/116	<u>13/117</u>
Qwen3-VL-8B	<u>52/116</u>	67/116	<u>70/116</u>	<u>11/117</u>

Insight 5. A stronger evaluator helps, but the MOBILEFORGE feedback-to-optimization loop remains beneficial with a weaker open decision model.

Table 7 Functional coverage of Broccoli tasks. Percentages are relative to each generated curriculum.

Functionality	Landing-Screen Baseline		MobileForge Curriculum	
	Count	%	Count	%
Recipe creation	49	16.3	14	5.0
Recipe editing	42	14.0	35	12.5
Recipe deletion	82	27.3	4	1.4
Search and filter	25	8.3	38	13.6
Information retrieval / QA	32	10.7	20	7.1
Favorites	0	0.0	3	1.1
Shopping list	0	0.0	33	11.8
Cooking assistant	0	0.0	26	9.3
Meal planner	0	0.0	13	4.6
Settings and configuration	0	0.0	9	3.2
Media and sharing	0	0.0	8	2.9
Other	70	23.3	77	27.5
Total	300	100.0	280	100.0

Ablation on curriculum grounding. Table 7 compares the functional coverage of tasks generated from only the landing screen against trajectory-grounded MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM. The landing-screen baseline over-concentrates on recipe creation, editing, and deletion, with recipe deletion alone taking 27.3% of tasks. In contrast, MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM covers broader functions such as shopping lists, cooking assistant flows, meal planning, settings, and media sharing.

Insight 6. Exploration grounding matters because it broadens the curriculum beyond functions visible on the first screen.

3.4 Case Study and Error Analysis




Figure 7 Case study on AndroidWorld ExpenseDeleteMultiple2. The task asks the agent to delete three expenses from Pro Expense: Streaming Services, Unexpected Expenses, and Pet Supplies. The base Qwen3-VL-8B loses the task flow after an early deletion and gets stuck around the menu/sidebar. The adapted ForgeQwen3-8B follows the task-specific deletion workflow and removes all requested expenses.

Case Study. Figure 7 compares Qwen3-VL-8B and the adapted ForgeQwen3-8B on AndroidWorld ExpenseDeleteMultiple2. The base model reaches a deletion confirmation but then loses the task flow, repeatedly opening and closing the sidebar instead of continuing through the remaining requested expenses. After MOBILEFORGE adaptation, ForgeQwen3-8B follows the app-specific deletion pattern across multiple items and completes the requested removals. Additional paired trajectory comparisons in Appendix I and Figures 10, 11, and 12 show the same pattern across AndroidWorld and MobileWorld tasks. This example reflects the quantitative gains in Figure 1: adaptation mainly improves the agent’s ability to preserve task intent across repeated UI procedures.




Figure 8 AndroidWorld tag-wise failure-rate reduction. Each cell reports the reduction in attempt-level failure rate after MOBILEFORGE adaptation relative to the corresponding base agent; higher is better. Blue cells indicate fewer failures after adaptation, while orange cells indicate regressions.

Error Analysis. Figure 8 visualizes tag-wise failure-rate reduction relative to each base agent. Positive values indicate that MOBILEFORGE reduces failures after adaptation. The largest gains are concentrated in app-grounded UI skills such as verification, search, complex UI understanding, screen reading, repetition, and information retrieval. For example, ForgeQwen3-8B reduces verification failures by 38.1 percentage points, and ForgeOwl-8B reduces search failures by 6.0 percentage points. The remaining hard cases are also clear: game-playing stays unsolved, multi-app tasks do not improve, and memorization/math-counting tasks remain brittle. These failures point to missing long-horizon state, cross-app coordination, and non-standard task-rule coverage rather than simple UI grounding.

4 Conclusion

We presented MOBILEFORGE, an annotation-free adaptation system for mobile GUI agents. MOBILEFORGE addresses two bottlenecks in annotation-free GUI learning: the lack of a unified mobile adaptation substrate and the weakness of isolated rollouts with coarse or sparse feedback for long-horizon GUI tasks. MOBILEGYM grounds task generation and hierarchical rollout evaluation in real target-app interaction, while HiFPO performs multi-attempt hint-guided rollout and transforms evaluated attempts, step-level process feedback, and corrective hints into step-level GRPO updates. Experiments on AndroidWorld and MobileWorld show that MOBILEFORGE improves both an open generalist VLM and a strong GUI-specialized model, with ForgeOwl-8B achieving the strongest open-data mobile GUI agent result in our evaluation. Future work should extend the same feedback-guided adaptation loop to broader app ecosystems, longer multi-app workflows, and more explicit safety constraints for real user devices.

5 Limitations

MOBILEFORGE is still bounded by the app ecosystem explored during adaptation. Our main training data comes from AndroidWorld-side apps, so broader app coverage, longer multi-app workflows, persistent user state, and unusual task rules remain challenging. The current system also relies on automatic evaluator quality; stronger or more verifiable critics may further improve safety and reliability on real user devices.

