

GameHorizon Suite: Multi-Horizon Data and Evaluation in Gameplay

Yiran Wang^{1,*†}, Xingyilang Yin^{1,2,6,*}, Junfu Pu^{1,*}, Guangzhi Wang^{1,*}, Kaifeng Li², Mingyu Ouyang^{1,3}, Huiqiang Sun^{1,4}, Lingen Li^{1,5}, Cheng Cheng¹, Wangbo Yu¹, Honghao Chen¹, Xiaodong Cun^{1,2,✉}, Chi-Man Pun⁶, Zhiguo Cao⁴, Ying Shan¹

¹ARC Lab, Tencent, ²GVC Lab, Great Bay University, ³National University of Singapore,

⁴Huazhong University of Science and Technology, ⁵MMLab, CUHK, ⁶University of Macau

[†]Project Lead, ^{*}Equal Contribution, [✉]Corresponding Author

Modern video games provide a measurable testbed for AI models, combining abilities of visual understanding, instruction decomposition, goal planning, and precise action control over multiple temporal horizons. Existing datasets and benchmarks, however, either cover a narrow range of games, lack language instructions, or rely on high-variance online rollouts. To address these challenges, we introduce GameHorizon, a unified data and evaluation suite that measures gameplay capabilities at different horizons for diverse model families. GameHorizon Suite consists of three components. First, GameHorizon-Annotator is a scalable and automated annotation pipeline for multi-horizon instructions. Second, utilizing the pipeline, we construct GameHorizon-Data, the first large-scale AAA gameplay dataset with temporally aligned videos, player actions, and multi-horizon instructions. It comprises 5,000 hours of recordings from 21 games, collected by 100 human expert players. Third, we build GameHorizon-Bench with reproducible offline and stepwise online testing. The offline track enables reproducible evaluation using thousands of standardized questions organized into three primary tasks and a series of diagnostic variants, while the online track tests whether offline scores reflect actual gameplay capabilities and localizes failures to specific steps within long-horizon gameplay. Based on our GameHorizon Suite, we evaluate 47 models through more than one million model invocations, revealing a meaningful hierarchy of task difficulty and pronounced differences in model capabilities. Our work can provide a standardized yardstick for evaluating gameplay capabilities across horizons and model families. We will release our dataset, annotator, and benchmark to facilitate future research.

Project Page: <https://gamehorizon-suite.github.io>

Github: <https://github.com/TencentARC/GameHorizon>

1 Introduction

Empowering AI models to play modern video games provides a measurable testbed for understanding, decision-making, and acting within complex environments. Game objectives span varying temporal scales, *e.g.*, collecting an item within seconds, winning a fight lasting several minutes, and executing a strategy that unfolds over an entire game session, as shown in Fig. 1. Whatever the horizon, these objectives are all reflected in the same stream of primitive actions, such as keystrokes and mouse movements. Thus, a growing number of dedicated game agents (Magne et al., 2026; Yue et al., 2026; Tan et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025a; Cai et al., 2024a) have emerged. General-purpose vision-language models (VLMs) and agents (Comanici et al., 2025; Team Gemini, 2023; Achiam et al., 2023; Baker et al., 2022; Bolton et al., 2025; Qin et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025b, 2023; Tan et al., 2024) have also begun to treat video games as a capability target, *e.g.*, SIMA 2 (Bolton et al., 2025) equips Gemini (Comanici et al., 2025) to follow instructions in open-world games.

Playing a game well requires two abilities at once: (1) based on an understanding of the situation so far, planning subsequent behavior by decomposing the long-horizon game objective into subgoals; and (2) turning the plans and goals into concrete actions. In practice, these two abilities are split across two families of models. Most dedicated game agents (Magne et al., 2026; Yue et al., 2026; Li et al., 2025; Cai et al., 2024b, 2025) are optimized for acting rather than planning. To sustain a high control frequency, they adopt lightweight vision-language-action (VLA) or action-head architectures (Brohan et al., 2023; Kim et al., 2024) under action-trajectory supervision, at the cost of the capacity to reason and plan. Conversely, general-purpose models (Comanici et al., 2025; Team Gemini, 2023; Achiam et al., 2023; Anthropic, 2025) excel at planning, yet they have never been systematically measured on action. The few reported cases, *e.g.*, Gemini and Claude playing Pokémon (Comanici et al., 2025; Anthropic, 2025), rely on bespoke agent harnesses and cannot be



Figure 1. GameHorizon Suite spans diverse games with a pyramid of primitive actions (*e.g.*, Left Mouse Button as LMB), short-horizon operations, medium-horizon goals, and long-horizon strategies, providing a unified yardstick for testing gameplay capabilities across models and temporal horizons. Red text highlights key actions or objects in video frames.

compared across models. What is needed, therefore, is a single yardstick for both families: one that measures whether a model can align vision, executable actions, and multi-horizon natural-language goals. To be useful, the yardstick should be low-cost, standardized, and reproducible, independent of harnesses or environments.

Existing game datasets and benchmarks fall short of these requirements. First, constrained by annotation cost, their game coverage is narrow. For instance, GameWorld (Ouyang et al., 2026) targets simple mini-games. STEVE-1 (Lifshitz et al., 2023) and MineDojo (Fan et al., 2022) are confined to Minecraft. WildWorld (Li et al., 2026) is collected from a single game, Monster Hunter Wilds. Conclusions drawn from a single title or simplified mini-games cannot generalize to complex and heterogeneous AAA games. Second, human-agent interaction is largely mediated through language, *e.g.*, instruction following, planning, and goal decomposition. However, previous attempts still lack comprehensive annotations of text instructions and goals. NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026) and GameVerse (Zhang et al., 2026) omit instructions entirely, while Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026) only provides highly sparse annotations. Consequently, existing data and benchmarks cannot systematically evaluate model performance across instruction following, goal planning, and action execution. Third, prior work mainly relies on online evaluations with a limited number of agent rollouts. Lumine (Tan et al., 2025) reports task success rates only by three trials per scene, while GameVerse (Zhang et al., 2026) conducts rollouts on 3–20 cases. Such small samples lead to low-confidence comparisons. Online results are sensitive to specific game environments and agent harnesses, making them difficult to reproduce. Moreover, an aggregate success rate collapses distinct failure modes into a single scalar. When a model fails, it remains unclear whether it misidentifies current actions, infers the next goal incorrectly, or fails to map the goal to right future controls.

To address these challenges, as presented in Fig. 1, we introduce **GameHorizon**, a data and evaluation suite spanning multiple temporal horizons and AAA games. It serves as a unified yardstick across a broad range of model types. Specifically, GameHorizon Suite consists of three key components. First, **GameHorizon-Annotator** is a scalable annotation pipeline for multi-horizon instructions in gameplay. Unlike the manual annotation in Game-TARS (Wang et al., 2025a), GameHorizon-Annotator automatically produces a pyramid of natural-language instructions at three temporal horizons, including short-horizon operations, medium-horizon goals, and long-horizon strategies. The pipeline operates bottom-up, abstracting fine-grained instructions into higher levels. Second, based on the annotator, we construct **GameHorizon-Data**, a large-scale gameplay dataset with 5,000 hours of recordings collected from 100 human expert players across 21 game titles. GameHorizon-Data is the first publicly available dataset that aligns game frames, player actions, and multi-horizon instructions, which also exceeds previous corpora such as D2E (Choi et al., 2026) and gaming-500-hours (Markov AI, 2026) in scale. Third, we build **GameHorizon-Bench**, combining reproducible offline evaluation and stepwise online testing. The offline track comprises three sorts of primary tasks: single-horizon action, multi-horizon instruction decomposition, and cross-horizon consistency. Additional variants enable model diagnosis at a finer

granularity. The offline track is reliable and reproducible based on thousands of questions with standardized actions and instructions. Besides, online track evaluates long-horizon gameplay through short-horizon subtasks, covering order-dependent causal tasks and order-flexible thematic tasks. Environment reset enables stepwise verification and failure localization. This track tests whether offline scores reflect actual gameplay abilities.

We conduct extensive empirical evaluations based on the GameHorizon-Data and GameHorizon-Bench. Our data covers various game categories, *e.g.*, open-world, action role-playing, competitive shooter, sandbox survival, and creature-collecting adventure genres. Our benchmark involves more than one million model inferences and API calls. For the offline setting, we test 47 models on our primary tasks, including general-purpose VLMs (Comanici et al., 2025; Achiam et al., 2023; Bai et al., 2026; Yang et al., 2025), unified multimodal models (UMMs) (Diao et al., 2026; Wang et al., 2025c; Tian et al., 2026; Deng et al., 2025), coding and GUI agents (Qin et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025b; GELab-Team, StepFun, 2025; Anthropic, 2026), as well as dedicated game agents (Wang et al., 2025a; Yue et al., 2026; Magne et al., 2026; Li et al., 2025). The results reveal a meaningful hierarchy of task difficulty and pronounced differences in model capabilities. For the online setting, we observe a clear positive association between task success rates and offline scores, suggesting that the offline accuracy provides a valid proxy for actual gameplay capabilities. Beyond aggregate performance, we further analyze the bottlenecks of current models. Planning future actions and decomposing complex goals are more challenging than deciding the current action. Compared with the vision-only input, incorporating our medium- and long-horizon instructions improves future-action planning by 7.2 percentage points, highlighting the effectiveness of our multi-horizon instructions. Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We introduce GameHorizon, a data and evaluation suite with multiple temporal horizons and AAA games.
- GameHorizon-Annotator works as a scalable annotation pipeline for multi-horizon instructions in gameplay.
- GameHorizon-Data is a large-scale gameplay dataset with aligned triplets of videos, actions, and instructions.
- GameHorizon-Bench unifies reproducible offline and stepwise online evaluations for diverse model families.

2 Related Work

Gameplay Datasets and Benchmarks. Prior gameplay data and benchmarks suffer from narrow game coverage, limited instruction annotations, and high-variance evaluations. First, many datasets are confined to a single game or simplified mini-games. WildWorld (Li et al., 2026) is collected from Monster Hunter Wilds. MineDojo (Fan et al., 2022), VPT (Baker et al., 2022), STEVE-1 (Lifshitz et al., 2023), MineRL (Guss et al., 2019), and MCU (Zheng et al., 2025) provide data and evaluation exclusively in Minecraft. Some efforts attempt to encompass multiple titles. However, constrained by annotation costs, they either remain limited in scale (*e.g.*, 300 hours for D2E by Choi et al., 2026 and 500 hours for gaming-500-hours by Markov AI, 2026) or fall back on mini-games (*e.g.*, GameWorld by Ouyang et al., 2026). Second, existing corpora lack comprehensive text instruction annotations, which are critical for human-agent interaction, *e.g.*, instruction following and goal planning. NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026), GameVerse (Zhang et al., 2026), D2E (Choi et al., 2026), and VPT (Baker et al., 2022) are entirely devoid of language instructions, whereas Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026) only offers sparse and coarse annotations. Game-TARS (Wang et al., 2025a) relies on costly manual annotations, which hinders scalability and remains unreleased. Third, previous benchmarks mainly adopt online evaluations with a limited number of rollouts. Lumine (Tan et al., 2025) reports success rates by three trials per scene. GameVerse (Zhang et al., 2026) conducts rollouts on 3–20 cases. VideoGameBench (Zhang et al., 2025) likewise tests each model with a single run per game. Such small sample sizes lead to low-confidence comparisons. Online results are sensitive to game environments and custom harnesses, making them difficult to reproduce. In contrast, GameHorizon provides a unified data and evaluation suite, featuring 5,000 hours of recordings, diverse AAA game genres, multi-horizon instructions, and reproducible offline-online benchmarks.

