

# See, Think, Act: Teaching Multimodal Agents to Effectively Interact with GUI by Identifying Toggles

ZONGRU WU, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

RUI MAO, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

ZHIYUAN TIAN, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

PENGZHOU CHENG, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

TIANJIE JU, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

ZHENG WU, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

LINGZHONG DONG, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

HAIYUE SHENG, School of Foreign Languages, Beijing Institute of Technology, China

ZHUOSHENG ZHANG\*, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

GONGSHEN LIU\*, School of Computer Science, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China

The advent of multimodal agents facilitates effective interaction within graphical user interface (GUI), especially in ubiquitous GUI control. However, their inability to reliably execute toggle control instructions remains a key bottleneck. To investigate this, we construct a state control benchmark with binary toggle instructions from public datasets. Evaluations of existing agents demonstrate their unreliability, particularly when the current toggle state already matches the desired state. To address the challenge, we propose **State-aware Reasoning (StaR)**, a training method that teaches agents to perceive the current toggle state, analyze the desired state from the instruction, and act accordingly. Experiments on three multimodal agents demonstrate that StaR can improve toggle instruction execution accuracy by over 30%. Further evaluations on three public benchmarks show that StaR also enhances general task performance. Finally, evaluations on a dynamic environment highlight the potential of StaR for real-world applications. Code, benchmark, and StaR-enhanced agents are available at <https://github.com/ZrW00/StaR>.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Human computer interaction (HCI)**; • **Computing methodologies** → **Natural language processing**; **Computer vision**.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Multimodal Agents, Effectively Interact, State-aware Reasoning, Toggle State Identification

## 1 Introduction

The prosperity of multimodal agents [22, 27, 42, 48, 50, 54] facilitates the effective interaction within graphical user interface (GUI) [25, 26]. Powered by multimodal large language models (MLLMs) [1, 7, 23, 24, 34, 37, 47], multimodal agents are capable to perceive and navigate GUIs to accomplish user-specific goals without the necessity of APIs, thereby serving as flexible and reliable assistants for facilitating efficient human-GUI interaction.

Within GUIs, toggle controls represent a fundamental interaction mechanism and are ubiquitous across various applications, including mobile device settings (e.g., alarm configuration in Figure 1) [15, 35], automotive systems [10], smart home environments [38, 46], and industrial control systems [12]. These controls allow users to switch between binary control states, such as turning features on or off, enabling or disabling system functions, or adjusting operation modes. Interacting with such systems often requires modifying specific settings through repetitive and routine commands, which can become time-consuming and error-prone. Multimodal agents can assist users in streamlining this process by automatically taking actions to achieve user intent, enabling more efficient and intelligent interaction [4, 48, 50].

\*Corresponding authors: Zhuosheng Zhang (zhangzs@sjtu.edu.cn) and Gongshen Liu (lgshen@sjtu.edu.cn).




Fig. 1. Illustration of two typical toggle errors. (i) Desired state differs from the current state, but the agent fails to toggle (false negative); (ii) desired state matches the current state, yet the agent still toggles (false positive).

However, as we will show later (Section 3), we construct a state control benchmark with binary toggle instructions from public datasets, revealing that existing agents typically fail to accurately execute such instructions, with execution accuracy below 50% for most agents, including GPT-5. Typical errors, illustrated in Figure 1, fall into two categories: (i) false negative toggles, where the user desired toggle state differs from the current state, but the agent omits the toggling action; and (ii) false positive toggles, where the user desired toggling state matches the current state, but the agent excessively executes the toggling action. These erroneous toggling actions misalign with the user intent, and can lead to task failure and even critical consequences for those applications that requiring precise control, highlighting a key bottleneck in multimodal agents for effective GUI interaction. This raises a key research question: *is it possible to improve the capability of multimodal agents to accurately execute toggle control instructions?*

To address the research question, a straightforward method is to introduce an additional annotator, leveraging multi-agent collaboration [35, 50] to perceive the current toggle state and guide the action agents accordingly. However, this strategy creates a paradox: on one hand, since existing multimodal agents already struggle with perceiving and executing toggle commands, they are unlikely to perform effectively as annotators; on the other hand, if an annotator is capable of reliably identifying the toggle state and instructing the action agents, it would be more reasonable to employ the annotator directly as the action agent, thereby mitigating the collaboration complexity and latency. This dilemma underscores the limitations of annotation-dependent strategy and highlights the demand to enhance the intrinsic capability of multimodal agents to perceive and execute toggle control instructions accurately.

