

# TGPO: TREE-GUIDED PREFERENCE OPTIMIZATION FOR ROBUST WEB AGENT REINFORCEMENT LEARNING

Ziyuan Chen<sup>1,2</sup>, Zhenghui Zhao<sup>2</sup>, Zhangye Han<sup>3,2</sup>, Miancan Liu<sup>5,2</sup>  
Xianhang Ye<sup>4,2</sup>, Yiqing Li<sup>5,2</sup>, Hongbo Min<sup>†,2</sup>, Jinkui Ren<sup>2</sup>, Xiantao Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Guitao Cao<sup>\*,1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>East China Normal University    <sup>2</sup>Alibaba Group

<sup>3</sup>University of Electronic Science and Technology of China    <sup>4</sup>Wuhan University    <sup>5</sup>Sun Yat-sen University

## ABSTRACT

With the rapid advancement of large language models and vision-language models, employing large models as Web Agents has become essential for automated web interaction. However, training Web Agents with reinforcement learning faces critical challenges including credit assignment misallocation, prohibitively high annotation costs, and reward sparsity. To address these issues, we propose Tree-Guided Preference Optimization (TGPO), an offline reinforcement learning framework that proposes a tree-structured trajectory representation merging semantically identical states across trajectories to eliminate label conflicts. Our framework incorporates a Process Reward Model that automatically generates fine-grained rewards through subgoal progress, redundancy detection, and action verification. Additionally, a dynamic weighting mechanism prioritizes high-impact decision points during training. Experiments on Online-Mind2Web and our self-constructed C-WebShop datasets demonstrate that TGPO significantly outperforms existing methods, achieving higher success rates with fewer redundant steps.

**Index Terms**— Reinforcement Learning, Web Agent, Preference Optimization

## 1. INTRODUCTION

With the rapid advancement of large language models (LLMs) and vision-language models (VLMs), autonomous Web agents [1, 2, 3] have achieved significant progress. Web agents translate natural language instructions into sequences of web interactions (e.g., clicking, typing) by processing visual and textual page information. Such agents typically require understanding web semantics, identifying interactive elements, and making decisions within dynamically changing web environments, forming a sequential decision-making process based on visual and/or textual state inputs.

Web interaction environments have vast action spaces and long-term dependencies, making traditional supervised

learning methods [4, 5] ineffective for training web agents. Approaches like Supervised Fine-Tuning (SFT) depend on large-scale high-quality annotated data, yet acquiring precise per-action labels is prohibitively costly and difficult to scale. In contrast, Reinforcement Learning (RL) enables agents to discover effective strategies via autonomous exploration [6, 7, 5, 8], exploits negative samples as informative training signals, and exhibits strong generalization by modeling abstract strategies and long-term rewards.

From the perspective of data collection, reinforcement learning (RL) for web agents [9] can be categorized into online and offline paradigms. Online RL [10, 11] collects new trajectories by interacting with websites in real time, which leads to high sampling costs and low efficiency. Real websites also add more difficulties, such as strict limits on request rates, login requirements, and other restrictions, making long-term training hard to sustain. As a result, methods like WebAgent-R1 [12], WebRL [13], and GiGPO [14] are usually trained in simulated or custom web environments [15, 16] instead of the live web. In contrast, offline RL methods such as DPO [17] and KTO [18] learn from pre-collected trajectories without real-time interaction, avoiding these constraints and making full use of existing data.


However, applying offline RL to web agents still presents three principal challenges: 1) *Credit Assignment Misallocation* — trajectory-level success/failure labels are uniformly applied to all state–action pairs, introducing noise by penalizing correct actions in failed trajectories and rewarding ineffective actions in successful ones; 2) *Prohibitive Annotation Cost* — while step-level labeling can mitigate credit-assignment errors, it demands substantial manual effort, often exceeding ten times the cost of trajectory-level annotation, which renders large-scale training impractical; 3) *Reward Sparsity* — the absence of fine-grained reward signals leads agents to learn suboptimal policies, often exhibiting redundant actions or cycles that degrade execution efficiency and task success rates.

To address these challenges, we propose Tree-Guided Preference Optimization (TGPO) for web agent RL. Our key insight is that aggregating semantically identical states from multiple trajectories into a unified tree structure provides a

Work done during an internship at Alibaba Group.

\* Corresponding author: gtcao@sei.ecnu.edu.cn.

† Project Leader.



**Fig. 1:** Overview of the proposed Tree-Guided Preference Optimization framework for Web Agents. Trajectories are aggregated into a state tree to enable fine-grained credit assignment and automated reward generation.

principled way to eliminate label ambiguity and automate reward signal generation.