Game-playing Models. Video games serve as a practical testbed for AI models to perceive, plan, decide, and act in complex environments. Various studies leverage games to enhance or test model capabilities. On one hand, dedicated game agents are typically tailored for high-frequency action control, often at the expense of reasoning abilities, *e.g.*, long-horizon goal decomposition and planning. Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026) employs an EfficientNet (Tan and Le, 2019) as a visual encoder alongside a lightweight action decoder for low-latency inference on consumer GPUs, whereas JARVIS-VLA (Li et al., 2025) instantiates a VLA policy with a short context window. On the other hand, general-purpose models, *e.g.*, VLMs, UMMs, and computer-use agents,




Figure 2. Overview of GameHorizon Suite. GameHorizon-Annotator automatically produces a three-level pyramid of short-horizon operations L_1 , medium-horizon goals L_2 , and long-horizon strategies L_3 . GameHorizon-Data contains 5,000 hours of gameplay across 21 game titles, with temporally aligned videos, actions, and multi-horizon instructions. GameHorizon-Bench provides reproducible offline and stepwise online testing. The offline track contains thousands of standardized questions across three primary tasks T_1 – T_3 and diagnostic variants T^* . The online track tests order-dependent causal and order-flexible thematic tasks through verifiable subtasks and game resets for failure localization.

exhibit stronger cognitive and planning capabilities, yet they have not been systematically evaluated on action execution. Cradle (Tan et al., 2024) couples GPT-4V (Achiam et al., 2023) with a multi-module agent harness on commercial games. Gemini (Comanici et al., 2025) and Claude (Anthropic, 2026) have been tested on *Pokémon* through bespoke agent loops. These evaluations remain incomparable due to specialized setups and harnesses. To bridge this gap, GameHorizon presents a unified and standardized yardstick for different models, enabling evaluations across goal planning, instruction following, and executable actions at multiple horizons.

3 GameHorizon Suite

We present GameHorizon, a unified data and evaluation suite spanning multiple temporal horizons, diverse AAA games, and a broad range of model families. We outline our approach in Sec. 3.1. In Sec. 3.2, we elaborate on GameHorizon-Annotator, an automated and scalable annotation pipeline for multi-horizon instructions. Our large-scale GameHorizon-Data is discussed in Sec. 3.3, while GameHorizon-Bench is illustrated in Sec. 3.4.

3.1 Overview

As shown in Fig. 2, GameHorizon Suite comprises three components: GameHorizon-Annotator, GameHorizon-Data, and GameHorizon-Bench. The workflow begins with raw gameplay acquisition. Previous work collects web videos and recovers action pseudo-labels via Inverse Dynamics Models (IDMs) (Baker et al., 2022; Lifshitz et al., 2023; Choi et al., 2026) or gamepad segmentation (Magne et al., 2026; Xie et al., 2021). The inferred pseudo-labels can deviate from the actual controls executed by humans. In contrast, we recruit 100 experienced human players and deploy a dedicated recording-and-upload system to synchronously capture game videos at 2K resolution along with timestamped keyboard and mouse actions. Authentic human gameplay recordings and action trajectories can establish a reliable foundation for faithful evaluations in complex game worlds.

Based on the recordings, we develop GameHorizon-Annotator, an annotation pipeline for textual instructions across multiple temporal horizons. Due to annotation costs or vision-only architectures, prior studies either omit instructions (Magne et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2026) or provide sparse labels (Yue et al., 2026). GameTARS (Wang et al., 2025a) relies on manual instruction labeling, which is expensive and remains unavailable to the community. However, instructions are vital for human-agent interaction, *e.g.*, instruction following and goal decomposition. When issuing requests to an agent, humans dictate not only primitive actions like reloading a weapon, but also long-term objectives such as defending a bridge. To this end, our GameHorizon-Annotator produces a three-level pyramid of instructions, including short-horizon operations (1–5 seconds), medium-horizon goals (1–2 minutes), and long-horizon strategies (5–8 minutes). The annotator operates




Figure 3. Workflow of GameHorizon-Annotator. Videos and actions are first processed by action-aware segmentation to produce short-horizon clips, with key actions determining their temporal boundaries. A VLM annotates each clip with an L_1 operation. Lower-level clips with their instructions are progressively merged into medium- and long-horizon clips based on action continuity and semantic coherence, from which the VLM derives L_2 goals and L_3 strategies. The bottom-up procedure abstracts fine-grained video-action trajectories into a pyramid of multi-horizon text instructions.

bottom-up, abstracting dense and action-grounded instructions into higher-level goals and strategies. The automated pipeline reduces annotation costs and enables scalable labeling across large gameplay collections.

Applying GameHorizon-Annotator to the collected trajectories, we construct GameHorizon-Data, the first large-scale AAA gameplay dataset that aligns videos, player actions, and multi-horizon instructions. It covers 5,000 hours of human gameplay from 21 game titles, spanning diverse genres such as open-world, action role-playing, competitive shooter, sandbox survival, and creature-collecting adventure titles. In total, GameHorizon-Data contains 4,571 videos recorded at 60 fps and 411.03 million keyboard-mouse action events. It is annotated with 6,184,036 distinct instructions, including 5,947,588 short-horizon operations, 189,158 medium-horizon goals, and 47,290 long-horizon strategies. On average, GameHorizon-Data provides one distinct short-horizon instruction every 2.63 seconds, while each frame is aligned with corresponding instructions at all three horizons. Our annotations are substantially denser than those in prior work. For example, Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026) includes only one instruction every few minutes, with uneven temporal coverage. Combining scale, density, and diversity, GameHorizon-Data enables unified evaluations of multi-horizon gameplay tasks and capabilities.

Finally, leveraging GameHorizon-Data, we introduce GameHorizon-Bench, a comprehensive benchmark featuring reproducible offline and stepwise online testing across diverse model families. As discussed in Sec. 1, prior gameplay benchmarks predominantly rely on a small number of harness-dependent online rollouts (Zhang et al., 2025; Tan et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2026), yielding low-confidence comparisons that are difficult to reproduce. Aggregate success rates also conflate different failure modes. In contrast, the offline track of our GameHorizon-Bench ensures reliable and reproducible evaluation through thousands of multiple-choice questions (MCQs) with standardized actions and instructions in three primary tasks, including single-horizon action, multi-horizon instruction decomposition, and cross-horizon consistency. Additional diagnostic variants further probe model capabilities along different dimensions, *e.g.*, current-action perception *vs.* future-action planning and top-down decomposition *vs.* bottom-up abstraction. Complementarily, the online track evaluates long-horizon gameplay through collections of verifiable short-horizon subtasks. It covers causal tasks, whose subtasks follow a prescribed sequence, and thematic tasks, whose subtasks can be completed in any order. When an agent fails at a subtask, the environment is reset to the corresponding success state, allowing evaluation to continue. The stepwise protocol localizes errors to specific steps. Our online track further tests whether offline scores reflect actual gameplay abilities. Together, the two tracks establish GameHorizon-Bench as a unified, standardized, reproducible, and diagnostic yardstick across model families and temporal horizons.

3.2 GameHorizon-Annotator

Given synchronized videos and actions, GameHorizon-Annotator constructs a three-level instruction pyramid, *i.e.*, short-horizon operations, medium-horizon goals, and long-horizon strategies. As illustrated in Fig. 3, our workflow comprises the action-aware segmentation, bottom-up temporal merging, and instruction annotation.

Action-Aware Video Segmentation. Constructing multi-horizon instructions from videos in a top-down manner is challenging, as VLMs struggle to resolve fine-grained visual and action details across extended temporal contexts, *e.g.*, an hour-long gameplay session. We therefore proceed bottom-up, partitioning long videos

into short clips that VLMs can interpret more reliably. However, off-the-shelf segmentation tools such as PySceneDetect (Castellano, 2024) rely on frame-to-frame visual similarity and tend to over-segment continuous actions, *e.g.*, under rapid camera motion or abrupt viewpoint shifts. To address this issue, we perform action-aware segmentation using keyboard-mouse traces to identify key action transitions and determine clip boundaries. Specifically, we map raw keyboard-mouse events to game-specific action semantics, *e.g.*, **Shift** as sprinting in *Cyberpunk 2077*. We then scan the mapped action stream chronologically, grouping consecutive actions within the same sustained event, such as alternating between walking and running during a single traversal. Discrete action events such as jumping or attacking define initial boundaries for coarse segmentation. Since the same keyboard-mouse input may carry different action semantics, *e.g.*, a left click may indicate an attack or item selection, we employ a VLM (Google DeepMind, 2026a) to examine video frames, disambiguate action semantics, and refine the initial segmentation to a final set of short-horizon clips.

Bottom-Up Temporal Merging. Based on the short-horizon (L_1) clips and instructions, we merge adjacent segments into medium-horizon (L_2) clips. Specifically, the VLM (Google DeepMind, 2026a) determines whether neighboring L_1 operations form a continuous progression toward the same medium-horizon goal. Similarly, to construct long-horizon (L_3) clips, the VLM assesses whether neighboring L_2 goals follow the same gameplay strategy. Besides, we apply a dynamic programming algorithm (Bellman, 1966) to enforce level-specific duration ranges of 1–5 seconds for L_1 , 1–2 minutes for L_2 , and 5–8 minutes for L_3 . The short range helps avoid fragmenting primitive actions, while the long range keeps clip durations within the reasoning capacity of current models. We term the temporal merging process bottom-up because it starts from numerous fine-grained L_1 clips at the base of the pyramid and progressively merges them into fewer higher-level clips.

Multi-Horizon Instruction Annotation. The VLM (Google DeepMind, 2026a) produces instructions at each level using specific prompts with distinct input modalities and output granularities. For an L_1 clip, the VLM receives sampled video frames and temporally aligned keyboard-mouse actions as input. The prompt asks the VLM to generate an action-grounded instruction describing the current operation of the player. We also require the VLM to include sufficient details, such as coordinates, object descriptions, and spatial relations, when needed to guide a virtual agent in game sessions. For an L_2 clip, frames, actions, and the constituent L_1 instructions serve as inputs to the VLM. The VLM synthesizes these inputs into a medium-horizon instruction describing the goal pursued by the player. We require the output to retain only necessary details while avoiding excessive local information. For an L_3 clip, the inputs comprise video frames and the constituent L_2 instructions, without action traces. The VLM generates a long-horizon instruction that captures the high-level gameplay strategy. The prompt emphasizes the long-term intent while suppressing local operational details.

For L_1 and L_2 , the action inputs to the VLM ground the instructions in controls executed by players rather than visual evidence alone. The actions are useful for identifying visually ambiguous operations, *e.g.*, determining whether the player detaches from the squad during skydiving in *Apex Legends*. By comparison, we omit actions at L_3 to keep the instructions focused on high-level strategies rather than detailed operations.

All prompts include the game title, clip duration, frame rate, and sampled frame indices for reference. At higher levels, the constituent lower-level instructions provide compact semantic context and help maintain consistency across horizons. The L_1 and L_2 prompts also incorporate game-specific keybinds that map keyboard-mouse actions to corresponding in-game semantics, facilitating action interpretation by the VLM.

Overall Workflow. As illustrated in Fig. 3, action-aware segmentation first partitions a recording of a complete gameplay session into L_1 clips, each annotated with a short-horizon operation. Using the L_1 instructions as semantic cues, we merge adjacent L_1 clips into L_2 clips and annotate them with medium-horizon goals. We then merge L_2 clips into L_3 clips and annotate them with long-horizon strategies. The GameHorizon-Annotator proceeds bottom-up via alternating temporal merging and instruction annotation across all temporal horizons. See the appendix for additional details regarding our prompt design, segmentation, instructions, and keybinds.

3.3 GameHorizon-Data

Using our annotator, we construct GameHorizon-Data as a large-scale corpus with gameplay videos, actions, and multi-horizon instructions across diverse games. We report data statistics and comparisons in this section.