To this end, focusing on the most prevalent mobile platform for toggle interactions, we propose **State-aware Reasoning (StaR)**, a training method to enhance the ability of multimodal agents to execute toggle control instructions. StaR refines the reasoning process on toggle control instructions, teaching agents to initiatively (i) perceive the current toggle state from the screenshot, (ii) analyze the desired toggle state from the user instruction, and (iii) decide whether to perform the toggle action based on the comparison between the two states. By integrating explicit state awareness into reasoning, StaR eliminates the reliance on additional annotators and enables agents to achieve more accurate and reliable execution of toggle control instructions.

To evaluate the effectiveness of StaR, we first assess the performance of StaR-enhanced agents on the state control benchmark. Results show significant improvements in execution accuracy for toggle-based instructions, with improvements of nearly 30% on UI-TARS [27] and over 30% on OS-Atlas [42]. Additionally, we evaluate the StaR-enhanced agents on three mobile agentic benchmarks and find that StaR can also improve the performance on general tasks. Furthermore, tests on dynamic environments [28] demonstrate the applicability of StaR in real-world dynamic scenarios.

Our contributions are summarized as follows:

(i) We construct a state control benchmark with binary toggle instructions from public datasets to evaluate agent performance on toggle execution. Results demonstrate that most existing agents achieve less than 50% accuracy, revealing a key bottleneck in multimodal agents for effective GUI interaction (Section 3).

(ii) To overcome this bottleneck, we propose StaR to enhance the ability of multimodal agents to execute toggle control instructions. StaR refines the reasoning process by teaching agents to perceive the current toggle state from the screenshot, analyze the desired toggle state from the user instruction, and decide whether to perform the toggle action based on the comparison. StaR eliminates the reliance on additional annotators and improve the intrinsic capability to accurately perceive and execute toggle control instructions (Section 4).

(iii) Through extensive experiments, we validate the effectiveness of StaR. Notably, StaR achieves substantial improvements in execution accuracy on toggle control instructions, with the improvement of **over 30%**. Furthermore, StaR also improves the performance of multimodal agents on general agentic tasks. Finally, evaluations on dynamic environments highlight the applicability of StaR in real-world toggle control tasks (Section 5).

## 2 Related Works

In this section, we review related works that form the basis of this work from three perspectives: Multimodal Agents for GUI Interaction, Interaction with GUI Toggles, and Reasoning in Multimodal Agents.

### 2.1 Multimodal Agents for GUI Interaction

Powered by MLLMs [1, 7, 23, 24, 34, 37, 47], multimodal agents have flourished promising opportunities for effective GUI interaction. Unlike traditional agents, which rely on textual perception of parsed GUIs [9, 56] and navigate through programs [32] or API calls [41, 49], multimodal agents directly perceive vision information from GUIs and interact within GUI environments through human-like actions, thereby enabling more flexible and efficient GUI interaction. These agents can be categorized into two main types: those based on prompt-engineered proprietary MLLMs, exemplified by the AppAgent series [13, 50] and Mobile-Agent v1 [36] and v2 [35]; and those based on further-trained open-source MLLMs, such as OS-Atlas [42], Aguviz [44], OS-Genesis [31], UI-TARS [27], AgentCPM-GUI [53], GUI-R1 [21], MagicGUI [33], and Mobile-Agent v3 [48], which offer greater flexibility in adaptation and customization, especially in information-sensitive scenarios. To enhance the ability of open-source MLLM-based agents, existing works focus on pre-training [18, 27, 33, 40, 42], further training on agentic benchmarks [16, 17, 21, 22, 53, 54], and test-time scaling [39, 45]. Together, these advances are driving the development of multimodal agents for effective real-world GUI interaction.

### 2.2 Interaction with GUI Toggles

To interact with GUI toggles, multimodal agents typically perceive the GUIs to identify the toggle state and make decisions based on the comparison of current toggle state and user desired state. However, due to the fine-grained nature of toggles in GUIs, it is challenging for multimodal agents to perceive the current toggle state accurately. To address this dilemma, most existing works focus on introducing an annotator (e.g., another multimodal agent, a lightweight

parser such as OminiParser [20], or even human intervention) to provide detailed state information of GUI toggles. For example, Li *et al.* [15] crowdsourced natural language descriptions for GUI widgets. Subsequently, Zhang *et al.* [51] leveraged GPT-4 [23] to annotate screen descriptions including toggle state. These toggle state information is then served as inputs for multimodal agents to reason and make decisions. In cases where the agent lacks confidence in its decision, human intervention may also be incorporated to ensure precise toggle interaction [4]. However, so far relatively few works concentrate on improving the intrinsic capability of multimodal agents to accurately execute toggle control instructions. As a result, current methods rely heavily on the accuracy of state annotation, which introduces additional complexity and risks falling into the paradox outlined in Section 1.