References

- [1] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025.
- [2] Kanzhi Cheng, Zehao Li, Zheng Ma, Nuo Chen, Jialin Cao, Qiushi Sun, Zichen Ding, Fangzhi Xu, Hang Yan, Jiajun Chen, et al. OpenMobile: Building open mobile agents with task and trajectory synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.15093*, 2026.
- [3] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Noveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blistein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261*, 2025.
- [4] Changlong Gao, Zhangxuan Gu, Yulin Liu, Xinyu Qiu, Shuheng Shen, Yue Wen, Tianyu Xia, Zhenyu Xu, Zhengwen Zeng, Beitong Zhou, et al. Ui-venus-1.5 technical report. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv-2602, 2026.
- [5] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Jiazheng Xu, Wenmeng Yu, Junhui Ji, Yan Wang, Zihan Wang, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, et al. Cogagent: A visual language model for gui agents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14281–14290, 2024.
- [6] Quyu Kong, Xu Zhang, Zhenyu Yang, Nolan Gao, Chen Liu, Panrong Tong, Chenglin Cai, Hanzhang Zhou, Jianan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, et al. Mobileworld: Benchmarking autonomous mobile agents in agent-user interactive and mcp-augmented environments. *arXiv preprint*, 2026.
- [7] Guangyi Liu, Pengxiang Zhao, Yaozhen Liang, Liang Liu, Yaxuan Guo, Han Xiao, Weifeng Lin, Yuxiang Chai, Yue Han, Shuai Ren, et al. Llm-powered gui agents in phone automation: Surveying progress and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19838*, 2025.

- [8] Zhaoyang Liu, JingJing Xie, Zichen Ding, Zehao Li, Bowen Yang, Zhenyu Wu, Xuehui Wang, Qiushi Sun, Shi Liu, Weiyun Wang, et al. Scalecua: Scaling open-source computer use agents with cross-platform data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.15221*, 2025.
- [9] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.21620*, 2025.
- [10] Christopher Rawles, Sarah Clinckemaillie, Yifan Chang, Jonathan Waltz, Gabrielle Lau, Marybeth Fair, Alice Li, William Bishop, Wei Li, Folawiyo Campbell-Ajala, et al. Androidworld: A dynamic benchmarking environment for autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.14573*, 2024.
- [11] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [12] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05720*, 2025.
- [13] 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.
- [14] 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. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.04700*, 2025.
- [15] Fei Tang, Zhiqiong Lu, Boxuan Zhang, Weiming Lu, Jun Xiao, Yueting Zhuang, and Yongliang Shen. ClawGUI: A unified framework for training, evaluating, and deploying gui agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.11784*, 2026.
- [16] Wenhao Wang, Mengying Yuan, Zijie Yu, Guangyi Liu, Rui Ye, Tian Jin, Siheng Chen, and Yanfeng Wang. Mobilea3gent: Training mobile gui agents using decentralized self-sourced data from diverse users. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.02982*, 2025.
- [17] Mengzhou Wu, Yuzhe Guo, Yuan Cao, Haochuan Lu, Songhe Zhu, Pingzhe Qu, Xin Chen, Kang Qin, Zhongpu Wang, Xiaode Zhang, et al. Ui-oceanus: Scaling gui agents with synthetic environmental dynamics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.02345*, 2026.
- [18] Bin Xie, Rui Shao, Gongwei Chen, Kaiwen Zhou, Yinchuan Li, Jie Liu, Min Zhang, and Liqiang Nie. Gui-explorer: Autonomous exploration and mining of transition-aware knowledge for gui agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16827*, 2025.
- [19] Haiyang Xu, Xi Zhang, Haowei Liu, Junyang Wang, Zhaozai Zhu, Shengjie Zhou, Xuhao Hu, Feiyu Gao, Junjie Cao, Zihua Wang, et al. Mobile-agent-v3.5: Multi-platform fundamental gui agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.16855*, 2026.
- [20] Tianci Xue, Zeyi Liao, Tianneng Shi, Zilu Wang, Kai Zhang, Dawn Song, Yu Su, and Huan Sun. Autonomous continual learning of computer-use agents for environment adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.10356*, 2026.
- [21] Chenyu Yang, Shiqian Su, Shi Liu, Xuan Dong, Yue Yu, Weijie Su, Xuehui Wang, Zhaoyang Liu, Jinguo Zhu, Hao Li, et al. Zerogui: Automating online gui learning at zero human cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23762*, 2025.
- [22] Bofei Zhang, Zirui Shang, Zhi Gao, Wang Zhang, Rui Xie, Xiaojian Ma, Tao Yuan, Xinxiao Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, and Qing Li. Tongui: Building generalized gui agents by learning from multimodal web tutorials. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv–2504, 2025.
- [23] Hanzhang Zhou, Xu Zhang, Panrong Tong, Jianan Zhang, Liangyu Chen, Quyu Kong, Chenglin Cai, Chen Liu, Yue Wang, Jingren Zhou, et al. Mai-ui technical report: Real-world centric foundation gui agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.22047*, 2025.