Dataset Statistics. We present detailed statistics of our GameHorizon-Data in Table 1. First, regarding data scale and proportion, the corpus comprises 5,000 hours of human gameplay across 21 game titles,

Table 1. Statistics of GameHorizon-Data across 21 game titles. We report the duration and share of recordings, counts of actions and instructions, and the average temporal span of each distinct instruction. Games are sorted by duration. Valid rate denotes the fraction retained for instruction annotation after filtering. Actions are reported in units of 10^4 .

Game Title	Recording Duration and Share				Annotation Counts				Avg. Instruction Span (s)		
	Total (h)	Share (%)	Valid Rate (%)	Valid (h)	Actions (10^4)	L_1	L_2	L_3	L_1	L_2	L_3
Valorant	617.5	12.35	86.4	533.8	5,811	705,380	23,113	5,778	2.72	83.1	332.5
Minecraft	589.8	11.80	84.5	498.3	5,087	448,166	21,715	5,429	4.00	82.6	330.4
Grand Theft Auto V	566.1	11.32	86.5	489.9	3,585	382,302	21,644	5,411	4.61	81.5	325.9
Palworld	438.7	8.77	83.5	366.5	3,741	329,615	15,971	3,993	4.00	82.6	330.4
Delta Force	337.0	6.74	85.1	286.9	3,123	379,091	12,422	3,105	2.72	83.1	332.5
Roco Kingdom: World	329.2	6.58	91.9	302.4	2,677	786,446	13,054	3,263	1.38	83.4	333.6
Red Dead Redemption 2	304.4	6.09	85.9	261.6	1,992	202,428	11,553	2,888	4.65	81.5	326.1
Cyberpunk 2077	301.2	6.02	87.9	264.7	2,574	192,222	11,646	2,912	4.96	81.8	327.3
Genshin Impact	232.6	4.65	90.4	210.4	1,862	547,134	9,082	2,270	1.38	83.4	333.6
PUBG: Battlegrounds	197.4	3.95	84.6	167.0	1,818	220,726	7,233	1,808	2.72	83.1	332.5
Elden Ring Nightreign	168.9	3.38	90.0	152.0	1,348	250,877	6,630	1,658	2.18	82.6	330.2
The Witcher 3: Wild Hunt	158.7	3.17	89.4	141.8	1,323	287,433	6,290	1,573	1.78	81.2	324.6
Elden Ring	135.9	2.72	92.6	125.9	1,116	207,706	5,489	1,372	2.18	82.6	330.2
Escape from Tarkov	119.8	2.40	81.7	97.9	1,065	129,320	4,237	1,059	2.72	83.1	332.5
Apex Legends	116.5	2.33	85.3	99.4	1,082	131,381	4,305	1,076	2.72	83.1	332.5
Wuthering Waves	108.4	2.17	89.1	96.5	819	294,088	4,077	1,019	1.18	85.2	341.0
Neverness to Everness	101.3	2.03	89.3	90.4	800	235,145	3,903	976	1.38	83.4	333.6
Assassin's Creed	51.1	1.02	87.0	44.5	338	34,401	1,963	491	4.65	81.5	326.1
Black Myth: Wukong	51.1	1.02	91.3	46.6	414	76,971	2,034	509	2.18	82.6	330.2
Watch Dogs 2	38.5	0.77	85.0	32.7	249	25,324	1,445	361	4.65	81.5	326.1
Honor of Kings: World	35.9	0.72	87.3	31.3	277	81,429	1,352	338	1.38	83.4	333.6
Total / Avg.	5,000	100.00	86.8	4,341	41,103	5,947,588	189,158	47,290	2.63	82.6	330.4

Table 2. Comparison with existing gameplay datasets. Large-scale denotes at least 3,000 hours of gameplay. AAA-focused indicates that more than half of the included game titles are AAA games. Direct human actions refer to cases where the majority of action labels are recorded directly from human players rather than inferred, extracted, or generated.

Dataset	Data Scope		Annotation Properties				Notes
	Large Scale	AAA-Focused	Direct Human Actions	Instruction Annotations	Dense Instructions	Multi-Horizon	
Single-Game Datasets							
MineRL (Guss et al., 2019)	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Minecraft; human actions; no textual instructions.
MineDojo (Fan et al., 2022)	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Web Minecraft videos; no actions or instructions.
VPT (Baker et al., 2022)	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Web Minecraft videos; IDM actions; no instructions.
STEVE-1 (Lifshitz et al., 2023)	✗	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	Minecraft; only 10K short-term text instructions.
PLAICraft (He et al., 2025)	✓	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Minecraft; human actions; no textual instructions.
WildWorld (Li et al., 2026)	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	Monster Hunter Wilds; AI actions; no instructions.
EgoCS-400K (Guo et al., 2026)	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	CS; replay-derived action labels; no instructions.
Multi-Game Datasets							
NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026)	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Gamepad-overlay actions without text instructions.
Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026)	✓	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	Majority non-AAA games; sparse text instructions.
D2E (Choi et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Mostly IDM-inferred actions; no text instructions.
Gaming-500-hours (Markov AI, 2026)	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	Majority non-AAA games; no textual instructions.
GameHorizon-Data (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	AAA; human actions; dense multi-horizon instructions.

spanning diverse genres such as open-world, action role-playing, competitive shooter, sandbox survival, and creature-collecting adventure games. Valorant contributes the largest share with 617.5 hours (12.35%), while even the smallest entry, Honor of Kings: World, contains 35.9 hours (0.72%). All recordings are collected from 100 experienced players who receive extensive training on the recording and upload procedures. We filter out low-quality or uninformative content using automated rules and VLM assessments, *e.g.*, prolonged action-free cutscenes and switches away from the game window. After filtering, 4,341 hours (86.8%) are retained for instruction annotation, while the synchronized keyboard-mouse actions remain available for all 5,000 hours. Second, in terms of annotation counts, GameHorizon-Data contains 411.03 million keyboard-mouse action events, averaging 22.84 events per second. The action stream combines mouse inputs (movements and button presses) sampled at 20 Hz with an average of 2.84 keyboard events per second. The retained footage is annotated with 6,184,036 textual instructions, including 5,947,588 short-horizon operations, 189,158 medium-horizon goals, and 47,290 long-horizon strategies. Third, turning to instruction spans, the average duration increases across horizons, *i.e.*, 2.63 seconds for L_1 , 82.6 seconds for L_2 , and 330.4 seconds for L_3 . Each span




Figure 4. The offline track of GameHorizon-Bench. It comprises three primary tasks and ten variant tasks. Given sampled frames and the short-horizon instruction L_1 , single-horizon action T_1 requires models to determine the correct action sequence. Multi-horizon decomposition T_2 evaluates whether models can decompose a medium-horizon goal L_2 into the correct sequence of short-horizon operations L_1 . Cross-horizon consistency T_3 assesses the overall consistency across frames, L_1 – L_3 instructions, and actions. Variant tasks T^* provide additional diagnostics and insights into different gameplay abilities. Due to space constraints, L_1 instructions are abridged in T_2 . Only the correct option appears in T_3 .

measures the temporal coverage of one distinct instruction, with all frames in the corresponding clip sharing the same instruction at that horizon. Thus, every frame is simultaneously aligned with instructions at all three horizons, yielding our dense multi-horizon instruction pyramid across diverse AAA gameplay scenarios.

Comparisons with Other Datasets. We compare GameHorizon-Data with existing datasets in Table 2. Our dataset is the first corpus that jointly provides large-scale AAA gameplay, direct human actions, and dense multi-horizon instructions. First, for data scope, most datasets are restricted to a single game. For example, MineDojo (Fan et al., 2022), VPT (Baker et al., 2022), and PLAICraft (He et al., 2025) cover only Minecraft. WildWorld (Li et al., 2026) and EgoCS-400K (Guo et al., 2026) are confined to Monster Hunter Wilds and Counter-Strike. The few multi-game datasets span predominantly non-AAA games, *e.g.*, NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026) and Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026). In contrast, GameHorizon-Data contains 5,000 hours of gameplay across 21 titles, with a primary focus on AAA games. Second, for action annotations, several datasets lack directly recorded human controls. For example, MineDojo (Fan et al., 2022) provides web Minecraft videos without action annotations, while some other datasets obtain action labels using IDMs (Baker et al., 2022; Choi et al., 2026), gamepad segmentation (Magne et al., 2026), in-game AI (Li et al., 2026), or game replays (Guo et al., 2026). By comparison, GameHorizon-Data captures synchronized keyboard-mouse actions from 100 experienced human players across the entire dataset. Third, most existing datasets omit instructions, *e.g.*, VPT (Baker et al., 2022), NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026), D2E (Choi et al., 2026), and gaming-500-hours (Markov AI, 2026). Among the few exceptions, STEVE-1 (Lifshitz et al., 2023) contains 10K short-term instructions, while Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026) provides one instruction every few minutes. Our dataset contains a total of 6,184,036 distinct multi-horizon instructions with dense per-frame coverage.

3.4 GameHorizon-Bench

Leveraging our data, we develop GameHorizon-Bench, a unified benchmark that evaluates multi-horizon gameplay capabilities across diverse model families through the reproducible offline and stepwise online tracks.

Reproducible Offline Track. The offline track formulates gameplay evaluation as standardized MCQs derived from the aligned frames, multi-horizon instructions, and player actions in GameHorizon-Data. It contains thousands of questions organized into three primary tasks and ten variant tasks. High-quality annotations, standardized inputs and options, as well as independence from game environments and agent harnesses enable unified and reproducible comparisons across the VLMs, UMMs, GUI agents, coding agents, and game agents.

To be specific, as shown in Fig. 4, the single-horizon action task (T_1) asks models to make the correct action decision based on input frames and the short-horizon instruction (L_1). The correct option is constructed by mapping ground-truth keyboard-mouse controls to textual action sequences using game-specific keybinds, which enables unified evaluation across games and models without being constrained by heterogeneous action spaces. T_1 provides a rigorous test centered on action perception. Next, the multi-horizon decomposition task (T_2) requires models to identify the ordered sequence of short-horizon operations for realizing a medium-horizon goal (L_2). The correct option presents the L_1 sequence corresponding to the target L_2 goal within the pyramid, whereas the distractors differ in their composition and temporal order. T_2 evaluates top-down goal




Figure 5. The online track of GameHorizon-Bench. It contains long-horizon causal and thematic tasks, each comprising multiple verifiable short-horizon subtasks. The causal tasks can only be completed in a prescribed order because of dependencies between successive subtasks. The thematic tasks contain subtasks that share a common theme but can be performed in any order. The figure shows results from Gemini 3.6 Flash (Google DeepMind, 2026b), with arrows indicating its actual execution order. After a subtask fails, the environment is reset to the corresponding success state so that evaluation can continue. A long-horizon task is considered passed only when all constituent subtasks succeed.

decomposition and temporal planning from abstract goals to concrete operations. Finally, the cross-horizon consistency task (T_3) assesses the overall consistency across videos, instructions, and actions. The correct option consists of the aligned L_3 , L_2 , and L_1 instructions, along with the action sequence from the pyramid. T_3 focuses on integrated understanding across visual observations, textual instructions, and gameplay actions.

Moreover, a series of variant tasks (T^*) can provide additional diagnostics and analyses of different gameplay capabilities. For T_1^* , we compare current-action perception and future-action planning under three input settings, including frames only, frames with a short-horizon instruction, and frames with multi-horizon instructions. The comparison reveals how textual instructions influence action decisions and planning. For T_2^* , we compare top-down decomposition from L_2 goals to L_1 operations with bottom-up abstraction in the reverse direction. The comparison clarifies the rationale for our bottom-up annotation pipeline and top-down benchmark design. As for T_3^* , we compare instruction-only versus instruction-and-action options. The comparison helps identify whether the performance bottlenecks arise from goal planning or action decoding.