### 2.3 Reasoning in Multimodal Agents

Given the proven success of reasoning chain in large language models (LLMs) [5, 6, 43, 52], reasoning has recently been introduced to multimodal agents to improve both interpretability and accuracy in decision-making. As CoAT reasoning [51] proved its effectiveness in improving action execution accuracy, recent works [17, 21, 53] further reinforce the reasoning process through additional training to improve the intrinsic ability of multimodal to interact within GUIs more accurately. To this end, we propose a novel training method to improve the intrinsic ability of multimodal agents to accurately perceive and execute toggle control instructions.

## 3 Preliminary Study

In this section, we present the construction process and evaluation metric of state control benchmark in Section 3.1, and assess the performance of existing multimodal agents on state control benchmark in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 State Control Benchmark

To evaluate the performance of multimodal agents in executing toggle control instructions, we construct a state control benchmark with binary toggle instructions and corresponding action labels from public datasets. Ensuring the quality of this benchmark requires precise annotation of both toggle state and toggle position. Given that the public datasets lack high-quality XML trees for extracting toggle state, we construct an annotation pipeline to obtain the precise toggle state, toggle position, and toggle feature directly from GUI screenshots. The annotation pipeline includes three steps: widget parsing, toggle identification, and state-feature annotation, as illustrated in Figure 2.

**Widget Parsing.** We first extract screenshots  $s \in \mathbb{S}$  with original widget bounding boxes  $b_o \in \mathbb{B}$  that correspond to user toggle control instructions  $u_t \in \mathbb{U}$  from public datasets, including AMEX [2], RICOSCA [15], GUIAct [3], AndroidWorld [29], AITW [30], and the grounding dataset of OS-Atlas [42]. To enrich the diversity of GUI toggle sources, we further apply OminiParser [20] to automatically parse additional bounding boxes  $b_p \in \mathbb{B}$  for clickable elements from these screenshots. Finally, we merge the original and parsed results into a unified set of bounding boxes, denoted as  $\{b\} = \{b_o\} \cup \{b_p\}$ , which serves as the foundation for subsequent toggle identification.

**Toggle Identification.** In this step, we identify GUI toggles from the bounding boxes of the clickable widgets. Inspired by the recent works that leverages proprietary MLLMs for reasoning chain annotations [51] and instantiate task trajectory generation [31], we utilize proprietary MLLMs as annotators to recognize GUI toggles. Specifically, we adopt GLM-4V [11] (denoted as  $\mathcal{G}$ ) and Qwen-2-VL-72B [37] (denoted as  $\mathcal{Q}$ ) as independent annotators. Given a bounding box  $b$  and its associated screenshot  $s_b$  (where  $b$  is visually highlighted to facilitate precise annotation), each annotator independently determines whether  $b$  corresponds to a GUI toggle. The prompt template for toggle




Fig. 2. Three-step annotation pipeline for constructing state control benchmark. First, we extract screenshots with widget bounding boxes that corresponding to toggle control instructions from public datasets and utilize OminiParser to parse clickable widgets. Second, we leverage GLM-4V and Qwen-2-VL-72B to identify toggles among the clickable widgets and establish inter-annotator agreement. Finally, we continuously employ GLM-4V and Qwen-2-VL-72B to annotate toggle state and toggle features, ensuring high-quality data through inter-annotator agreement.

identification is provided in Appendix C. To ensure annotation reliability, we apply inter-annotator agreement: only when both  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  classify  $b$  as a toggle do we retain the pair  $\langle s_b, b \rangle$  for subsequent state-feature annotation. Formally, the process of toggle identification can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{G}}(s_b, b), \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}(s_b, b) &\in \{0, 1\}, \\
 \mathcal{I}_m(s_b, b) &= m(s_b, b), m \in \{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Q}\}, \\
 \mathcal{I}(s_b, b) &= \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{G}}(s_b, b) \wedge \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{Q}}(s_b, b).
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