Evaluated on Online-Mind2Web [19, 20] and C-WebShop benchmarks with Qwen3-14B [21] and Qwen2.5-VL-72B [22] models, TGPO consistently outperforms existing methods with better success rates and less redundant actions. In summary, our work makes the following contributions to the field:

- We propose Tree-Guided Preference Optimization, which integrates tree-structured trajectory representation with automated process reward modeling for Web Agent training.
- We propose a solution to the three fundamental challenges in Web Agent training through unbiased action evaluation, automated step-level reward generation, and strategic focus on critical decision points.
- Comprehensive experiments showing TGPO’s superiority over other reinforcement learning methods in both success rates and execution efficiency.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we introduce TGPO with three components: a tree-structured trajectory representation that resolves label conflicts via state merging, a Process Reward Model (PRM) that provides fine-grained rewards to reduce manual labeling, and a dynamic weighting mechanism that prioritizes critical decision points based on reward differences.

### 2.1. Tree-Structured Trajectory Representation

Given a user instruction  $\mathcal{I}$ , the Web Agent is required to complete the corresponding task through a sequence of state-action interactions within a web environment. We formalize this process as a Markov Decision Process (MDP)  $\mathcal{M} = \langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, R \rangle$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  represents the state space consisting of web interface


states (encoded via screenshots or DOM trees),  $\mathcal{A}$  denotes the action space containing interactive operations (e.g., click, type, scroll),  $P(s'|s, a)$  defines the state transition function, and  $R(s, a)$  provides immediate feedback for state-action pairs. A trajectory  $\tau = (s_0, a_0, s_1, \dots, s_T)$  represents a complete execution sequence generated by the agent, where  $s_t \in \mathcal{S}$  denotes the state at step  $t$  and  $a_t \in \mathcal{A}$  represents the action taken.

When executing a task  $K$  times, we obtain  $K$  trajectories  $\mathcal{T} = \{\tau^{(1)}, \dots, \tau^{(K)}\}$ , each with trajectory-level label  $y^{(k)} \in \{0, 1\}$  indicating success or failure. Directly applying these labels to individual steps creates cross-trajectory label conflicts. As shown in Figure 2, consider two trajectories that share identical intermediate states but with different outcomes: in trajectory  $\tau^{(1)}$  (which ultimately failed), the action *Click Sort Button* is part of a correct sequence but is incorrectly labeled *incorrect* due to final failure ( $y^{(1)} = 0$ ); in trajectory  $\tau^{(2)}$  (which ultimately succeeded), the same action is correctly labeled *correct* ( $y^{(2)} = 1$ ). This creates contradictory evaluations for identical state-action pairs. The same action appears correct in one trajectory but incorrect in another, despite occurring in identical states. Trajectory-level labels cannot distinguish whether an action itself is flawed or whether failure results from subsequent decisions.

To resolve this, we propose a tree-structured representation that merges semantically identical states across multiple trajectories. Starting from the initial state  $s_0$ , we collect  $K$  trajectories  $\tau^{(k)} = (s_0^{(k)}, a_0^{(k)}, s_1^{(k)}, a_1^{(k)}, \dots, s_T^{(k)})$  and construct a tree  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V$  contains unique state nodes and  $E$  represents action transitions.

Two states  $s_i$  and  $s_j$  are merged if: (1) standardized URLs match (keeping essential parameters); and (2) either (a) effective action sequences are consistent after URL change, or (b) image hashes are identical. This ensures semantically equivalent states are aggregated while preserving action differences.

Based on this, we construct a tree-structured representation of the trajectories, as shown in Figure 2. This tree architecture provides several key advantages: (1) automatic step-level label-



**Fig. 2:** Linear vs. Tree-structured representation. Green/red: correct/incorrect actions. ✓/✗: success/failure. Task: Search Coca-Cola, sort by price, add first item to cart.

ing, reducing annotation costs; (2) identification and removal of redundant actions; (3) precise intermediate reward assignment via backtracking; (4) natural representation of correction behaviors as loops.