Stepwise Online Track. As a complementary evaluation, our online track tests whether offline scores are positively associated with gameplay capabilities. It evaluates long-horizon gameplay through order-dependent causal tasks and order-flexible thematic tasks, each comprising 2–6 verifiable short-horizon subtasks. When a subtask fails, the game is reset to the corresponding success state to prevent the failure from affecting subsequent steps. Beyond the aggregate success rates in previous work (Tan et al., 2025; Wang et al., 2025a; Bolton et al., 2025), our stepwise protocol can localize failures to specific stages within long-horizon objectives.

Specifically, the online track comprises 10 causal and 10 thematic tasks with 62 short-horizon subtasks. Due to the inaccessibility of underlying game states in most AAA titles, we implement the online track in Minecraft, as in prior work (Ju et al., 2026; Zheng et al., 2025; Li et al., 2025; Cai et al., 2024a; Fan et al., 2022). Four example tasks are presented in Fig. 5 with the actual execution order and results of Gemini 3.6 Flash (Google DeepMind, 2026b). The steps within each causal task have sequential dependencies, e.g., first collecting milk, then crafting a cake, and finally placing it on the dining table. For thematic tasks, the subtasks share a common theme and can be completed in any order, e.g., crafting a wooden pickaxe, axe, and shovel for a toolkit. In the failure cases, Gemini 3.6 Flash understands intended operations yet still commits execution errors, e.g., placing objects in inaccurate positions or failing to follow the correct recipe when making a cake.

Comparisons with Other Benchmarks. We compare gameplay benchmarks in Table 3. First, with a primary focus on AAA titles, GameHorizon-Bench evaluates 47 models on 21 games, e.g., VLMs, UMMs, GUI, coding, and game agents. Prior work tests limited model types mainly on Minecraft (Fan et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2025; Ju et al., 2026) or non-AAA games (Paglieri et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2026; Ouyang et al., 2026). Second, multi-horizon instructions and human actions enable reliable evaluation across nested horizons. Third, beyond online success rates (Fan et al., 2022; Ouyang et al., 2026; Tan et al., 2025) or progress scores (Paglieri et al., 2025; Ju et al., 2026), we provide the reproducible offline track with thousands of MCQs and the stepwise online track with failure localization. Refer to the appendix for more details about our GameHorizon-Bench.

Table 3. Comparison with existing gameplay benchmarks. Model diversity denotes evaluation across at least three model paradigms, *e.g.*, VLMs, UMMs, GUI, coding, and game agents. Our GameHorizon-Bench tests 47 models of five types.

Benchmark	Benchmark Scope		Annotation Properties		Evaluation Settings		Notes
	Model Diversity	AAA-Focused	Direct Human Actions	Multi-Horizon	Reproducible Offline	Stepwise Online	
Single-Game Benchmarks							
MineDojo (Fan et al., 2022)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Online success rates in Minecraft; the game agents only.
MCU (Zheng et al., 2025)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Minecraft; VLM-based online scores; game agents only.
MineExplorer (Ju et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	Online milestone rates in Minecraft; the VLMs only.
Multi-Game Benchmarks							
BALROG (Paglieri et al., 2025)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	Non-AAA; the online progress scores; LLMs and VLMs.
VideoGameBench (Zhang et al., 2025)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Retro and classic games; online scores and VLMs only.
Orak (Park et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Majority non-AAA; the online scores; LLMs and VLMs.
GameWorld (Ouyang et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Browser mini-games only; online scores; VLM agents.
GameVerse (Zhang et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	Mostly non-AAA; online milestone scores; VLM agents.
GameHorizon-Bench (Ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	AAA; reproducible offline; stepwise online; diverse models.

4 Experiments

We conduct extensive experiments and systematic evaluations using our GameHorizon-Bench. We describe the evaluation protocols and implementation details in Sec. 4.1. The testing results on our offline primary tasks and variant tasks are presented in Sec. 4.2 and Sec. 4.3, respectively. Besides, Sec. 4.4 reports the results from our stepwise online track, which examines the relations between offline scores and online gameplay abilities.

4.1 Evaluation Protocols and Details

Offline Track. We evaluate 47 models spanning five categories, including 35 general-purpose VLMs, 4 UMMs, 2 GUI agents, 3 coding agents, and 3 dedicated game agents. The 44 models of the first four types natively support question answering. We adopt unified MCQs for all offline tasks. Each model receives the same four-option questions and directly outputs the selections, ensuring standardized and reproducible evaluation.

On the other hand, the dedicated game agents (Yue et al., 2026; Magne et al., 2026; Li et al., 2025) are trained to produce action sequences without supporting question answering or reasoning. Thus, we evaluate these models only on the single-horizon action task (T_1) by matching their action predictions against the four options via sequence alignment (Needleman and Wunsch, 1970). The option with the highest alignment score is taken as the selected answer. If all four scores fall below a threshold, indicating no meaningful overlap with any option, the prediction is marked incorrect, *e.g.*, an empty action sequence. For NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026), we additionally map its gamepad actions to the keyboard-and-mouse trajectories using our keybinds.

As for the implementation details, each of the three primary tasks (T_1 – T_3) contains 1,000 MCQs, while each of the ten variants contains 200 MCQs. In total, the offline track consists of 5,000 MCQs for high-confidence and reliable evaluation. Some models are evaluated through their official APIs, while the others are served locally on GPUs. The inference of dedicated game agents follows their official checkpoints, rollout procedures, and context-window sizes, whereas the other four model categories are given the same number of input frames. We report MCQ accuracy for all models and divide them into four performance tiers based on their rankings.

Online Track. Due to evaluation costs, we sample three models per offline tier, yielding 12 models for online testing. We construct ten causal and ten thematic tasks with 62 short-horizon subtasks. The thematic tasks span diverse themes, *e.g.*, resource gathering, crafting, farming, building, and combat. A multi-step long-horizon task is considered passed only when the model completes it end-to-end without intermediate failures and game resets. Besides, each subtask is allocated a maximum budget of 400 model calls. Any subtask not completed within this budget is marked as failed. The task outcomes are automatically determined by the underlying game states. We report success rates for both short-horizon subtasks and long-horizon tasks.

4.2 Offline Primary Tasks

Benchmark Discriminability. We first test the 44 models with question-answering abilities in Table 4. The mean accuracy across our benchmark is 64.7%, substantially above the 25% random baseline, suggesting that the designed tasks are solvable yet challenging for meaningful evaluation. Among the evaluated models, the

Table 4. Offline results of the primary tasks T_1 - T_3 . The table reports results for general VLMs, UMMs, GUI agents, and coding agents with question-answering abilities. Accuracies are reported as percentages. Overall denotes the mean accuracy across three tasks. Models are ordered from higher to lower performance and divided into four tiers. The best and second-best metrics are marked in bold and underlined. The final row reports the average accuracy for all models.

Tier 1					Tier 2						
Rank	Model	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	Overall	Rank	Model	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	Overall
 1	GPT-6-Astra	69.4	79.6	91.5	80.2	12	Doubao-Seed-2.0-Pro	59.2	74.9	80.0	71.4
 2	Gemini 3.8 Flash	65.9	81.2	84.8	77.3	13	Claude Fable 5	62.9	72.7	78.1	71.2
 3	Gemini 3.7 Flash	66.2	80.1	83.9	76.7	14	GPT-5.6 Terra	62.1	75.6	74.4	70.7
4	Gemini 3.6 Flash	62.3	79.1	84.6	75.3	15	Qwen3.7-Plus	58.8	75.9	71.5	68.7
5	GPT-5.6 Sol	65.3	77.5	81.5	74.8	16	Qwen3.8-27B	59.9	77.4	68.1	68.5
6	Kimi-K3	64.4	79.3	79.7	74.5	17	GPT-5.6 Luna	61.6	70.7	71.1	67.8
7	Gemini 3.5 Flash	64.9	77.4	80.8	74.4	17	Kimi-K2.6	61.2	73.2	69.0	67.8
8	GPT-5.5	64.6	78.9	76.2	73.2	19	Doubao-Seed-2.0-Lite	55.2	69.0	76.3	66.8
9	Gemini 3.1 Pro	64.5	75.8	78.2	72.8	20	Gemma 4 31B-IT	53.8	68.6	76.6	66.3
10	Doubao-Seed-2.1-Turbo	63.1	79.4	75.5	72.7	21	MiniMax-M3	57.8	68.5	70.6	65.6
11	Doubao-Seed-2.1-Pro	62.9	76.7	76.6	72.1	22	Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B-Thinking	58.2	71.6	65.9	65.2
Tier 3					Tier 4						
Rank	Model	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	Overall	Rank	Model	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	Overall
23	Claude Opus 4.8	59.1	62.1	73.1	64.8	34	Qwen3.6-35B-A3B	53.3	52.9	66.3	57.5
24	Claude Sonnet 5	54.4	57.7	82.0	64.7	35	Qwen3-Omni-30B-A3B-Instruct	52.5	55.6	63.7	57.3
25	Step-3.7-Flash	57.5	71.3	63.4	64.1	36	GELab-Zero-4B-Preview	51.8	46.8	72.7	57.1
26	Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B-Instruct	55.1	62.1	73.1	63.4	37	Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct	52.0	54.3	63.7	56.7
27	GLM-5V-Turbo	53.4	65.4	70.8	63.2	38	InternVL3.5-8B	51.8	50.2	65.5	55.8
28	GPT-5.2	58.9	58.9	70.6	62.8	39	GLM-4.1V-9B-Thinking	54.9	54.8	55.3	55.0
29	Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	53.3	60.1	73.5	62.3	40	GPT-4o	55.7	46.3	61.3	54.4
30	BAGEL-7B-MoT	51.7	57.3	75.1	61.4	41	UI-TARS-1.5-7B	49.1	47.1	62.9	53.0
31	Qwen2.5-VL-32B-Instruct	54.8	58.0	69.7	60.8	42	Ovis-U1-3B	44.7	39.6	59.2	47.8
32	Step3-VL-10B	55.4	64.7	61.7	60.6	43	InternVL3.5-2B	45.1	40.3	52.7	46.0
33	SenseNova-U1-8B-MoT	48.2	59.2	67.5	58.3	44	InternVL-U-4B	46.1	37.9	49.8	44.6
Average over all models:		T ₁ = 57.3	T ₂ = 65.1	T ₃ = 71.6	Overall = 64.7						

accuracy ranges from 44.6% to 80.2%, spanning 35.6 percentage points and clearly distinguishing models in different capability tiers. At the task level, the results reveal a coherent difficulty hierarchy, *i.e.*, 57.3% on T_1 , 65.1% on T_2 , and 71.6% on T_3 . T_1 is the most difficult task because it requires fine-grained action prediction under strict correctness criteria from keyboard-mouse trajectories. T_3 emphasizes cross-horizon understanding and exhibits the highest accuracy because the options provide rich information from multi-horizon instructions and actions. T_2 lies between T_1 and T_3 , focusing on the decomposition and planning of complex goals. Overall, our GameHorizon-Bench demonstrates an appropriate task-difficulty gradient and clear model discriminability.

General-Purpose VLMs. Proprietary models dominate the top of the leaderboard, occupying ten of the eleven positions in Tier 1. GPT-6-Astra ranks first with 80.2% overall accuracy, followed by Gemini 3.8 Flash and Gemini 3.7 Flash with 77.3% and 76.7%, respectively. Kimi-K3 is the only open-weight model in Tier 1, ranking sixth with 74.5%. Recent open-weight models also show competitive performance, *e.g.*, Qwen3.8-27B, Kimi-K2.6, and Gemma 4 31B-IT rank 16th, 17th, and 20th, surpassing several proprietary models. Within the same model family, newer or larger variants generally perform better. For example, overall accuracy increases from 62.8% for GPT-5.2 to 73.2% for GPT-5.5, 74.8% for GPT-5.6 Sol, and 80.2% for GPT-6-Astra. Similar trends are also observed in other families, such as Gemini, Kimi, Qwen, Doubao, InternVL, and GLM.