**State-feature Annotation.** This is the key step in constructing the state control benchmark, where we employ  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  as independent annotators to label the GUI toggle state and its associated feature. Given the bounding box  $b$  of a GUI toggle and the corresponding box-highlighted screenshot  $s_b$ , each annotator independently determines the current state  $\sigma$  and the feature  $f$  of the toggle. The prompt template for state-feature annotation is provided in Appendix C. Similar to toggle identification, we further apply inter-annotator agreement to ensure label reliability: only when both  $\mathcal{G}$  and  $\mathcal{Q}$  produce identical annotations for both  $\sigma$  and feature  $f$ , do we accept and retain the final annotation  $\langle s_b, b, \sigma, f \rangle$ . Formally, the process of state-feature annotation can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sigma_m(s_b, b), f_m(s_b, b) &= m(s_b, b), m \in \{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{Q}\}, \\
 \mathcal{I}_{\sigma}(s_b, b) &= \mathbf{1} [\sigma_{\mathcal{G}}(s_b, b) = \sigma_{\mathcal{Q}}(s_b, b)], \\
 \mathcal{I}_f(s_b, b) &= \mathbf{1} [f_{\mathcal{G}}(s_b, b) = f_{\mathcal{Q}}(s_b, b)].
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Finally, we obtain 40,918 quadruplets  $\langle s_b, b, \sigma, f \rangle$ . We replace the box-highlighted screenshots  $s_b$  with the original screenshots  $s$  for more comprehensive evaluation. Subsequently, based on the annotated toggle state  $\sigma$ , each quadruplet  $\langle s, b, \sigma, f \rangle$  is expanded into two samples corresponding to opposite toggle actions. For example, if  $\sigma = 1$  (the toggle is currently on), we generate two samples:  $\langle s, b, u_p, a_p \rangle$  and  $\langle s, b, u_n, a_n \rangle$ , where  $u_p$  denotes the positive instruction “turn off  $f$ ” and  $u_n$  denotes negative instruction “turn on  $f$ ”. Notably, the label action  $a_p$  for  $u_p$  is to CLICK on the toggle to vary its state (since the current state differs from the desired state), while the label action for  $u_n$  is to stop and set the task as COMPLETED (since the current state already matches the desired state). This expansion results in 81,836 samples,

which we split into 73,652 balanced training samples ( $u_p$  vs.  $u_n$ ) and 8,184 balanced testing samples. We provide the examples from the test split of the state control benchmark in Appendix A.1.

To comprehensively evaluate multimodal agents on the state control benchmark, we adopt the following metrics:

- (i) **Overall Type Match Rate (O-TMR)**  $\uparrow$ : The proportion of test samples where the predicted action type (CLICK or COMPLETED) matches the ground truth.
- (ii) **Overall Action Match Rate (O-AMR)**  $\uparrow$ : The proportion of test samples where the predicted action exactly matches the ground truth, considering both action type and click coordinate accuracy. O-AMR is the most critical metric on state control benchmark, reflecting the overall action precision of multimodal agents. The detailed evaluation process of action match rate is provided in Appendix A.4.
- (iii) **Positive Type Match Rate (P-TMR)**  $\uparrow$ : The proportion of positive-instruction samples where the predicted action type (CLICK) matches the ground truth.
- (iv) **Positive Action Match Rate (P-AMR)**  $\uparrow$ : The proportion of positive-instruction samples where the predicted action exactly matches the ground truth, including both type and click coordinate accuracy.
- (v) **Positive False Negative Rate (P-FNR)**  $\downarrow$ : The proportion of positive-instruction samples incorrectly predicted as negative (COMPLETED), reflecting the severity of false negatives.
- (vi) **Negative Action Match Rate (N-AMR)**  $\uparrow$ : The proportion of negative-instruction samples where the predicted action (COMPLETED) matches the ground truth.
- (vii) **Negative False Positive Type Rate (N-FPTR)**  $\downarrow$ : The proportion of negative-instruction samples incorrectly predicted as CLICK. This reflects the false-positive tendency of multimodal agents.
- (viii) **Negative False Positive Rate (N-FPR)**  $\downarrow$ : The proportion of negative-instruction samples where the predicted CLICK coincides with the corresponding positive action, indicating the severity of false positives.

### 3.2 Evaluation of Multimodal Agents on State Control Benchmark

To assess the ability of multimodal agents to execute state control instructions, we evaluate them on the state-control benchmark. Specifically, we adopt GPT-5 [24], GPT-4o [23], and Gemini 2.5 Pro [7] as representatives of proprietary MLLM-based agents. Additionally, we adopt Qwen-2-VL-72B [37], GUI-R1-7B [21], OS-Atlas-7B [42], UI-TARS-7B [27], and AgentCPM-GUI-8B [53] as representatives of open-source MLLM-based agents. The performance of these multimodal agents is shown in Figure 3, with eight-dimensional metrics illustrated in Section 3.1.

Based on the evaluation results in Figure 3, we summarize the following observations:

(i) General proprietary MLLM-based agents struggle to accurately execute state control instructions. For all three general proprietary MLLM-based agents, the O-AMR consistently falls below 40%, underscoring their inability to accurately execute state control instructions. Additionally, the near-100% P-TMR and only about 20% P-AMR highlight the limited grounding capabilities of general proprietary MLLM-based agents. A similar weakness is also observed in the large discrepancy between N-FPTR and N-FPR.