A Detailed Related Work

This appendix expands the concise related-work discussion in Section 1. We organize prior work around the two bottlenecks emphasized in the main paper: the need for a mobile interaction and evaluation substrate, and the need to convert rollout feedback into effective policy optimization signals.

External GUI data construction and trajectory synthesis. Several recent systems reduce manual annotation by constructing GUI supervision from external or automatically synthesized sources. TongUI mines multimodal web tutorials and converts them into generalized GUI trajectories across platforms and applications [22]. MobileA3gent instead uses decentralized user-phone trajectories, automatic intent annotation, and federated training to exploit self-sourced mobile data while preserving user privacy [16]. OS-Genesis reverses the usual task-first pipeline: it first explores GUI transitions, synthesizes instructions from observed state changes, and filters constructed trajectories with a trajectory reward model [13]. These works substantially reduce the cost of obtaining GUI training data. However, they mainly address data construction. Their supervision is not necessarily grounded in the current state of a target mobile app, and they do not directly connect an agent’s own rollout failures to step-level policy improvement.

Autonomous exploration and knowledge mining. GUI-explorer is closely related to the exploration side of MOBILEFORGE. It autonomously explores target apps, mines transition-aware knowledge from observation-action-outcome triples, and retrieves that knowledge at inference time to improve GUI grounding and decision making [18]. This shows that direct target-app exploration can expose app-specific affordances that static model knowledge misses. The key distinction is the role of the explored knowledge. GUI-explorer is training-free and uses mined knowledge as prompt-side guidance, whereas MOBILEFORGE uses target-app exploration to build an executable curriculum and then continues through rollout execution, hierarchical evaluation, and policy optimization.

Online GUI reinforcement learning. ZeroGUI moves GUI learning toward zero-human-cost online RL by automatically generating tasks, estimating trajectory-level success with a VLM evaluator, and updating the GUI policy through online reinforcement learning [21]. MobileGUI-RL further studies online mobile GUI RL with self-exploration, task filtering, trajectory-aware advantages, and composite rewards that combine success and execution efficiency [12]. These works demonstrate that GUI agents can improve through interaction rather than relying only on offline demonstrations. Their optimization signals, however, remain centered on trajectory-level or composite rewards. Such feedback is useful for deciding whether a rollout is good overall, but it provides limited credit assignment for long-horizon mobile tasks where a failed trajectory may still contain useful local decisions and a successful trajectory may include redundant or accidental actions. MOBILEFORGE addresses this by using trajectory outcome feedback, step-level process feedback, and corrective hints for task filtering, trajectory selection, step extraction, and hint-contextualized GRPO.

Self-evolving and continual computer-use agents. SEAgent and ACuRL share MOBILEFORGE’s motivation that computer-use agents should adapt from their own experience. SEAgent studies self-evolving computer-use agents with a world-state model, curriculum generation, step-wise assessment, guidebook-style experience accumulation, and policy improvement through GRPO and imitation-style objectives [14]. ACuRL formulates environment adaptation as autonomous continual learning: the agent explores an environment, generates curriculum tasks, obtains automatic evaluator feedback, and improves over continual training rounds [20]. These systems are broader computer-use frameworks, primarily designed around desktop or general digital environments. MOBILEFORGE is mobile-specific: MOBILEGYM provides target mobile app interaction, curriculum mining, rollout execution, and hierarchical mobile rollout evaluation, while HiFPO schedules multi-attempt rollout, reuses corrective hints across attempts, and performs hint-contextualized step-level GRPO.

Synthetic GUI environmental dynamics. UI-Oceanus scales GUI agents by synthesizing environmental dynamics and training on transition-oriented objectives [17]. This line improves the coverage of GUI state transitions without requiring every transition to be manually collected in the target environment. It is

Table 8 Comparison with annotation-free GUI agent learning and adaptation methods. We organize the comparison around two limitations addressed by MOBILEFORGE: the lack of a unified mobile interaction and evaluation substrate, and the reliance on isolated rollout experience with coarse or sparse feedback.

Method	Main Source / Setting	Pain Point 1: Mobile Interaction and Evaluation Substrate			Pain Point 2: Feedback-to-Optimization		
		Target Mobile Interaction	Auto Task / Curriculum	Hierarchical Rollout Eval.	Feedback Granularity	Cross-Attempt Experience	Policy Update
TongUI	Web tutorials	△	✗	✗	Tutorial-derived trajectories	✗	SFT
MobileA3gent	User phone trajectories	△	✗	✗	Auto-annotated instructions	✗	SFT / FL
GUI-explorer	Autonomous app exploration	✓	△	✗	Transition-aware knowledge	△	✗
OS-Genesis	Reverse task synthesis	△	✓	△	Trajectory reward model	✗	SFT
ZeroGUI	Online GUI rollout	△	✓	△	Trajectory-level VLM reward	✗	Online RL
MobileGUI-RL	Online mobile rollout	✓	✓	△	Trajectory-level composite reward	✗	MobiGRPO
SEAgent	Desktop software	✗	✓	△	Step-wise assessment	△	GRPO + imitation
ACuRL	Computer-use environments	✗	✓	△	Outcome evaluator / CUAJudge	△	Curriculum RL
UI-Oceanus	Synthetic GUI dynamics	△	✓	✗	Transition objectives	✗	CPT + SFT
MobileForge	Target mobile apps	✓	✓	✓	Trajectory outcome + step-level process + corrective hints	✓	HiFPO