Unified Multimodal Models. We evaluate four UMMs, including BAGEL-7B-MoT (Deng et al., 2025), SenseNova-U1-8B-MoT (Diao et al., 2026), Ovis-U1-3B (Wang et al., 2025c), and InternVL-U-4B (Tian et al., 2026). All four models fall into Tier 3 or Tier 4, indicating that current UMMs remain less competitive in gameplay tasks. The larger models perform better, *i.e.*, BAGEL-7B-MoT achieves 61.4% and ranks 30th, while SenseNova-U1-8B-MoT achieves 58.3% and ranks 33rd. In comparison, Ovis-U1-3B and InternVL-U-4B achieve only 47.8% and 44.6%. To examine potential interference between understanding and generation, we compare InternVL-U-4B with its understanding backbone, InternVL3.5-2B. Despite having additional generation parameters, InternVL-U-4B underperforms InternVL3.5-2B by 1.4 percentage points. The result suggests that unifying understanding and generation could introduce interference, offsetting gains from increased capacity.

Table 5. Offline results of game agents. We evaluate NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026), Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026), and JARVIS-VLA (Li et al., 2025), with Gemma 4 31B-IT as a reference. Game agents are trained to predict actions without question answering or reasoning abilities. We test them only on the single-horizon action task T_1 . In-domain denotes fine-tuning on the dataset, *e.g.*, JARVIS-VLA on VPT (Baker et al., 2022). Zero-shot indicates the opposite.

Model	T_1	In-Domain	Zero-Shot	Model	T_1	In-Domain	Zero-Shot
NitroGen	22.0	✗	✓	Open-P2P	26.8	✗	✓
Open-P2P	24.4	✗	✓	Gemma 4 31B-IT	54.1	✗	✓
JARVIS-VLA	28.1	✗	✓	JARVIS-VLA	54.2	✓	✗

(a) GameHorizon-Bench (AAA games) (b) VPT (Minecraft)

Table 6. Effects of thinking on offline results. Δ denotes the change in overall accuracy. For lightweight models, thinking often induces hallucinations, leading to performance degradation. More capable models can leverage thinking to plan and decompose complex goals in gameplay, thus improving the accuracy, *e.g.*, GLM-5V-Turbo and Doubao-Seed-2.1-Pro.

Model	Thinking	T_1	T_2	T_3	Overall	Δ	Model	Thinking	T_1	T_2	T_3	Overall	Δ
UI-TARS-1.5-7B	✗	49.1	47.1	62.9	53.0	—	GLM-5V-Turbo	✗	53.2	56.4	63.1	57.6	—
	✓	45.2	45.4	43.9	44.8	-8.2		✓	53.4	65.4	70.8	63.2	+5.6
Qwen2.5-VL-7B	✗	52.0	54.3	63.7	56.7	—	Doubao-Seed-2.1-Pro	✗	56.4	56.8	75.2	62.8	—
	✓	44.4	52.2	55.7	50.8	-5.9		✓	62.9	76.7	76.6	72.1	+9.3

(a) Degradation with Thinking (b) Improvement with Thinking

GUI Agents. We evaluate two GUI agents, GELab-Zero-4B-Preview (GELab-Team, StepFun, 2025) and UI-TARS-1.5-7B (Qin et al., 2025), on our benchmark. Both models fall into Tier 4, indicating limited transfer from computer-use environments to AAA gameplay. GELab-Zero-4B-Preview achieves 57.1% overall accuracy and ranks 36th, outperforming UI-TARS-1.5-7B by 4.1 percentage points. UI-TARS-1.5-7B achieves 53.0% and ranks 41st, trailing its general-purpose baseline, Qwen2.5-VL-7B-Instruct, by 3.7 percentage points. These results suggest that domain-specific post-training can weaken the model generalization across domains.

Coding Agents. We evaluate three coding agents, including Claude Sonnet 5, Opus 4.8, and Fable 5. Among the three models, Claude Fable 5 performs best, ranking 13th in Tier 2 with 71.2% overall accuracy. Claude Opus 4.8 and Sonnet 5 fall into Tier 3, ranking 23rd and 24th with 64.8% and 64.7%, respectively. Despite the focus on coding abilities, these models generalize well to gameplay and achieve competitive performance on our benchmark. Their advantage over the GUI agents (Qin et al., 2025; GELab-Team, StepFun, 2025) may stem from the broader training data, stronger foundation models, and better reasoning capabilities.

Dedicated Game Agents. As shown in Table 5, the three game agents perform near the 25% random baseline on unseen AAA games. Their scores can fall below random because action outputs that fail to match any option are counted as incorrect, *e.g.*, empty action sequences. JARVIS-VLA (Li et al., 2025) shows strong domain dependence. After fine-tuning on VPT (Baker et al., 2022), it achieves 54.2% on the in-domain Minecraft data, comparable to the zero-shot Gemma 4 31B-IT at 54.1%. However, the accuracy drops to 28.1% on unseen AAA games. NitroGen (Magne et al., 2026) and Open-P2P (Yue et al., 2026) show similar limitations, as neither is trained on AAA gameplay data with aligned multi-horizon instructions and actions. These results further highlight the value of our dataset covering diverse AAA game titles and multiple temporal horizons.

Effects of Thinking. As shown in Table 6, thinking does not uniformly improve offline performance. The effects vary with model reasoning quality. Enabling thinking improves the accuracy of GLM-5V-Turbo and Doubao-Seed-2.1-Pro by 5.6 and 9.3 percentage points. The gains are particularly pronounced on T_2 , reaching 9.0 and 19.9 percentage points, suggesting that capable models can leverage thinking to decompose and plan complex goals. In contrast, thinking reduces the accuracy of UI-TARS-1.5-7B and Qwen2.5-VL-7B by 8.2 and 5.9 percentage points. Qualitative inspection indicates that lightweight models can produce hallucinated reasoning, thereby misleading action prediction rather than improving it. The results indicate that the efficacy of thinking in gameplay depends on whether it enables models to decompose and plan complex goals correctly. The findings reveal an inherent trade-off between reasoning ability and model efficiency in real-time gameplay.

Table 7. Results of the offline variant tasks T_1^* . The table presents six variants of the primary task T_1 , including current-action perception and future-action planning under three input settings, *i.e.*, frames only, frames with short-horizon instructions, and frames with multi-horizon instructions. Considering the evaluation costs, we test four models using 200 questions for each variant. Values outside parentheses denote accuracy, while parenthesized values denote changes in percentage points relative to the preceding column. The final row reports the average results across all four models.

Model	Current-Action Perception			Future-Action Planning		
	Frames Only	+ Short	+ Multi-Horizon	Frames Only	+ Short	+ Multi-Horizon
Qwen2.5-VL-32B-Instruct	39.0	53.5 (+14.5)	54.5 (+1.0)	33.5	29.5 (−4.0)	33.5 (+4.0)
Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B-Instruct	41.0	52.0 (+11.0)	54.5 (+2.5)	37.0	34.0 (−3.0)	39.5 (+5.5)
Gemini 3.1 Pro	50.0	67.0 (+17.0)	67.0 (+0.0)	34.0	36.5 (+2.5)	46.5 (+10.0)
Gemini 3.5 Flash	48.0	62.0 (+14.0)	64.0 (+2.0)	34.0	39.0 (+5.0)	47.5 (+8.5)
Overall	44.5	58.6 (+14.1)	60.0 (+1.4)	34.6	34.8 (+0.2)	41.8 (+7.0)

Table 8. Offline variant tasks T_2^* and T_3^* . The left table compares top-down decomposition from L_2 to L_1 with bottom-up abstraction from L_1 to L_2 . The right table quantifies the accuracy loss from action decoding in cross-horizon consistency.

Model	Top-Down Decomposition	Bottom-Up Abstraction	Model	$L_3 - L_2 - L_1$ w/o Actions	$L_3 - L_2 - L_1$ w/ Actions
Qwen2.5-VL-32B-Instruct	61.0	98.0 (+37.0)	Qwen2.5-VL-32B-Instruct	69.0	68.5 (−0.5)
Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B-Instruct	61.5	98.0 (+36.5)	Qwen3-VL-235B-A22B-Instruct	72.0	71.0 (−1.0)
Gemini 3.1 Pro	76.5	99.0 (+22.5)	Gemini 3.1 Pro	77.5	77.5 (+0.0)
Gemini 3.5 Flash	79.0	98.5 (+19.5)	Gemini 3.5 Flash	77.5	76.5 (−1.0)
Overall	69.5	98.4 (+28.9)	Overall	74.0	73.4 (−0.6)

(a) Goal Decomposition and Abstraction (T_2^*)

(b) Cross-Horizon Consistency (T_3^*)

4.3 Offline Variant Tasks

Given the evaluation costs, we test four models on 200 randomly sampled questions for each of the ten variants.

Action Perception and Planning. As shown in Table 7, all four models consistently perform better on current-action perception than future-action planning across the three input settings. On average, perception outperforms planning by 9.9 percentage points with frames only, 23.8 points with short-horizon instructions, and 18.2 points with multi-horizon instructions. The consistent gap indicates that models more reliably recognize actions depicted in the observed frames than determine appropriate future actions. Future-action planning remains more challenging because it requires inferring subsequent behavior from temporal context. Nevertheless, the capability of planning is essential to gameplay, especially for the complex long-horizon tasks.

Visual Inputs and Textual Instructions. Table 7 shows that adding short-horizon instructions to the visual inputs consistently improves action perception across all four models. Average accuracy increases by 14.1 percentage points, from 44.5% with frames only to 58.6% with short-horizon instructions. Notably, the improvement is achieved solely by adding the instructions to the model inputs, without any fine-tuning on our annotations. The results indicate that visual observations alone (Magne et al., 2026) may not fully specify task intent, whereas textual instructions can help models to identify the correct operations for the specified game goals. The finding underscores the value of our instructions as inputs for model training and evaluation in gameplay.

Multi-Horizon Pyramid. In Table 7, instruction horizons have distinct effects on current-action perception and future-action planning. For action perception, short-horizon instructions increase average accuracy by 14.1 points, whereas multi-horizon instructions yield only a further 1.4-point improvement to 60.0%. Conversely, for future planning, short-horizon instructions produce only a 0.2-point improvement, while multi-horizon instructions further increase accuracy from 34.8% to 41.8% by 7.0 points. Short-horizon instructions directly describe immediate operations and therefore align more closely with current actions. Medium- and long-horizon instructions provide sustained goals and game strategies that better guide future planning. These results demonstrate the advantage of our multi-horizon pyramid over the prior simple instructions (Yue et al., 2026). Overall, our multi-horizon framework can support both immediate decision-making and future-task planning.

Top-Down and Bottom-Up. In Table 8(a), all four models perform substantially better on bottom-up abstraction than top-down decomposition. Average accuracy reaches 98.4% for abstraction but only 69.5% for decomposition, with a gap of 28.9 percentage points. For bottom-up abstraction, concrete low-level

Table 9. Online results of GameHorizon-Bench. Due to the high evaluation costs, we test 12 models in our online track, with three models per offline performance tier. Each entry reports the success rate as a percentage, followed by the number of passed tasks out of the total in parentheses. The offline and online rankings show a clear positive association.