## 2.2. Process Reward Model

To overcome the challenges of sparse rewards and costly manual labeling in trajectory-based learning, we propose a fine-grained, automatically verifiable Process Reward Model based on the tree-structured representation. Inspired by works [23], this mechanism comprises four reward dimensions:

**Subgoal Reward ( $R_{\text{subgoal}}$ ):** Quantifies progress toward goal completion with

$$R_{\text{subgoal}} = \frac{L_{\min}}{d(s_0 \rightarrow s_t) + \min_q d(s_t \rightarrow s_{\text{goal}})}, \quad (1)$$

where  $L_{\min}$  represents the theoretical minimum steps from the initial state to the goal state;  $d(s_0 \rightarrow s_t)$  represents the actual cumulative steps to reach the current state, and  $\min_q d(s_t \rightarrow s_{\text{goal}})$  represents the minimum estimated steps from the current state to the goal state (calculated through tree-structured). This reward encourages the agent to select the shortest path to complete the task.

**Redundancy Penalty ( $R_{\text{red}}$ ):**  $R_{\text{red}} = -1.0$  if state cycle detected, otherwise 0. Automatically identifies and penalizes repetitive actions through tree structure analysis.

**Accuracy Reward ( $R_{\text{acc}}$ ):**  $R_{\text{acc}} = +1.0$  if action effective, otherwise 0. Uses VLM verify expected interface modifications.

**Format Reward ( $R_{\text{format}}$ ):**  $R_{\text{format}} + 1.0$  if action format valid, otherwise 0. Validates compliance with the action execution engine’s syntax requirements.

Thus, the total reward can be expressed as:

$$R = R_{\text{acc}} + R_{\text{format}} + R_{\text{red}} + \alpha \cdot R_{\text{subgoal}}. \quad (2)$$

Among them,  $R_{\text{subgoal}}$  and  $R_{\text{red}}$  are computed based on the tree structure, while  $R_{\text{acc}}$  and  $R_{\text{format}}$  are verified automatically. Empirically,  $\alpha$  is set between 2-5 to properly emphasize the importance of subgoal progression.

## 2.3. TGPO: Tree-Guided Preference Optimization

Unlike KTO training (suffering label conflicts) and DPO training (requiring preference pair construction from trajectory-level data, which is inherently challenging), we leverage the tree structure’s properties to construct high-quality preference pairs.

Specifically, at each state node  $s$  in the tree, multiple action branches lead to divergent paths. By comparing their cumulative rewards, we automatically generate ranked preference pairs  $(a_w, a_l)$ , where  $a_w$  is the high-reward action (chosen) and  $a_l$  is the low-reward action (rejected).

Moreover, standard DPO training has limitations when handling Web Agent tasks: it treats all preference pairs equally, failing to distinguish the importance of different decision points. Based on the tree-structured representation, we observe that action branches under different state nodes have varying value differences, which reflect the importance of decision points. To address this, we propose the TGPO training method, which introduces a dynamic weighting mechanism based on reward differences, enabling the model to focus on the most critical and highest-variance decision points.

Based on preference pairs and fine-grained reward signals, we propose Tree-Guided Preference Optimization (TGPO). We first define the *logit margin* between the preferred action  $a_w$  and the less preferred action  $a_l$  as:

$$\Delta = \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_w | s)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(a_w | s)} - \log \frac{\pi_{\theta}(a_l | s)}{\pi_{\text{ref}}(a_l | s)}. \quad (3)$$

Then the TGPO loss function is formulated as:

$$L_{\text{TGPO}} = -\frac{|r_w - r_l|}{\sigma(R_s)} \cdot \log \left( \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta \Delta)} \right), \quad (4)$$

where  $r_w$  and  $r_l$  represent the cumulative rewards of the chosen and rejected actions, respectively, and  $\sigma(R_s)$  is the standard deviation of rewards for all actions at state  $s$ . The weight  $w = \frac{|r_w - r_l|}{\sigma(R_s)}$  standardizes the reward difference, ensuring comparability of weights across different state nodes.

**Table 1:** Performance comparison between TGPO and other methods.

Method	Success Rate (%)	Execution Efficiency	
		Avg. Steps	Red. Steps
<i>Online-Mind2Web Dataset + Browser-Use</i>			
Qwen3-14B [21]	26.8	12.79	3.31
+ SFT	31.8	11.73	2.76
+ KTO [18]	27.1	11.94	2.90
+ KTO-Tree	34.4	10.98	<b>2.42</b>
+ DPO [17]	34.0	11.53	2.88
+ TGPO	<b>38.4</b>	<b>10.71</b>	2.52
GPT-4o [26]	30.0	–	–
<i>C-Webshop Dataset + SeeAct</i>			
Qwen2.5-vl-72B-Instruct [22]	36.7	14.28	4.95
+ SFT	70.3	9.73	1.26
+ KTO [18]	72.9	9.42	1.40
+ KTO-Tree	77.6	8.97	1.08
+ DPO [17]	72.1	9.85	1.41
+ TGPO	<b>78.6</b>	<b>8.66</b>	<b>0.97</b>

Note: Avg. Steps represents average trajectory length; Red. Steps counts redundant actions.