✓: explicitly supported; △: partially supported or not specific to annotation-free mobile adaptation; ✗: not supported or not the focus. MOBILEGYM covers the interaction and evaluation substrate, while HiFPO covers cross-attempt experience reuse and policy optimization.

complementary to MOBILEFORGE: synthetic dynamics can broaden pretraining or supervised training data, while MOBILEFORGE focuses on annotation-free adaptation inside target mobile apps, where the agent must discover executable tasks, evaluate its own rollouts, and update from the resulting experience.

Positioning of MOBILEFORGE. Taken together, prior work has made GUI learning less dependent on human-written demonstrations, but two bottlenecks remain for mobile target-app adaptation. External data construction provides scalable supervision but may not reflect the current target app. Exploration methods expose app-specific knowledge but often stop at inference-time guidance. Online RL methods update the policy but usually rely on coarse trajectory feedback. Continual computer-use methods study self-evolution but are not designed as mobile-specific interaction and evaluation substrates. MOBILEFORGE addresses these gaps by separating the system into two roles. MOBILEGYM supplies the mobile substrate: target-app exploration, executable curriculum mining, rollout execution, and hierarchical feedback. HiFPO supplies the feedback-to-optimization mechanism: it schedules multi-attempt rollout, accumulates corrective hints, filters mastered tasks, selects informative trajectories and steps, and optimizes the policy with hint-contextualized step-level GRPO. Table 8 summarizes this comparison.

B Method Notation and Algorithm

Table 9 lists the main symbols used in Section 2. Algorithm 1 gives a compact procedural view of the annotation-free adaptation loop.

C Pipeline Details

Table 10 summarizes the main system stages and their inputs and outputs.

Filtering order. The task-level success-rate filter is applied before best-trajectory selection. This matters because the task success rate must be computed from the original multi-attempt task group. The main setting uses $SR_{\min} = 0.0$ and $SR_{\max} < 1.0$, which removes all-success mastered tasks and keeps all-fail and partially solved tasks. Best-trajectory selection and reasonable-step filtering are then applied to extract useful local decisions.

D Experimental Protocol Details

Benchmarks. AndroidWorld [10] is the in-domain setting: MOBILEFORGE explores the AndroidWorld app ecosystem, mines adaptation tasks, collects HiFPO rollouts, and evaluates on 116 AndroidWorld tasks with

Table 9 Key notation used in the method.

Symbol	Meaning
\mathcal{E}	Target mobile app environment.
\mathcal{Z}	Exploration evidence collected from target apps.
\mathcal{T}	Generated adaptation curriculum.
x	A generated task in curriculum \mathcal{T} .
τ_k	The k -th rollout attempt for task x .
$\eta_{<k}$	Corrective hint context from earlier attempts of task x .
\mathcal{F}_k	Hierarchical feedback for attempt τ_k .
$I_k^{(t)}$	Screenshot observation at attempt k and step t .
$s_k^{(t)}$	Decision state at attempt k and step t .
$a_k^{(t)} = (\alpha, \psi)$	Structured GUI action with type α and arguments ψ .
z_k	Trajectory outcome label; 1 means task success and 0 means failure.
$\ell_k^{(t)}$	Step-level process label.
$v_k^{(t)}$	Binary reasonableness label for step t in attempt k .
$e_k^{(t)}$	Natural-language rationale for the step-level label.
$\chi_k^{(t)}$	Indicator that a step is marked reasonable by MOBILEGYM-CRITIC.
Q_k	Local quality score of attempt τ_k .
h_k	Corrective hint generated after an attempt.
$d_j = (s_j, a_j^*)$	Step-level training sample and selected action.
\tilde{s}_j	Hint-contextualized prompt used by step-level GRPO.
$R_{j,g}$	Adaptive GUI action reward for candidate g in a GRPO group.

Pass@1, Pass@2, and Pass@3. MobileWorld GUI-only [6] is the out-of-domain setting: we evaluate on its 117-task split and use no MobileWorld rollout, task, or feedback for adaptation.

Base agents and adaptation scale. We use two 8B-scale instruct base agents: the open generalist Qwen3-VL-8B and the GUI-specialized GUI-Owl-1.5-8B [1, 19]. MOBILEFORGE generates 3,249 AndroidWorld-side candidate tasks grounded in 527 source trajectory identifiers from 20 apps. To study scaling under realistic compute constraints, we train with 200-, 400-, and 900-task subsets. The main 900-task 8B runs use eight 80GB GPUs and take roughly 80 hours.