(ii) Open-source MLLM-based agents achieve higher performance but remain unsatisfactory. Optimized for agentic tasks, the O-AMR of open-source MLLM-based agents is notably higher than that of proprietary agents, with Qwen-2-VL-72B achieving the highest O-AMR of 66.42% due to its large parameter scale. However, for small-scale agents, the O-AMRs remain unsatisfactory, with only the reasoning-reinforced AgentCPM-GUI-8B and GUI-R1-7B exceeding 50%.

(iii) All multimodal agents demonstrate a strong bias towards varying the toggle state, leading to erroneous toggling. Across all representative multimodal agents, the P-FNR consistently stays low, whereas the N-FPTR remains relatively




Fig. 3. Eight-dimensional performance of representative multimodal agents on the state-control benchmark (metrics are illustrated in Section 3.1). (a) Proprietary MLLM-based agents. (b) Open-source MLLM-based agents.

high. Additionally, for open-source MLLM-based agents in particular, the N-FPR is also non-negligible, indicating significant erroneous toggling. These results reveal a strong bias toward predicting CLICK to change the toggle state for most toggle control instructions, even when the current state already matches the desired state, highlighting the inability of multimodal agents to perform careful analysis and reasoning before making toggle decisions.

These observations demonstrate that existing representative multimodal agents are still unreliable to execute toggle control instructions. Improving the accuracy of multimodal agents in such tasks remains a challenging bottleneck in effective and reliable GUI interaction.

#### 4 Methodology

The evaluations in Section 3.2 reveal that existing multimodal agents are unreliable in executing toggle control instructions, particularly when the current toggle state already matches the desired state. To address this bottleneck, we propose **State-aware Reasoning (StaR)**, a training method that explicitly incorporates state perception and analysis into the reasoning chain, thereby enhancing the ability of multimodal agents to execute toggle control instructions.

Rethink the process of human execution of toggle control instructions, which can be formally structured into three steps: (i) perceive the current toggle state from the screenshot; (ii) refer the toggle control instruction to analyze the desired state; and (iii) decide whether to change the toggle state based on the comparison of current and desired states. Inspired by this, StaR simulates human reasoning by refining the reasoning chain and incorporating state-aware reasoning into multimodal agents, as illustrated in Figure 4.

Specifically, we further train open-source MLLM-based agents on the training split of the state control benchmark, where each screenshot is paired with positive and negative toggle control instructions. Leveraging the annotations of the current state  $\sigma$  and toggle feature  $f$ , we construct a structured reasoning chain consisting of three steps:




Fig. 4. The reasoning chain of StaR. StaR refines the reasoning chain to simulate human-like reasoning for toggle control instructions by incorporating state-aware reasoning into multimodal agents. The reasoning chain consists of three parts: (i) perceiving the current state from the screenshot; (ii) analyzing the desired state from the user instruction; and (iii) deciding whether to change the toggle state based on the comparison between the two states.

(i) **Perceiving.** Leveraging the annotation of current state  $\sigma$ , we construct labels that guide multimodal agents to perceive the toggle state directly from the screenshot. In this way, the agents are explicitly trained to learn the mapping between the toggle state and the corresponding visual features in the screenshot, thereby strengthening their intrinsic ability to perceive fine-grained toggle state information.

(ii) **Analyzing.** We teach the multimodal agents to explicitly analyze the desired state  $\sigma_u$  from the user instructions. Consistent with Section 3.1, for positive instructions, the desired state  $\sigma_u$  differs from the current state  $\sigma$ , while for negative instructions, the desired state remains  $\sigma_u$  the same as the current state  $\sigma$ .

(iii) **Deciding.** Finally, the agents are guided to decide whether to change the toggle state by comparing the current state  $\sigma$  with the desired state  $\sigma_u$ . If current state  $\sigma$  differs from the desired state  $\sigma_u$ , the agent should predict CLICK to change the toggle state; otherwise, the agent should predict COMPLETED to preserve the current state.

Additionally, to maintain the generalizability of multimodal agents, we also annotate and refine the reasoning process of the episodes involving toggle control instructions on agentic benchmarks, which are commonly included in the training set of open-source MLLM-based agents, while retaining the original reasoning process of other episodes. We then train the multimodal agents on both the state-control benchmark and the refined agentic benchmarks with StaR. After training, the multimodal agents are able adaptively apply the reasoning chain of StaR on toggle control instructions, while preserving their original reasoning chain for other instructions, thereby improving their precision on state control tasks without sacrificing general performance.