Tier 1							Tier 2						
Online Rank	Model	Offline Rank	Short-Horizon Subtasks	Long-Horizon Tasks	Causal	Thematic	Online Rank	Model	Offline Rank	Short-Horizon Subtasks	Long-Horizon Tasks	Causal	Thematic
1	GPT-6-Astra	1	66.1 (41/62)	45.0 (9/20)	40.0 (4/10)	50.0 (5/10)	4	GPT-5.6 Terra	14	37.1 (23/62)	10.0 (2/20)	20.0 (2/10)	0.0 (0/10)
2	Gemini 3.6 Flash	4	56.5 (35/62)	30.0 (6/20)	30.0 (3/10)	30.0 (3/10)	5	GPT-5.6 Luna	17	33.9 (21/62)	10.0 (2/20)	10.0 (1/10)	10.0 (1/10)
3	Kimi-K3	6	46.8 (29/62)	10.0 (2/20)	20.0 (2/10)	0.0 (0/10)	6	MiniMax-M3	21	29.0 (18/62)	10.0 (2/20)	10.0 (1/10)	10.0 (1/10)
Tier 3							Tier 4						
Online Rank	Model	Offline Rank	Short-Horizon Subtasks	Long-Horizon Tasks	Causal	Thematic	Online Rank	Model	Offline Rank	Short-Horizon Subtasks	Long-Horizon Tasks	Causal	Thematic
7	GLM-5V-Turbo	27	27.4 (17/62)	5.0 (1/20)	10.0 (1/10)	0.0 (0/10)	10	Qwen3.6-35B-A3B	34	11.3 (7/62)	5.0 (1/20)	10.0 (1/10)	0.0 (0/10)
8	Qwen3.5-397B-A17B	29	19.4 (12/62)	5.0 (1/20)	10.0 (1/10)	0.0 (0/10)	11	InternVL3.5-8B	38	3.2 (2/62)	0.0 (0/20)	0.0 (0/10)	0.0 (0/10)
9	Step3-VL-10B	32	14.5 (9/62)	5.0 (1/20)	10.0 (1/10)	0.0 (0/10)	12	UI-TARS-1.5-7B	41	1.6 (1/62)	0.0 (0/20)	0.0 (0/10)	0.0 (0/10)

action sequences contain sufficient information to identify the corresponding higher-level goals, resulting in near-ceiling accuracy. Although this saturation limits its discriminability for evaluation, the reliable bottom-up mapping is well suited to our annotation pipeline, which constructs higher-level instructions from segmented short-horizon trajectories. In contrast, top-down decomposition starts from abstract goals and strategies that omit operational details and may correspond to multiple valid action sequences. The information insufficiency and underdetermination make top-down decomposition unsuitable for annotation but turn it into a challenging evaluation task for goal decomposition and planning. Together, these results justify our complementary design choices, *i.e.*, the bottom-up abstraction for data annotation and top-down decomposition for model evaluation.

Action-Decoding Error. In Table 8(b), adding action sequences to the cross-horizon consistency task causes only modest performance degradation. Average accuracy decreases from 74.0% without actions to 73.4% with actions, corresponding to a loss of 0.6 percentage points. The limited gap indicates that decoding low-level action sequences introduces little additional error beyond matching instructions across temporal horizons. Most errors therefore arise from decomposing, planning, and aligning multi-horizon goals rather than from action decoding. The results help to locate the primary bottleneck for current models in gameplay scenarios.

4.4 Stepwise Online Track

Offline-Online Association. In Table 9, online performance closely aligns with offline rankings. Models from offline Tiers 1–4 occupy online ranks 1–3, 4–6, 7–9, and 10–12, respectively. The positive association proves that our offline track captures relevant abilities and provides an effective indicator of online gameplay performance.

Long-Horizon Challenges. The long-horizon online tasks remain difficult for current models. GPT-6-Astra achieves the highest success rate of 45.0%, while ten of the twelve models achieve at most 10.0%. Each long-horizon task requires many sequential operations. A single failure in a short-horizon subtask can invalidate the entire task. The results expose existing limitations in long-horizon game planning and strategy formulation.

Stepwise Diagnosis. As described in Fig. 5 and Sec. 3.4, each long-horizon causal or thematic task is decomposed into short-horizon subtasks. The stepwise protocol with game resets can localize failures to specific operations. *E.g.*, we can distinguish models that do not know how to craft a cake from those that understand the procedure but perform a certain step incorrectly. This design can support fine-grained diagnosis in long-horizon gameplay.

5 Conclusion

We propose GameHorizon, a unified data and evaluation suite that measures gameplay capabilities at different horizons across diverse model families. First, GameHorizon-Annotator can automatically build a dense instruction pyramid spanning short-horizon operations, medium-horizon goals, and long-horizon strategies. Second, we construct GameHorizon-Data, a large-scale AAA gameplay dataset with temporally aligned videos, actions, and multi-horizon instructions in 21 titles. Third, based on our data, GameHorizon-Bench combines reproducible offline evaluation with stepwise online testing, enabling standardized model comparisons and fine-grained failure diagnosis. Extensive experiments reveal capability differences among current models and identify their primary bottlenecks. Our work can serve as a data foundation and unified yardstick for systematically examining the gameplay performance across model families and temporal horizons.

References

- Loïc Magne, Anas Awadalla, Guanzhi Wang, Yinzhen Xu, Joshua Belofsky, Fengyuan Hu, Joohwan Kim, Ludwig Schmidt, Georgia Gkioxari, Jan Kautz, Yisong Yue, Yejin Choi, Yuke Zhu, and Linxi Fan. Nitrogen: An open foundation model for generalist gaming agents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 21511–21521, 2026.
- Yuguang Yue, Irakli Salia, Samuel Hunt, Chris Green, Wenzhe Shi, and Jonathan J Hunt. Scaling behavior cloning improves causal reasoning: An open model for real-time video game playing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.04575*, 2026.
- Weihao Tan, Xiangyang Li, Yunhao Fang, Heyuan Yao, Shi Yan, Hao Luo, Tenglong Ao, Huihui Li, Hongbin Ren, Bairen Yi, et al. Lumine: An open recipe for building generalist agents in 3d open worlds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.08892*, 2025.
- Zihao Wang, Xujing Li, Yining Ye, Junjie Fang, Haoming Wang, Longxiang Liu, Shihao Liang, Juntong Lu, Zhiyong Wu, Jiazhan Feng, et al. Game-tars: Pretrained foundation models for scalable generalist multimodal game agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.23691*, 2025a.
- Shaofei Cai, Zhancun Mu, Kaichen He, Bowei Zhang, Xinyue Zheng, Anji Liu, and Yitao Liang. Minestudio: A streamlined package for minecraft ai agent development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.18293*, 2024a.
- Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaeckermann, 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.
- Team Gemini. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- Bowen Baker, Ilge Akkaya, Peter Zhokov, Joost Huizinga, Jie Tang, Adrien Ecoffet, Brandon Houghton, Raul Sampedro, and Jeff Clune. Video pretraining (vpt): Learning to act by watching unlabeled online videos. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, volume 35, pages 24639–24654, 2022.
- Adrian Bolton, Alexander Lerchner, Alexandra Cordell, Alexandre Moufaret, Andrew Bolt, Andrew Lampinen, Anna Mitenkova, Arne Olav Hallingstad, Bojan Vujatovic, Bonnie Li, et al. Sima 2: A generalist embodied agent for virtual worlds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04797*, 2025.
- Yujia Qin, Yining Ye, Junjie Fang, Haoming Wang, Shihao Liang, Shizuo Tian, Junda Zhang, Jiahao Li, Yunxin Li, Shijue Huang, et al. Ui-tars: Pioneering automated gui interaction with native agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12326*, 2025.
- Haoming Wang, Haoyang Zou, Huatong Song, Jiazhan Feng, Junjie Fang, Juntong Lu, Longxiang Liu, Qinyu Luo, Shihao Liang, Shijue Huang, et al. Ui-tars-2 technical report: Advancing gui agent with multi-turn reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.02544*, 2025b.
- Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models, 2023. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- Weihao Tan, Wentao Zhang, Xinrun Xu, Haochong Xia, Ziluo Ding, Boyu Li, Bohan Zhou, Junpeng Yue, Jiechuan Jiang, Yewen Li, et al. Cradle: Empowering foundation agents towards general computer control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03186*, 2024.
- Muyao Li, Zihao Wang, Kaichen He, Xiaojian Ma, and Yitao Liang. Jarvis-vla: Post-training large-scale vision language models to play visual games with keyboards and mouse. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 17878–17899, 2025.
- Shaofei Cai, Bowei Zhang, Zihao Wang, Xiaojian Ma, Anji Liu, and Yitao Liang. Groot: Learning to follow instructions by watching gameplay videos. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b.
- Shaofei Cai, Zihao Wang, Kewei Lian, Zhancun Mu, Xiaojian Ma, Anji Liu, and Yitao Liang. Rocket-1: Mastering open-world interaction with visual-temporal context prompting. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 12122–12131, 2025.
- Anthony Brohan, Noah Brown, Justice Carbajal, Yevgen Chebotar, Xi Chen, Krzysztof Choromanski, Tianli Ding, Danny Driess, Avinava Dubey, Chelsea Finn, et al. Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15818*, 2023.

- Moo Jin Kim, Karl Pertsch, Siddharth Karamcheti, Ted Xiao, Ashwin Balakrishna, Suraj Nair, Rafael Rafailov, Ethan Foster, Grace Lam, Pannag Sanketi, et al. Openvla: An open-source vision-language-action model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09246*, 2024.
- Anthropic. Claude 3.7 Sonnet and Claude Code. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-7-sonnet>, February 2025. Accessed: 2026-08-20.
- Mingyu Ouyang, Siyuan Hu, Kevin Qinghong Lin, Hwee Tou Ng, and Mike Zheng Shou. Gameworld: Towards standardized and verifiable evaluation of multimodal game agents. 2026.
- Shalev Lifshitz, Keiran Paster, Harris Chan, Jimmy Ba, and Sheila McIlraith. Steve-1: A generative model for text-to-behavior in minecraft. 36:69900–69929, 2023.
- Linxi Fan, Guanzhi Wang, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Yuncong Yang, Haoyi Zhu, Andrew Tang, De-An Huang, Yuke Zhu, and Anima Anandkumar. Minedojo: Building open-ended embodied agents with internet-scale knowledge. 35:18343–18362, 2022.
- Zhen Li, Zian Meng, Shuwei Shi, Wenshuo Peng, Yuwei Wu, Bo Zheng, Chuanhao Li, and Kaipeng Zhang. Wildworld: A large-scale dataset for dynamic world modeling with actions and explicit state toward generative arpg. 2026.
- Kuan Zhang, Dongchen Liu, Qiyue Zhao, Jinkun Hou, Xinran Zhang, Qinlei Xie, Miao Liu, and Yiming Li. Gameverse: Can vision-language models learn from video-based reflection? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.06656*, 2026.
- Suhwan Choi, Jaeyoon Jung, Haebin Seong, Minchan Kim, Minyeong Kim, Yongjun Cho, Yoonshik Kim, Yu Park, Youngjae Yu, and Yunsung Lee. D2e: Scaling vision-action pretraining on desktop data for transfer to embodied ai. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026.
- Markov AI. gaming-500-hours. Hugging Face Datasets, <https://huggingface.co/datasets/markov-ai/gaming-500-hours>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-08-20.
- Tongtong Bai, Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, Jianfeng Cai, Xinyuan Cai, Peizhou Cao, Yuxuan Cao, Ziwei Chai, Y Charles, et al. Kimi k3: Open frontier intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.24653*, 2026.
- An Yang, Anfeng Li, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Chengen Huang, Chenxu Lv, et al. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.
- Haiwen Diao, Penghao Wu, Hanming Deng, Jiahao Wang, Shihao Bai, Silei Wu, Weichen Fan, Wenjie Ye, Wenwen Tong, Xiangyu Fan, et al. Sensenova-u1: Unifying multimodal understanding and generation with neo-unify architecture. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.12500*, 2026.
- Guo-Hua Wang, Shanshan Zhao, Xinjie Zhang, Liangfu Cao, Pengxin Zhan, Lunhao Duan, Shiyin Lu, Minghao Fu, Xiaohao Chen, Jianshan Zhao, et al. Ovis-u1 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.23044*, 2025c.
- Changyao Tian, Danni Yang, Guanzhou Chen, Erfei Cui, Zhaokai Wang, Yuchen Duan, Penghao Yin, Sitao Chen, Ganlin Yang, Mingxin Liu, et al. Internvl-u: Democratizing unified multimodal models for understanding, reasoning, generation and editing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.09877*, 2026.
- Chaorui Deng, Deyao Zhu, Kunchang Li, Chenhui Gou, Feng Li, Zeyu Wang, Shu Zhong, Weihao Yu, Xiaonan Nie, Ziang Song, et al. Emerging properties in unified multimodal pretraining. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14683*, 2025.
- GELab-Team, StepFun. Step-GUI technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.15431*, 2025.
- Anthropic. Claude model system cards. <https://www.anthropic.com/system-cards>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-08-20.
- William H. Guss, Brandon Houghton, Nicholay Topin, Phillip Wang, Cayden Codel, Manuela Veloso, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Minerl: a large-scale dataset of minecraft demonstrations. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, page 2442–2448, 2019.
- Xinyue Zheng, Haowei Lin, Kaichen He, Zihao Wang, Qiang Fu, Haobo Fu, Zilong Zheng, and Yitao Liang. MCU: An evaluation framework for open-ended game agents. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 78221–78259. PMLR, 2025.
- Alex L Zhang, Thomas L Griffiths, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. Videogamebench: Can vision-language models complete popular video games? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18134*, 2025.
- Mingxing Tan and Quoc Le. EfficientNet: Rethinking model scaling for convolutional neural networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6105–6114. PMLR, 2019.
- Enze Xie, Wenhai Wang, Zhiding Yu, Anima Anandkumar, Jose M Alvarez, and Ping Luo. Segformer: Simple and efficient design for semantic segmentation with transformers. 34:12077–12090, 2021.