Ablation scope. The ablations isolate corrective hints during rollout, hint-contextualized GRPO versus SFT, task-level success-rate filtering, final-decision evaluator choice, and trajectory-grounded curriculum coverage.

E Annotation-Free Adaptation Data Details

Table 11 reports the generated AndroidWorld-side adaptation task pool by source app. The full pool contains 3,249 candidate tasks grounded in 527 source trajectory identifiers from 20 apps.

F Exploration Phase Details

MOBILEGYM begins by collecting raw interaction evidence from each target app. We adopt a function-aware exploration strategy inspired by GUI-explorer [18], replacing unguided random walks with app-grounded goal generation and systematic traversal.

Exploration anchors. For an Android app, the explorer extracts structural anchors from app metadata, especially the activity list declared by the APK. These anchors provide a compact description of reachable app

Algorithm 1: MOBILEFORGE annotation-free adaptation loop

Input: Target apps \mathcal{E} , policy π_θ , attempts per task K **Output:** Adapted policy $\pi_{\theta'}$

```
1 Explore target apps and record reachable GUI transitions;
2 Generate trajectory-grounded tasks from the explored transitions;
3 foreach task  $x \in \mathcal{T}$  do
4   initialize hint context  $\eta_{<1} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
5   for  $k = 1$  to  $K$  do
6     run attempt  $\tau_k$  with policy  $\pi_\theta$  and hints  $\eta_{<k}$ ;
7     evaluate the attempt to obtain outcome label  $z$ , step labels  $\ell$ , and hint  $h$ ;
8     update the hint context for later attempts;
9   end
10 end
11 Remove mastered tasks, select informative attempts, and extract useful local steps;
12 Train the policy with hint-contextualized step-level GRPO;
13 return  $\pi_{\theta'}$ ;
```

Table 10 Pipeline stages used by MOBILEFORGE.

Stage	Input	Output
Target exploration	Target apps	Exploration evidence
Curriculum generation	Exploration evidence	Executable task curriculum
HiFPO hint-guided rollout	Tasks and current policy	Multi-attempt trajectories
MobileGym hierarchical evaluation	Completed trajectories	Outcome feedback, process feedback, hints
Step-level filtering	Tasks, trajectories, feedback	Filtered step-level training samples
Policy optimization	Step-level samples	Adapted policy

functions and screens. They do not serve as demonstrations; they only ground exploration goals in functions that the app plausibly exposes.

Function-aware goal generation. At each exploration state, an MLLM receives the current screenshot together with the app name, package name, and available activity anchors. It generates concrete user goals that start from the current screen, are expected to be executable within a bounded number of steps, and cover diverse interaction patterns such as viewing, editing, searching, sharing, configuration, and information lookup. This design makes the explored trajectories more likely to touch real app functions than generic task templates.

Depth-first trajectory collection. The explorer pursues generated goals with depth-first traversal. When branching to a new goal from an earlier state, it restores the parent state by relaunching the app and replaying the parent action prefix, then continues exploration from that state. For each transition, it records the task goal, before/after screenshots, selected action, target element, execution metadata, and a short summary. The output is a rich but unstructured evidence pool \mathcal{Z} used by MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM to mine executable adaptation tasks.

G Prompt Templates

G.1 Curriculum Generation Prompt

The MOBILEGYM-CURRICULUM prompt jointly performs trajectory assessment and task generation. The model observes the original exploration goal, visualized screenshots from the trajectory, few-shot task examples, task-generation principles, and already generated tasks for the same app. The core template is shown below.

Table 11 Generated AndroidWorld-side adaptation tasks by source app. The full pool contains 3,249 candidate tasks grounded in 527 source trajectory identifiers from 20 apps.

App	#Tasks	App	#Tasks
Files	258	Tasks	150
Pro Expense	247	Simple Draw Pro	145
Broccoli Recipe	241	OsmAnd	136
Simple SMS Messenger	240	Joplin	130
Markor	233	Simple Calendar Pro	107
Clock	215	OpenTracks	104
Retro Music	189	Settings	102
Contacts	166	Camera	94
VLC	161	Audio Recorder	91
Chrome	157	Simple Gallery Pro	83

Prompt 1: MobileGym-Curriculum core prompt

You are an expert Curriculum Generator - a teacher designing comprehensive learning tasks for GUI agents. Your core purpose is to create a complete curriculum covering all app functionalities with progressive difficulty levels to systematically teach GUI agents how to use the target app.

Your job is to:

1. EVALUATE the original task for reasonableness and completion.
2. GENERATE new diverse curriculum tasks that comprehensively cover the app's functionality.

App Information

App Name: {app_name}

Original Task Goal: {original_goal}

Few-shot Examples

{fewshot_examples}

Task Generation Principles

{task_principles}

Already Generated Tasks for {app_name}

{existing_tasks}

IMPORTANT: Do not generate tasks that are too similar to the above.