## 5 Experiments

This section comprehensively evaluates the effectiveness of StaR on multimodal agents. Section 5.1 outlines the experimental setup. Subsequently, Section 5.2 presents the substantial improvements of StaR on the state control benchmark, demonstrating the effectiveness of StaR in improving the execution accuracy on toggle control instructions. Subsequent sections provide more detailed discussions and analysis. Section 5.3 demonstrates the generalizability of StaR that it can preserve or even improve the performance on general agentic tasks. Furthermore, Section 5.4 evaluates

StaR-enhanced agents in dynamic environments, highlighting the potential of StaR for real-world applications. Finally, Section 5.5 presents case studies that showcase how StaR enhances the ability to perceive, analyze, and act on toggle control instructions, leading to more reliable toggling.

## 5.1 Experimental Setup

*5.1.1 Target Multimodal Agents.* We adopt three representative multimodal agents covering diverse history modeling strategies to evaluate StaR: OS-Atlas-7B [42], which is trained on Qwen-2-VL-7B [37] and with a textual action history chain; UI-TARS-7B [27], which is also trained on Qwen-2-VL-7B but with a multi-screenshot history chain; AgentCPM-GUI-8B [53], which is trained on MiniCPM-V [47] without a history chain. Each agent is further fine-tuned with its original prompt templates and data format. The prompt templates for all three agents are provided in Appendix C.

*5.1.2 Training Datasets.* In addition to the training split of the state control benchmark, we also adopt the training splits of several agentic benchmarks to train the multimodal agents. Specifically, we adopt AndroidControl [14], AITZ [51], and GUI-Odyssey [19], which consists of long-chain and complex tasks. Notably, all these benchmarks are already included in the original training sets of the three agents.

*5.1.3 Evaluation Benchmarks.* In addition to the test split of the state-control benchmark, we adopt the test splits of AndroidControl [14], AITZ [51], and GUI-Odyssey [19] to evaluate performance on general agentic tasks. Notably, following prior works [27, 42, 53], we adopt AndroidControl in two settings: (i) AndroidControl-H, where only high-level goals are provided, requiring agents to autonomously reason and make action decisions; and (ii) AndroidControl-L, where both high-level goals and low-level step instructions are provided, facilitating the reasoning and decision-making process. The detailed information for these agentic benchmarks is provided in Appendix A.2.

To further assess real-world applicability, we construct a dynamic evaluation benchmark consisting of 20 real-world toggle control tasks. This benchmark is implemented on the Android emulator from AndroidStudio<sup>1</sup> and built upon the AndroidWorld framework [28], enabling evaluation under dynamic and realistic mobile environments. Additional details of this benchmark are provided in Appendix A.3.

*5.1.4 Evaluation Metrics.* In addition to the metrics for the state-control benchmark (details are presented in Section 3.1), we adopt following four standard metrics for agentic benchmarks, and adopt final task success rate for real-world toggle control tasks in the dynamic environment. For dynamic evaluation, we follow the task success rate metric from AndroidWorld [28]. Specifically, the task success rate ranges from  $[0, 1]$  and reflects the success ratio of a real-world task. Notably, as a real-world task can include several subtasks, if half of the subtasks succeed while the other half fail, the task success rate is considered as 0.5. More information is provided in Appendix A.3.

- (i) **Type Match Rate (TMR)**↑: Proportion of test samples where the predicted action type matches the ground truth.
- (ii) **Action Match Rate (AMR)**↑: Proportion of test samples where the predicted action matches the ground truth in both type and parameters (e.g., click coordinates, text content, app names). AMR serves as the key step-level metric, with its detailed evaluation process provided in Appendix A.4.
- (iii) **Task Success Rate (TSR)**↑: Proportion of successful task trajectories, where success requires the predicted action to match the ground truth at every step. As a higher-level metric, TSR reflects overall task execution performance.
- (iv) **Grounding Match Rate (GMR)**↑: Proportion of correct clicks among all click actions, reflecting the grounding ability of the multimodal agent.