### 3. EXPERIMENTS

#### 3.1. Environments and Baselines

**Environments.** We evaluate on two Web Agent frameworks, SeeAct [24] and Browser-use [25], using dataset Online-Mind2Web [19, 20] with 300 tasks from 136 websites and our self-constructed C-WebShop dataset with 50 Chinese e-commerce tasks from Taobao.

**Baselines.** We adopt open-source models Qwen2.5-VL-72B [22] and Qwen3-14B [21] as baselines. Leveraging its superior multimodal capability, Qwen2.5-VL-72B is implemented on SeeAct, while Qwen3-14B is implemented on Browser-use. We compare SFT, KTO [18], KTO-Tree, DPO [17] and our TGPO. Specifically, KTO-Tree, DPO and TGPO leverage step-level annotations derived from the tree structure. Both DPO and TGPO are built upon models initially trained with SFT. All RL methods are trained for 2 epochs on 8 H20 GPUs with a learning rate of  $1 \times 10^{-5}$ . For KTO and KTO-Tree, *desirable* and *undesirable* weights are set by the positive/negative sample ratio.

#### 3.2. Main Results

Table 1 presents the performance comparison of different training methods on the Online-Mind2Web and C-WebShop datasets. On the Online-Mind2Web benchmark, our TGPO achieves the highest success rate of 38.4% and the shortest average trajectory length of 10.71 steps, outperforming ex-

isting methods and closed-source model GPT-4o. Notably, TGPO improves the success rate by 11.3% over standard KTO training and reduces redundant steps from 2.90 to 2.52, demonstrating the effectiveness of our tree-structured representation in resolving label conflicts and optimizing action sequences.

The tree-guided variant KTO-Tree also shows significant improvement over the original KTO method, achieving a 34.4% success rate (vs. 27.1%) and reducing average steps from 11.94 to 10.98, highlighting the value of state merging for unbiased action evaluation.

On the C-WebShop dataset, TGPO maintains its superiority with a 78.6% success rate (vs. 72.1% for DPO and 77.6% for KTO-Tree), while cutting average steps from 14.28 to 8.66 and nearly eliminating redundant actions (0.97 vs. 4.95 in the base model). These results validate the robustness of our framework across diverse web interaction scenarios.

#### 3.3. Ablation Study

##### 3.3.1. Tree structure effectiveness.

Table 2 shows that both datasets contain substantial label conflicts. As shown in Table 1, after eliminating these conflicts, KTO-Tree outperforms KTO success rates by increasing success rates and reducing redundant steps: on Online-Mind2Web, the success rate improves by 7.3% with a 16.6% reduction in redundant steps, while on C-WebShop it gains 4.7% in success rate and reduces redundant steps by 22.9%.

**Table 2:** Label conflict percentage in raw trajectories.

Dataset	Label Conflict Percentage
Online-Mind2Web [19, 20]	38.71%
C-WebShop	26.95%

##### 3.3.2. Fine-grained reward effectiveness.

TGPO achieves 6.5% higher success rate than DPO on C-WebShop, reducing execution steps from 9.85 to 8.66 and redundant steps from 1.41 to 0.97. The dynamic weighting mechanism focuses training on high-variance decision points, enabling more efficient execution paths with fewer redundant operations.

### 4. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose TGPO, a method designed to overcome key challenges in Web agent training: credit assignment misallocation, high annotation costs, and reward sparsity. TGPO resolves label conflicts using tree-structured representation, generates fine-grained rewards through PRM, and prioritizes critical decisions with adaptive weighting, achieving higher success rates with fewer redundant actions on the Online-Mind2Web and C-WebShop benchmarks. This approach is also extensible to other applications such as GUI interactions and gaming environments.