Curriculum Design Instructions

Step 1: Task Evaluation

1. Reasonableness Assessment:

- Is this a reasonable task that a user might actually want to perform in this app?
- Are the requirements clear and achievable?
- Does the task make sense in the context of the app?

2. Step-by-Step Quality Analysis:

- Analyze representative visible steps in the screenshot sequence.
- A reasonable step logically progresses toward task completion.
- An unreasonable step is unnecessary, wrong, counterproductive, stuck in a loop, or moves backward unnecessarily.
- Failed trajectories may contain reasonable steps.

```

- Successful trajectories may contain detours or inefficiencies.
- Compute trajectory_quality_score = reasonable_steps / total_steps.

3. Overall Completion Assessment:
- Did the agent complete the stated task?
- Were the required steps performed correctly?
- Did the agent reach the intended goal state?

### Step 2: Curriculum Task Generation
Generate 3-8 new learning tasks that:
- cover different core functionalities of {app_name};
- vary in length from 1 to 40 steps;
- are pedagogically useful for teaching GUI agents;
- avoid redundancy with existing tasks;
- focus on core functionality variations, not only parameter changes;
- limit each functionality to at most 3 parameter variations.

## Output Format
Return JSON:
{
  "evaluation": {
    "task_reasonable": true/false,
    "task_completed": true/false,
    "reasonableness_explanation": "...",
    "completion_explanation": "...",
    "confidence_score": 0.0-1.0,
    "step_quality_analysis": {
      "total_steps": 10,
      "reasonable_steps": 8,
      "trajectory_quality_score": 0.8,
      "quality_summary": "..."
    }
  },
  "generated_tasks": [
    {
      "task_id": "task_1",
      "instruction": "Self-contained learning task",
      "estimated_steps": 5,
      "core_functionality": "Main functionality being taught",
      "variation_type": "simplification/parameter_change/"
      "scenario_application/step_progression",
      "prerequisites": "Only non-obvious prerequisites"
    }
  ]
}

```

G.2 MobileGym-Critic Prompts

MOBILEGYM-CRITIC uses a hierarchical prompting procedure. The first prompt converts each visualized action into a compact step description. The second prompt makes the final trajectory decision and step-level process assessment. The third prompt turns failures or inefficient steps into corrective hints for later attempts.

Prompt 2: MobileGym-Critic step description prompt

```

System:
You are an expert mobile device assistant. Analyze a two-panel image
showing the Before Action and After Action state of a user's workflow.
Focus only on the Before Action panel. Output JSON.

```

User:

The overall task is: {task_description}

The image shows a before/after action state. The user action is visualized with markers, and the raw action log is:

- Action Type: {log_action}
- Action Detail: {log_detail}

Return JSON:

```
{
  "action_description": "A crisp description of the action performed",
  "ui_description": "Task-relevant UI elements visible before the action"
}
```

Prompt 3: MobileGym-Critic final decision prompt

System:

You are an expert in evaluating mobile UI automation tasks.

Use the evaluation guidelines:

- The final UI state must satisfy all task requirements.
- Existing conditions can satisfy requirements without repetition.
- A logically correct action sequence can imply success even if the last screen alone is insufficient.
- The agent may make and correct mistakes.
- If a task is inherently infeasible, the agent can still succeed by correctly identifying the impossibility and giving appropriate feedback.

User:

Task Description: {task_description}

Here is a step-by-step breakdown of the agent's actions, including raw action logs and VLM-generated descriptions:

{step_descriptions_with_raw_logs}

You are also provided with a composite image of the last screenshots. Synthesize the visual evidence with the full step list.

Required assessment:

1. Decide whether the attempt completed the task.
2. Assess whether the task itself is feasible.
3. If failed, identify the failure_step.
4. Analyze every step for reasonableness and provide a concise rationale.

Return JSON:

```
{
  "decision": 1 or 0,
  "reason": "Explanation of the final judgment",
  "failure_step": 4,
  "task_feasible": true/false,
  "task_feasible_reason": "Why the task is feasible or infeasible",
  "task_barriers": [],
  "reasonable_steps": [1, 2, 4],
  "unreasonable_steps": [3],
  "step_analysis": {
    "1": {
      "reasonableness": "reasonable",
      "explanation": "..."
    },
  },
}
```

```

    "3": {
      "reasonableness": "unreasonable",
      "explanation": "...
    }
  }
}

```

Prompt 4: MobileGym-Critic corrective hint prompt

System:
 You are an intelligent agent performing self-reflection on your task execution. Analyze your own actions, identify mistakes and inefficiencies, and extract lessons for future attempts. Use the step-by-step reasonableness analysis. Output JSON.

User:
 ## Task
 {task_description}

My Steps (with Reasonableness Analysis)
 {step_descriptions_with_step_analysis}

Evaluation Result
 {failure_or_inefficiency_reason}

Reflect on the execution:

1. Identify key mistakes, especially unreasonable steps.
2. Specify what to avoid in future attempts.
3. Propose concrete alternative approaches.
4. Extract important task insights.