<sup>1</sup><https://developer.android.com/studio>

| Model            | O-TMR $\uparrow$                | O-AMR $\uparrow$                | P-TMR $\uparrow$                 | P-AMR $\uparrow$                | P-FNR $\downarrow$            | N-AMR $\uparrow$                | N-FPTR $\downarrow$              | N-FPR $\downarrow$               |
|------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>Zero-shot</i> |                                 |                                 |                                  |                                 |                               |                                 |                                  |                                  |
| GPT-5            | 75.35                           | 37.05                           | 91.91                            | 15.30                           | 2.79                          | 58.80                           | 36.14                            | <u>3.01</u>                      |
| GPT-4o           | 72.40                           | 27.17                           | 97.04                            | 6.60                            | 2.35                          | 47.75                           | 48.83                            | <b>2.39</b>                      |
| Gemini-2.5-Pro   | 68.74                           | 30.25                           | <b>98.85</b>                     | 21.87                           | <b>0.78</b>                   | 38.64                           | 60.14                            | 9.31                             |
| Qwen-2-VL-72B    | <b>87.59</b>                    | <b>66.42</b>                    | 96.21                            | <u>53.89</u>                    | 3.69                          | <b>78.96</b>                    | <b>20.67</b>                     | 6.33                             |
| GUI-R1-7B        | 78.27                           | 54.14                           | 97.58                            | 49.32                           | 2.03                          | 58.97                           | 40.37                            | 12.63                            |
| OS-Atlas-7B      | 67.16                           | 43.95                           | <u>98.51</u>                     | 52.10                           | <u>1.27</u>                   | 35.80                           | 64.10                            | 28.67                            |
| UI-TARS-7B       | 67.49                           | 45.53                           | 97.61                            | 53.69                           | 2.01                          | 37.37                           | 55.25                            | 26.10                            |
| AgentCPM-GUI-8B  | <u>81.74</u>                    | <u>64.08</u>                    | 95.38                            | <b>60.04</b>                    | 3.32                          | <u>68.11</u>                    | <u>30.69</u>                     | 11.07                            |
| <i>w/ StaR</i>   |                                 |                                 |                                  |                                 |                               |                                 |                                  |                                  |
| OS-Atlas-7B      | <b>96.13</b> $\uparrow_{28.97}$ | <b>79.72</b> $\uparrow_{35.77}$ | <b>95.77</b> $\downarrow_{2.74}$ | <b>62.95</b> $\uparrow_{10.85}$ | <b>4.23</b> $\uparrow_{2.96}$ | <b>96.48</b> $\uparrow_{60.68}$ | <b>3.52</b> $\downarrow_{60.58}$ | <b>1.52</b> $\downarrow_{27.15}$ |
| UI-TARS-7B       | 92.38 $\uparrow_{24.89}$        | 74.52 $\uparrow_{28.99}$        | <u>95.21</u> $\downarrow_{2.40}$ | 59.51 $\uparrow_{5.82}$         | <u>4.77</u> $\uparrow_{2.76}$ | 89.54 $\uparrow_{52.17}$        | 9.95 $\downarrow_{45.30}$        | 5.65 $\downarrow_{20.45}$        |
| AgentCPM-GUI-8B  | <u>95.98</u> $\uparrow_{14.24}$ | <u>79.00</u> $\uparrow_{14.92}$ | 94.50 $\downarrow_{0.88}$        | <u>60.53</u> $\uparrow_{0.49}$  | 5.50 $\uparrow_{2.18}$        | <b>97.46</b> $\uparrow_{29.35}$ | <b>2.54</b> $\downarrow_{28.15}$ | <b>0.95</b> $\downarrow_{10.12}$ |

Table 1. The performance of zero-shot and StaR-enhanced multimodal agents on state control benchmark. Subscripts denote absolute improvements over the zero-shot baseline, with red indicating improvements and green indicating degradations. The optimal and the suboptimal results are **bolded** and underlined, respectively.

*5.1.5 Implementation Details.* Following the original settings of all three multimodal agents, click coordinates are normalized to the range  $[0, 1000]$ . We adopt LLaMA-Factory [55] framework to train the multimodal agents, with a learning rate of  $5 \times 10^{-6}$  for 3 epochs. During training and testing, we employ flash-attn [8] for acceleration.

## 5.2 Improvements on State Control Benchmark

Table 1 presents the performance of the StaR-enhanced multimodal agents on the state control benchmark, with zero-shot performance for comparison.

We summarize our primarily findings as follows:

(i) StaR achieves substantial overall improvements, significantly improves performance across all three multimodal agents. Notably, the O-AMR of OS-Atlas-7B is improved by **35.77%**, that of UI-TARS-7B is improved by **28.99%**, and even AgentCPM-GUI-8B, which obtain the suboptimal overall performance in zero-shot setting, is improved by **14.92%**. The most pronounced improvements of OS-Atlas-7B are likely due to its initially limited reasoning capabilities, which can be effectively reshaped and enhanced through StaR. These substantial improvements demonstrate the effectiveness of StaR in improving the overall performance of multimodal agents on the state control benchmark.

(ii) StaR enhances grounding ability. It consistently improves P-AMR across all three agents, with the notable improvements of **10.85%** for OS-Atlas-7B. Although P-TMR, which reflects the type prediction accuracy of CLICK for positive instructions, exhibits a slight decrease, the improvements in more comprehensive P-AMR demonstrate the optimized ability of grounding of StaR-enhanced agents.

(iii) StaR improves negative-instruction accuracy. It significantly improves N-AMR compared to zero-shot baselines. Notably, OS-Atlas-7B, which has the worst performance in zero-shot setting, achieves an improvement of **60.68%** in N-AMR with StaR, while UI-TARS-7B achieves an improvement of **52.17%**. With StaR, N-AMR reaches near or above 90%, demonstrating that StaR effectively improves agents to precisely perceive and analyze states for negative instructions, addressing the bottleneck identified in Section 3.2.