## 5. REFERENCES

- [1] 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,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [2] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, et al., “Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03688*, 2023.
- [3] Liangbo Ning, Ziran Liang, Zhuohang Jiang, Haohao Qu, Yujian Ding, Wenqi Fan, Xiao-yong Wei, Shanru Lin, Hui Liu, Philip S Yu, et al., “A survey of webagents: Towards next-generation ai agents for web automation with large foundation models,” in *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 2*, 2025, pp. 6140–6150.
- [4] Hanyu Lai, Xiao Liu, Iat Long Iong, Shuntian Yao, Yuxuan Chen, Pengbo Shen, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Xiaohan Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, et al., “Autowebglm: A large language model-based web navigating agent,” in *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 2024, pp. 5295–5306.
- [5] Jiayi Pan, Yichi Zhang, Nicholas Tomlin, Yifei Zhou, Sergey Levine, and Alane Suhr, “Autonomous evaluation and refinement of digital agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06474*, 2024.
- [6] Thomas Carta, Clément Romic, Thomas Wolf, Sylvain Lamprier, Olivier Sigaud, and Pierre-Yves Oudeyer, “Grounding large language models in interactive environments with online reinforcement learning,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 3676–3713.
- [7] Hao Bai, Yifei Zhou, Jiayi Pan, Mert Cemri, Alane Suhr, Sergey Levine, and Aviral Kumar, “Digirl: Training in-the-wild device-control agents with autonomous reinforcement learning,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 37, pp. 12461–12495, 2024.
- [8] Simon Zhai, Hao Bai, Zipeng Lin, Jiayi Pan, Peter Tong, Yifei Zhou, Alane Suhr, Saining Xie, Yann LeCun, Yi Ma, et al., “Fine-tuning large vision-language models as decision-making agents via reinforcement learning,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 37, pp. 110935–110971, 2024.
- [9] Guibin Zhang, Hejia Geng, Xiaohang Yu, Zhenfei Yin, Zaibin Zhang, Zelin Tan, Heng Zhou, Zhongzhi Li, Xiangyuan Xue, Yijiang Li, Yifan Zhou, Yang Chen, Chen Zhang, Yutao Fan, Zihu Wang, Songtao Huang, Yue Liao, Hongru Wang, Mengyue Yang, Heng Ji, Michael Littman, Jun Wang, Shuicheng Yan, Philip Torr, and Lei Bai, “The landscape of agentic reinforcement learning for llms: A survey,” 2025.
- [10] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov, “Proximal policy optimization algorithms,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*, 2017.
- [11] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, YK Li, Yang Wu, et al., “Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.
- [12] Zhepei Wei, Wenlin Yao, Yao Liu, Weizhi Zhang, Qin Lu, Liang Qiu, Changlong Yu, Puyang Xu, Chao Zhang, Bing Yin, Hyokun Yun, and Lihong Li, “Webagent-r1: Training web agents via end-to-end multi-turn reinforcement learning,” 2025.
- [13] Zehan Qi, Xiao Liu, Iat Long Iong, Hanyu Lai, Xueqiao Sun, Xinyue Yang, Jiada Sun, Yu Yang, Shuntian Yao, Tianjie Zhang, et al., “Webrl: Training llm web agents via self-evolving online curriculum reinforcement learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02337*, 2024.
- [14] Lang Feng, Zhenghai Xue, Tingcong Liu, and Bo An, “Group-in-group policy optimization for llm agent training,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.10978*, 2025.
- [15] Shuyan Zhou, Frank F Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, et al., “Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13854*, 2023.
- [16] Shunyu Yao, Howard Chen, John Yang, and Karthik Narasimhan, “Webshop: Towards scalable real-world web interaction with grounded language agents,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 20744–20757, 2022.
- [17] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn, “Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 36, pp. 53728–53741, 2023.
- [18] Kawin Ethayarajh, Winnie Xu, Niklas Muennighoff, Dan Jurafsky, and Douwe Kiela, “Kto: Model alignment as prospect theoretic optimization,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01306*, 2024.
- [19] Tianci Xue, Weijian Qi, Tianneng Shi, Chan Hee Song, Boyu Gou, Dawn Song, Huan Sun, and Yu Su, “An illusion of progress? assessing the current state of web agents,” 2025.
- [20] Xiang Deng, Yu Gu, Boyuan Zheng, Shijie Chen, Sam Stevens, Boshi Wang, Huan Sun, and Yu Su, “Mind2web: Towards a generalist agent for the web,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023, vol. 36, pp. 28091–28114.
- [21] 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.
- [22] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al., “Qwen2. 5-vl technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025.
- [23] Chenyu Yang, Shiqian Su, Shi Liu, Xuan Dong, Yue Yu, Weijie Su, Xuehui Wang, Zhaoyang Liu, Jinguo Zhu, Hao Li, et al., “Zerogui: Automating online gui learning at zero human cost,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23762*, 2025.
- [24] Boyuan Zheng, Boyu Gou, Jihyung Kil, Huan Sun, and Yu Su, “Gpt-4v (ision) is a generalist web agent, if grounded,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01614*, 2024.
- [25] Magnus Müller and Gregor Žunič, “Browser use: Enable ai to control your browser,” 2024.
- [26] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al., “Gpt-4o system card,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.