Return JSON:

```

{
  "key_mistake": "Concise summary of the main mistake",
  "what_to_avoid": ["..."],
  "suggested_approach": ["..."],
  "important_insights": ["..."],
  "hint_summary": "Brief self-reminder for the next attempt"
}

```

G.3 Hint-Guided Rollout Prompts

During HiFPO rollout, the hint context $\eta_{<k}$ is appended to the task instruction before attempt k . The same mechanism is used for both base agents; the difference lies in each agent's native step prompt. The shared hint block has the following structure.

Prompt 5: Corrective hint context block

EVALUATION HINTS FROM PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS
 The following insights come from analysis of previous failed attempts.
 Please review these carefully to avoid repeating the same mistakes:

--- Hint from Attempt #{attempt_id} ---

```

Summary: {hint_summary}
Key Mistake: {key_mistake}
What to Avoid:
- {avoid_item_1}
- {avoid_item_2}
Suggested Approach:
- {approach_item_1}
- {approach_item_2}
Important Insights:
- {insight_item_1}

END OF EVALUATION HINTS

```

For Qwen3-VL, the structured hint block is inserted into the query field, while the screenshot remains the visual observation for the current step.

Prompt 6: Qwen3-VL hint-contextualized rollout prompt

```

System:
You are a helpful assistant that can help with tasks on a mobile device.
Use the mobile_use tool with actions such as click, long_press, swipe,
type, answer, system_button, wait, and terminate.
Return exactly:
<thinking>...</thinking>
<tool_call>{"name": "mobile_use", "arguments": {...}}</tool_call>
<conclusion>UI observation: ... Intended action: ...</conclusion>
If the task is completed, terminate with status="success"; if it is
infeasible, terminate with status="failure". Trust the current UI state
over action history. If hints are present in the task description, use
them to avoid repeating previous mistakes.

User:
The user query: {task_instruction}
{EVALUATION_HINTS_FROM_PREVIOUS_ATTEMPTS}

Task progress (You have done the following operation on the current
device):
{previous_step_conclusions}
<image>

```

For GUI-Owl, the hint block is likewise appended to the instruction, while the prompt preserves GUI-Owl's concise action-plus-tool-call format.

Prompt 7: GUI-Owl hint-contextualized rollout prompt

```

System:
You may use the mobile_use tool with actions such as key, click,
long_press, swipe, type, system_button, open, wait, answer, and
terminate. For each step, output:
Action: {short imperative}
<tool_call>{"name": "mobile_use", "arguments": {...}}</tool_call>

User:
Please generate the next move according to the UI screenshot,

```

```

instruction and previous actions.

Instruction: {task_instruction}
{EVALUATION_HINTS_FROM_PREVIOUS_ATTEMPTS}

Previous actions:
{action_history_or_no_previous_action}
<image>

```

H Adaptive GUI Action Reward

The step-level GRPO stage uses a rule-based GUI action reward. For each hint-contextualized prompt, the policy samples a group of responses. Each response is first parsed into a structured action $\hat{a} = (\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\psi})$ and compared against the selected action $a^* = (\alpha^*, \psi^*)$ extracted from hierarchical feedback. The parser supports the output templates used by both base agents and maps action aliases into a canonical mobile action space before scoring.

The optimized scalar reward is

$$R(\hat{a}, a^*) = \lambda_{\text{type}} r_{\text{type}} + \lambda_{\text{arg}} r_{\text{arg}}, \quad (22)$$

where λ_{type} and λ_{arg} are configurable weights. The implementation also logs a binary format score for malformed tool calls, but this format score is not included in R . The type score is

$$r_{\text{type}} = \mathbb{I}[\hat{\alpha} = \alpha^*]. \quad (23)$$

The argument score is gated by the type score:

$$r_{\text{arg}} = \begin{cases} S_{\alpha^*}(\hat{\psi}, \psi^*), & r_{\text{type}} = 1, \\ 0, & r_{\text{type}} = 0. \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

Thus a response with the wrong action type receives no parameter credit. The main experiments use the reward weights reported in Section 3; the same reward implementation exposes these weights as hyperparameters.

I Training Details

Table 13 lists the main hyperparameters and hardware setting used for the 900-task 8B runs. Figure 9 reports the corresponding reward curves. The curves show that both models learn the action-argument component throughout training; GUI-Owl-1.5-8B starts from a lower overall reward but improves steadily, while Qwen3-VL-8B starts high and receives smaller but still positive reward gains.


Track-completion cases. Figures 10, 11, and 12 provide paired base-versus-adapted trajectory comparisons on the same tasks. The examples complement the case study in Section 3.4 by showing how adaptation changes full task-completion behavior across both AndroidWorld and MobileWorld.

Table 12 Rule-based argument score S_α used by the adaptive GUI action reward.