- Brandon Castellano. PySceneDetect. <https://www.scsenedetect.com>, 2024. Software; accessed August 20, 2026.
- Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.5 Flash: Model card. <https://deepmind.google/models/model-cards/gemini-3-5-flash/>, 2026a. Accessed: 2026-09-05.
- Richard Bellman. Dynamic Programming. *Science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- Yingchen He, Christian D Weilbach, Martyna E Wojciechowska, Yuxuan Zhang, and Frank Wood. Plaicraft: Large-scale time-aligned vision-speech-action dataset for embodied ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.12707*, 2025.
- Rongjin Guo, Dong Liang, Yuhao Liu, Fang Liu, Tianyu Huang, Gerhard P Hancke, and Rynson WH Lau. Egocs-400k: An egocentric gameplay dataset for world models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.18180*, 2026.
- Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.6 Flash: Model card. <https://deepmind.google/models/model-cards/gemini-3-6-flash/>, 2026b. Accessed: 2026-09-05.
- Tianjie Ju, Yueqing Sun, Zheng Wu, Wei Zhang, Yaqi Huo, Xi Su, Qi Gu, Xunliang Cai, Gongshen Liu, and Zhuosheng Zhang. Mineexplorer: Evaluating open-world exploration of mllm agents in minecraft, 2026.
- Davide Paglieri, Bartłomiej Cupiał, Samuel Coward, Ulyana Piterbarg, Maciej Wołczyk, Akbir Khan, Eduardo Pignatelli, Łukasz Kuciński, Lerrel Pinto, Rob Fergus, Jakob Foerster, Jack Parker-Holder, and Tim Rocktaeschel. BALROG: Benchmarking agentic LLM and VLM reasoning on games. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- Dongmin Park, Minkyu Kim, Beongjun Choi, Junhyuck Kim, Keon Lee, Jonghyun Lee, Inkyu Park, ByeongUk Lee, Jaeyoung Hwang, JAEWOO AHN, Ameya Mahabaleshwarkar, Bilal Kartal, Pritam Biswas, Yoshi Suhara, Kangwook Lee, and Jaewoong Cho. Orak: A foundational benchmark for training and evaluating LLM agents on diverse video games. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026.
- Saul B Needleman and Christian D Wunsch. A general method applicable to the search for similarities in the amino acid sequence of two proteins. *Journal of molecular biology*, 48(3):443–453, 1970.

Appendix

This appendix contains the following contents:

- More details on our GameHorizon-Annotator, *e.g.*, annotation prompts, segmentation, and keybinds.
- More experimental results on our GameHorizon-Bench, *e.g.*, qualitative examples of the online track.

A More Details on GameHorizon-Annotator

A.1 Annotation Prompts

As described in Sec. 3.2 of the main paper, we utilize a VLM to annotate the multi-horizon instructions. Here, we present the annotation prompts for short-horizon operations, medium-horizon goals, and long-horizon strategies in Fig. 6, Fig. 7, and Fig. 8, respectively. The short-horizon prompt takes sampled frames and temporally aligned keyboard-mouse actions as inputs. It requires the VLM to describe the current operation with sufficient critical details, such as object descriptions and spatial relations. The medium-horizon prompt also incorporates the constituent short-horizon instructions and asks the VLM to summarize the player’s goal while avoiding excessive local details. Game-specific keybinds are additionally provided in the short- and medium-horizon prompts to help the VLM interpret keyboard and mouse actions in terms of their in-game semantics. The long-horizon prompt takes sampled frames and the constituent medium-horizon goals as inputs while omitting actions and keybinds. It requires the VLM to capture the player’s overall gameplay strategy without local operational details. Across all three horizons, the prompts provide common video metadata, including the game type, clip duration, frame rate, and sampled frame indices. They also require the VLM to analyze the visual context and output only a natural-language instruction without any additional explanation.

A.2 Action-Aware Video Segmentation

We provide more details on the action-aware video segmentation. The segmentation follows four stages, including keyboard-mouse semantic calibration, primitive action classification, rule-based coarse segmentation, and VLM-based refinement. First, using game-specific keybinds, we map raw keyboard and mouse events to gameplay actions, such as movement, attack, interaction, skill activation, and menu operations. When one input can correspond to multiple actions, we retain all candidates instead of making an early decision. Second, we classify primitive actions as input-deterministic, input-ambiguous, or vision-dependent according to how reliably their semantics can be inferred from the inputs. Third, we replay the frame-aligned input logs to recover held keys, discrete triggers, mouse-button states, and camera movements. When multiple actions occur in the same frame, action-priority rules select the primary label, while the remaining actions are retained as concurrent evidence. Consecutive frames with identical labels are merged, short noisy segments are smoothed, and overly long segments are divided. Finally, ambiguous or vision-dependent segments are refined by a VLM using videos, candidate labels, action semantics, and trigger timestamps. We further remove temporal gaps and overlaps, producing segments with continuous action events. Our GameHorizon-Annotator is also compatible with segmentation tools such as PySceneDetect (Castellano, 2024), which detects boundaries based on inter-frame visual similarity and can therefore fragment continuous actions under large camera movements.

A.3 Game-Specific Keybinds

As mentioned in Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 3.4 of the main manuscript, we adopt the game-specific keybinds for mapping the raw keyboard and mouse inputs to in-game action semantics. We showcase the keybinds for Apex Legends and Cyberpunk 2077 as two representative examples in Table 10 and Table 11, respectively.

B More Results on GameHorizon-Bench

We present additional results from the online track of our GameHorizon-Bench. In Fig. 9, we showcase rollouts of Gemini 3.6 Flash (Google DeepMind, 2026b), with arrows indicating its actual execution order. In Table 12, we list all 20 long-horizon tasks and their 62 constituent short-horizon subtasks, grouped into the causal and thematic categories.

Table 10. The keybind for Apex Legends. Keyboard and mouse inputs are mapped to their corresponding in-game action semantics via game-specific keybinds. Multiple candidate semantics for an ambiguous input are separated by slashes.

Input Event	In-Game Action Semantics
KEY_W	Move Forward
KEY_S	Move Back
KEY_A	Move Left
KEY_D	Move Right
SPACE	Jump
LSHIFT	Sprint
KEY_C	Crouch – Toggle
LCONTROL	Crouch – Hold
RI_MOUSE_LEFT_BUTTON_DOWN	Attack
RI_MOUSE_RIGHT_BUTTON_DOWN	Aim Down Sight
KEY_R	Reload
KEY_V	Melee
KEY_1	Equip Weapon 1
KEY_2	Equip Weapon 2
KEY_3	Holster Weapons
RI_MOUSE_WHEEL	Cycle Weapon
KEY_G	Equip Grenade
KEY_N	Inspect Weapon
KEY_Q	Tactical Ability
KEY_Z	Ultimate Ability
KEY_E	Interact / Pickup / Open Door / Revive / Use Zipline
KEY_4	Use Selected Health Item
KEY_H	Character Utility Action
RI_MOUSE_MIDDLE_BUTTON_DOWN	Smart Tag / Middle Mouse Button
TAB	Open/Close Inventory
KEY_M	Open/Close Map

Table 11. The keybind for Cyberpunk 2077. Keyboard and mouse inputs are mapped to their corresponding in-game action semantics via game-specific keybinds. Multiple candidate semantics for an ambiguous input are separated by slashes.

Input Event	In-Game Action Semantics
KEY_W	Move Forward / Vehicle Accelerate
KEY_S	Move Back / Vehicle Brake or Reverse
KEY_A	Move Left / Vehicle Turn Left
KEY_D	Move Right / Vehicle Turn Right
SPACE	Jump / Vehicle Handbrake / Pause Brainspace
LSHIFT	Sprint – Toggle / Change Brainspace Layer
RSHIFT	Sprint – Hold
KEY_C	Crouch – Toggle / Skip Dialogue
LCONTROL	Crouch – Hold / Vehicle Horn / Panzer Smokescreen
RI_MOUSE_LEFT_BUTTON_DOWN	Shoot / Fast Attack / Panzer Primary Cannon
RI_MOUSE_RIGHT_BUTTON_DOWN	Aim / Block / Panzer Missile Launcher
RI_MOUSE_MIDDLE_BUTTON_DOWN	Use Combat Gadget / Tag / Reverse Camera / Brainspace Zoom
RI_MOUSE_WHEEL	Cycle Weapon / Next or Previous Weapon / Brainspace Zoom
KEY_R	Reload / Vehicle Radio / Restart Brainspace
KEY_Q	Quick Attack / Vehicle Cycle Camera / Rewind Brainspace
KEY_E	Cyberware Systems / Fast-Forward Brainspace
KEY_F	Interact / Pickup / Enter or Exit Vehicle
KEY_X	Use Consumable / Exit Brainspace
KEY_Y	Skip Dialogue / Dialogue Confirm
KEY_Z	Open Notifications / Quickhack Details
KEY_T	Open Phone
TAB	Scan – Hold / Brainspace Analysis Mode
KEY_1	Select First Weapon / Previous Item
KEY_2	Select Second Weapon
KEY_3	Select Third Weapon / Next Item
LMENU	Cycle Weapon / Weapon Wheel / Vehicle Cycle Lights
KEY_V	Call Vehicle
KEY_B	Draw or Withdraw Weapon
KEY_I	Open Main Menu / Inventory
KEY_M	Open Map
KEY_J	Open Journal
KEY_K	Open Crafting
ESCAPE	Pause Menu / Close Menu

Annotation Prompt for Short-Horizon Operations

System Information

I am providing a sequence of `{sampled_frames_numbers}` game video **frames**. I am also providing the corresponding mouse (mouse_movement and mouse_key) and keyboard **action annotations** of the game player for each frame. The game type is `{game_type}`. Your task is to specify the current **short-horizon operation** of the game player as a short-term text instruction for a virtual agent.