Action	Argument score
click	If the target is a box, reward is 1 when the predicted point is inside the box; otherwise it decays with distance to the box center normalized by the box diagonal. If the target is a point, reward is $\max(0, 1 - d/50)$ in the normalized 0–1000 coordinate space.
long press	Same coordinate score as click.
swipe	If a target direction is provided, reward is 1 only when the predicted direction matches. If no target direction is provided, a valid swipe parameter receives full credit.
type	Token-level F1 similarity between predicted text and target text.
answer	Token-level F1 similarity when a target answer is provided; otherwise full credit after the action type is correct.
system button	Exact match of the system button identity, such as Back, Home, Menu, or Enter.
wait	Full credit after the action type is correct; no additional argument is required by the training target.
terminate	Exact match of the termination status when one is provided; otherwise full credit after the action type is correct.
open	Exact app-name match receives full credit; containment-based partial app-name match receives partial credit. If no target app name is provided, the argument score is treated as satisfied.
key	Exact key-name match when one is provided; otherwise full credit after the action type is correct.

Table 13 Main HiFPO training configuration for the 900-task 8B runs. The same configuration is used for both base agents unless noted otherwise.


Category	Setting
Hardware and runtime	8 x 80GB GPUs; approximately 80 hours for a 900-task 8B run.
Training data	900 generated AndroidWorld-side tasks for the main runs; held-out validation data is not used for MobileWorld adaptation.
Sequence length	Maximum prompt length 2048 tokens; maximum response length 2048 tokens; overlong prompts are filtered.
Filtering	Success-rate range [0.0, 0.9]; best-trajectory filtering enabled; mastered tasks removed; corrective hints retained.
GRPO rollout	5 sampled responses per step-level prompt; temperature 1.0; top- p 1.0; tensor parallel size 2.
Optimization	4 epochs; global batch size 128; rollout batch size 512; AdamW with learning rate 1.0×10^{-6} , weight decay 1.0×10^{-2} , and max gradient norm 1.0.
KL regularization	GRPO advantage estimator; KL loss enabled with low-variance KL penalty and coefficient 1.0×10^{-2} .
Model training	Vision tower is not frozen; gradient checkpointing and FSDP full-shard training are enabled; parameters and optimizer states are offloaded.
Reward weights	Action-type reward weight 0.2; action-argument reward weight 0.8.
Validation	Validation every 50 steps; greedy validation decoding with temperature 0 and one response per prompt.




(a) Qwen3-VL-8B: overall




(b) Qwen3-VL-8B: action type




(c) Qwen3-VL-8B: arguments



(d) GUI-Owl-1.5-8B: overall




(e) GUI-Owl-1.5-8B: action type




(f) GUI-Owl-1.5-8B: arguments

Figure 9 Training reward curves for the 900-task HiFPO runs. The overall reward combines action type and action arguments with weights 0.2 and 0.8.




(a) Qwen3-VL-8B base: failed



(b) ForgeQwen3-8B: successful

Figure 10 AndroidWorld track-completion comparison for Qwen3-VL-8B. On the same Broccoli recipe-deletion task, the base model falls into repeated scrolling after partial progress, while MOBILEFORGE adaptation enables ForgeQwen3-8B to switch to a targeted search strategy and complete the remaining deletion.


<Instruction> Search up the UF academic calendar and find out the week that grades are due in the Spring 2026 semester. Then, set a calendar event at 6pm on the Saturday of that week titled 'Graduation Party'. Search my email for the list of students graduating from the math department this year. Send an email to all the graduates with the subject 'Graduation Party' and body 'Don't forget about this year's graduation party! More details coming soon.'



<Decision> Failed

(a) Qwen3-VL-8B base: failed

<Instruction> Search up the UF academic calendar and find out the week that grades are due in the Spring 2026 semester. Then, set a calendar event at 6pm on the Saturday of that week titled 'Graduation Party'. Search my email for the list of students graduating from the math department this year. Send an email to all the graduates with the subject 'Graduation Party' and body 'Don't forget about this year's graduation party! More details coming soon.'




<Decision> Successful

(b) ForgeQwen3-8B: successful

Figure 11 MobileWorld track-completion comparison for Qwen3-VL-8B. On the same multi-app academic-calendar and email task, the base model selects an underspecified semester result and then skips the calendar subtask, while ForgeQwen3-8B verifies the Spring 2026 deadline window, creates the calendar event, and proceeds to the email workflow.


<Instruction> Read the invoice PDF file in the download directory. The customer has notified that payment will be made 45 days after the due date. Please recalculate the total amount payable and forward the result number to the customer via Email.



<Decision> **Failed**

(a) GUI-Owl-1.5-8B base: failed

<Instruction> Read the invoice PDF file in the download directory. The customer has notified that payment will be made 45 days after the due date. Please recalculate the total amount payable and forward the result number to the customer via Email.



<Decision> **Successful**

(b) ForgeOwl-8B: successful

Figure 12 MobileWorld track-completion comparison for GUI-Owl-1.5-8B. On the same invoice recalculation and email task, the base model leaves the invoice context too early and sends an incorrect amount, while ForgeOwl-8B preserves the key invoice conditions, shares the document into Mail, and sends the correct recalculated total.