Task

1. Analyze the visual context of the gameplay.
2. Identify key entities, UI elements, and environmental factors.
3. Correlate the player's actions with visual context to understand the intent and operation.
4. Output the short-horizon operation as a text instruction based on the visual evidence and action trajectory.

Goal

The instruction should include the **sufficient critical details** (e.g., coordinates, object descriptions, or spatial relations) to guide the agent in the gameplay.

Besides, you should output only the instruction text.

Important Rules

1. You should only output the textual instruction without any other text.
2. DO NOT output anything such as "The instruction is:" or "After analyzing the video."
3. Instructions should be written in natural language.

Information

1. Video Information

`{sampled_frames_numbers}` frames are sampled from the short-horizon clip. The duration is `{clip_duration}`. The frame rate is `{clip_fps}` fps. The frame index list is: `{sampled_frames_index_in_clip}`.

2. Action and Keybind Information

For better understanding, here is some keybind information about the `{game_type}` game.

For mouse movement [dx, dy], dx and dy represent mouse movement in the x and y directions.

dx > 0 means movement horizontally to the right. dx < 0 means movement horizontally to the left.

dy > 0 means movement vertically upward. dy < 0 means movement vertically downward.

If one term contains multiple actions, e.g., [[dx1,dy1],[dx2,dy2]], actions are listed in the order of occurrence.

Mouse-key and keyboard actions indicate the specific mouse buttons and keyboard keys that the player pressed or released. The mapping between keys and in-game actions is as follows: `{game_specific_keybinds}`.

Input

1. Video Input

The frames of the short-horizon clips are listed as: `{sampled_frames_input}`.

2. Action Input

For each sampled frame, the corresponding mouse and keyboard action annotations of the game player are provided below, which may help you understand the operation and intention: `{sampled_actions_input}`.

Figure 6. The prompt for short-horizon operations. Key differences across horizons are highlighted in red, such as the inputs, outputs, and required levels of detail in the instructions. Blue text denotes the code variables in the prompt. The short-horizon prompt takes sampled frames and temporally aligned keyboard-mouse actions as inputs. It requires the VLM to describe the current operation with sufficient details, such as the object descriptions and spatial relations.



Annotation Prompt for Medium-Horizon Goals



System Information

I am providing a sequence of `{sampled_frames_numbers}` game video **frames**. I am also providing the corresponding mouse (mouse_movement and mouse_key), keyboard **actions**, and the **lower-level text instructions (short-horizon)** of the game player. The game type is `{game_type}`. Your task is to specify the **medium-horizon goal** of the game player as a medium-term text instruction for an agent.



Task

1. Analyze the visual context of the gameplay.
2. Identify key entities, UI elements, and environmental factors.
3. Correlate the player's actions and instructions with visual context to understand the intentions and goals.
4. Output the medium-horizon goal as a text instruction based on frames, actions, and short-term instructions.



Goal

The instruction should not focus excessively on local details. Instead, it must clearly state the player's goal throughout this video clip from `{min_L2_minute}` to `{max_L2_minute}` minutes. You can **include some details, only when necessary** to guide the agent.



Important Rules

1. You should only output the textual instruction without any other text.
2. DO NOT output anything such as "The instruction is:" or "After analyzing the video."
3. Instructions should be written in natural language.



Information

1. Video Information

`{sampled_frames_numbers}` frames are sampled from medium-horizon clip. The duration is `{clip_duration}`. The frame rate is `{clip_fps}` fps. The frame index list is: `{sampled_frames_index_in_clip}`.

2. Action and Keybind Information

For better understanding, here is some keybind information about the `{game_type}` game.

For mouse movement [dx, dy], dx and dy represent mouse movement in the x and y directions.

dx > 0 means movement horizontally to the right. dx < 0 means movement horizontally to the left.

dy > 0 means movement vertically upward. dy < 0 means movement vertically downward.

If one term contains multiple actions, e.g., [[dx1,dy1],[dx2,dy2]], actions are listed in the order of occurrence.

Mouse-key and keyboard actions indicate the specific mouse buttons and keyboard keys that the player pressed or released. The mapping between keys and in-game actions is as follows: `{game_specific_keybinds}`.



Input

1. Video Input

The frames of the medium-horizon clips are listed as: `{sampled_frames_input}`.

2. Instruction (short-horizon operations, i.e., the lower level)

The short-horizon operations included in the medium-horizon clips are listed as: `{sampled_L1_instruct_input}`.

3. Action Input

For each sampled frame, the corresponding mouse and keyboard action annotations of the game player are provided below, which may help you understand the operation and intention: `{sampled_actions_input}`.

Figure 7. The prompt for medium-horizon goals. Key differences across the three horizons are highlighted in red, such as the inputs, outputs, and required levels of detail in the instructions. Blue text denotes the code variables in the prompt. The medium-horizon prompt incorporates video frames, aligned actions, and the constituent short-horizon instructions, requiring the VLM to summarize the sustained goal of the player while avoiding excessive local details.



Annotation Prompt for Long-Horizon Strategies



System Information

I am providing a sequence of `{sampled_frames_numbers}` game video **frames**. I am also providing the **lower-level text instructions (medium-horizon goals)** of the game player. The game type is `{game_type}`. Your task is to specify the **long-horizon game strategies** of the game player as a long-term text instruction for an agent.



Task

1. Analyze the visual context of the gameplay.
2. Identify key entities, UI elements, and environmental factors.
3. Correlate the player's instructions with visual context to understand the long-term game strategies.
4. Output the long-horizon strategy as a text instruction based on frames and medium-horizon instructions.



Goal

The instruction **should not include local details**. It must clearly state the player's gameplay strategy throughout the video clip from `{min_L3_minute}` to `{max_L3_minute}` minutes. Besides, you should only output the instruction text without any other text.



Important Rules

1. You should only output the textual instruction without any other text.
2. DO NOT output anything such as "The instruction is:" or "After analyzing the video."
3. Instructions should be written in natural language.



Information

1. Video Information
`{sampled_frames_numbers}` frames are sampled from long-horizon clip. The duration is `{clip_duration}`. The frame rate is `{clip_fps}` fps. The frame index list is: `{sampled_frames_index_in_clip}`.



Input

1. Video Input
The frames of the long-horizon clips are listed as: `{sampled_frames_input}`.
2. Instruction (medium-horizon goals, i.e., the lower level)
The medium-horizon goals included in the long-horizon clips are listed as: `{sampled_L2_Instruct_input}`.

Figure 8. The prompt for long-horizon strategies. Key differences across three horizons are highlighted in red, such as the inputs, outputs, and required levels of detail in the instructions. Blue text denotes the code variables in the prompt. The long-horizon prompt takes sampled frames and the constituent medium-horizon goals as inputs while omitting actions and keybinds. It requires the VLM to capture the overall gameplay strategy without local operational details.




Figure 9. The online track of GameHorizon-Bench. It contains long-horizon causal and thematic tasks, each comprising multiple verifiable short-horizon subtasks. The causal tasks can only be completed in a prescribed order because of dependencies between successive subtasks. The thematic tasks contain subtasks that share a common theme but can be performed in any order. The figure shows results from Gemini 3.6 Flash (Google DeepMind, 2026b), with arrows indicating its actual execution order. After a subtask fails, the environment is reset to the corresponding success state so that evaluation can continue. A long-horizon task is considered passed only when all constituent subtasks succeed.

Table 12. Long-horizon online tasks and the constituent short-horizon subtasks. The online track contains 20 long-horizon tasks and 62 short-horizon subtasks. The causal tasks impose a fixed order, whereas thematic tasks allow any order.

No.	Long-Horizon Task	Steps	Short-Horizon Subtasks
Causal Tasks			
1	Craft a wooden axe.	2	(1) Chop down trees and gather wood logs outside. (2) Use the crafting table to craft a wooden axe and retrieve it.
2	Craft an armor stand from workshop materials.	5	(1) Craft four oak planks from an oak log. (2) Craft eight sticks from the oak planks. (3) Smelt three stone blocks into smooth stone. (4) Craft six smooth stone slabs. (5) Craft an armor stand from the sticks and a smooth stone slab.
3	Craft an item frame from workshop materials.	3	(1) Craft eight oak planks from two oak logs. (2) Craft eight sticks from four oak planks. (3) Craft an item frame from eight sticks and one leather.
4	Retrieve shears, shear a sheep, and store the wool in the chest.	3	(1) Retrieve the shears from the chest. (2) Shear the sheep in the nearby pen. (3) Store the wool in the chest.
5	Fill the remaining bucket with milk, bake a cake, and place it on the dining table.	3	(1) Fill the remaining empty bucket with milk from the cow. (2) Craft a cake at the crafting table. (3) Place the cake on the marked dining table.
6	Repair the gap in the animal pen.	2	(1) Select the oak fence from the hotbar. (2) Place the oak fence to close the gap in the pen.
7	Mine the missing obsidian block, repair the ruined portal, and ignite it.	3	(1) Mine the loose obsidian block using the diamond pickaxe. (2) Place the obsidian in the missing portal-frame position. (3) Ignite the completed Nether portal with flint and steel.
8	Collect lava using a bucket.	2	(1) Select the bucket from the hotbar. (2) Scoop up lava from the pool using the empty bucket.

Continued on the next page

Table 12 continued

No.	Long-Horizon Task	Steps	Short-Horizon Subtasks
9	Mine iron, forge an iron sword, and use it to defeat the zombie.	4	(1) Mine two iron ore blocks using the stone pickaxe. (2) Smelt the iron ore into two iron ingots. (3) Craft an iron sword. (4) Kill the zombie using the iron sword.
10	Select the golden sword and use it to kill the spider.	2	(1) Select the golden sword from the hotbar. (2) Kill the spider using the golden sword.
Thematic Tasks			
1	Complete the target house's exterior wall using the finished house beside it as a reference.	6	(1) Place a stripped oak log in the ground-row left gap. (2) Place a stone brick block in the ground-row center gap. (3) Place a birch plank in the ground-row right gap. (4) Place a dark oak plank in the second-row left gap. (5) Place a glass block in the second-row center gap. (6) Place a spruce plank in the second-row right gap.
2	Eliminate the zombie and shear the sheep.	2	(1) Kill the zombie inside the animal pen. (2) Shear the sheep in the animal pen.
3	Store items from the inventory into the chest.	2	(1) Store the iron ingots in the chest. (2) Store the bread in the chest.
4	Assemble a mixed-material toolkit at the workshop.	3	(1) Craft an iron pickaxe. (2) Craft a wooden axe. (3) Craft a diamond sword.
5	Secure and light the tunnel to mine coal and iron.	4	(1) Fill a gap in the passage using cobblestone. (2) Place a torch in the mine. (3) Mine coal ore. (4) Mine iron ore.
6	Complete routine farm chores by gathering food, planting crops, and managing livestock.	5	(1) Milk the cow using an empty bucket. (2) Pick up the egg lying on the ground. (3) Plant wheat seeds on the farmland. (4) Kill the sheep using the diamond sword. (5) Kill the chicken using the iron sword.
7	Collect raw blocks for building.	2	(1) Dig dirt blocks using an iron shovel. (2) Mine stone blocks using a diamond pickaxe.
8	Process building materials and food at the shelter.	2	(1) Smelt cobblestone in the furnace. (2) Cook raw mutton in the smoker.
9	Assemble a wooden toolkit at the workshop.	3	(1) Craft a wooden pickaxe. (2) Craft a wooden axe. (3) Craft a wooden shovel.
10	Prepare the travel campsite by setting up the sleeping area, lighting the entrance, cooking food, and storing navigation equipment.	4	(1) Place the red bed on the wooden sleeping pad inside the tent. (2) Place a torch on the marked block at the campsite entrance. (3) Cook the raw cod in the smoker. (4) Store the compass in the supply chest.