Fig. 5. The performance of zero-shot and StaR-enhanced (a) UI-TARS-7B; and (b) OS-Atlas-7B on agentic benchmarks.

(iv) StaR mitigates false positives. Compared to the zero-shot baselines that exhibit strong bias towards erroneously changing the toggle state for negative instructions, StaR significantly reduces both N-FPTR and N-FPR. This indicates that StaR effectively mitigates false positives, leading to more accurate execution of toggle control instructions. Regarding P-FNR, although the StaR-enhanced agents exhibit a slight increase, it remains within an acceptable range, indicating that StaR does not significantly increase false negatives.

(v) StaR bridges the gap of model scale. StaR-enhanced agents outperform the best zero-shot baselines (Qwen-2-VL-72B) with much fewer parameters, demonstrating that StaR can significantly improve toggle control performance without relying on large foundation models.

In summary, these findings collectively demonstrate that StaR significantly improves the ability of multimodal agents to accurately execute toggle control instructions.

### 5.3 Generalization on Agentic Benchmarks

To verify the generalizability of StaR in general agentic tasks, we evaluate the performance of StaR-enhanced agents on three static agentic benchmarks. Figure 5 presents the four-dimensional evaluations for UI-TARS-7B and OS-Atlas-7B on these benchmarks, while evaluations on AgentCPM-GUI-8B are presented in Appendix B.1.

| StaR | UI-TARS-7B          | OS-Atlas-7B          | AgentCPM-GUI-8B         |
|------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| w/o  | 35 <sub>7</sub> /20 | 10 <sub>2</sub> /20  | 20 <sub>4</sub> /20     |
| w/   | 40 <sub>8</sub> /20 | 55 <sub>11</sub> /20 | 42.5 <sub>8.5</sub> /20 |

Table 2. The task success rate of the three multimodal agents on the dynamic evaluation benchmark, with subscripts indicating the number of successful tasks over the total number of tasks.

Specifically, for AndroidControl-H, AITZ, and GUI-Odyssey, agents are required to autonomously reason and make decisions, generating both a reasoning process (Thought) and an action decision (Action). In contrast, AndroidControl-L provides pre-defined Thought and only requires agents to output Action. For StaR-enhanced agents, the provided Thought is refined into explicit state-aware reasoning chains, guiding agents to perceive the current state, analyze the desired state, and decide accordingly. In comparison, zero-shot agents receive low-level instructions as their Thought.

From the results in Figure 5, we draw the following conclusions:

(i) StaR consistently preserves or enhances performance on agentic benchmarks. Across four benchmark settings, incorporating StaR leads to performance that is comparable to or better than the baseline without StaR. This indicates that StaR does not degrade agent capabilities and is generally beneficial across different agentic tasks.

(ii) StaR yields notable improvements on complex, long-chain tasks. The most substantial improvements are observed on GUI-Odyssey, which involves complex and long-chain agentic tasks. For instance, for UI-TARS-7B, StaR improves all four metrics by near 10%, with more pronounced improvements from 7.14% to 20.17% on TSR. Similar improvements are observed on AITZ, and results from OS-Atlas-7B further confirm the significant improvement on GUI-Odyssey. These improvements across multiple benchmarks suggest that StaR can effectively enhance the reasoning ability of agents, facilitating them to handle complex, long-chain tasks.

(iii) State-aware reasoning chains facilitate decision-making. Prior works indicate that providing low-level instructions improves the ability of multimodal agents to make precise action decisions [27, 42], as evidenced by the performance improvements from AndroidControl-H to AndroidControl-L. Building on this, results on AndroidControl-L further demonstrate that providing state-aware reasoning chains further amplify this effect, yielding consistent improvements across all four metrics. Notably, the TSR of OS-Atlas-7B increases from 58.45% to 64.55%. These findings underscore the effectiveness of state-aware reasoning in enhancing decision-making for general agentic tasks.

(iv) StaR generalizes across multimodal agents. Results on both UI-TARS-7B and OS-Atlas-7B indicate that StaR consistently improves performance on agentic benchmarks, with UI-TARS-7B achieving better performance, possibly due to its comprehensive pre-training compared to OS-Atlas-7B. These findings demonstrate that StaR is model-agnostic and can effectively enhance the reasoning ability of diverse multimodal agents.

In summary, StaR generalizes well across diverse agentic tasks, consistently preserving or improving performance while offering pronounced benefits on complex, long-chain tasks.

#### 5.4 Performance on Dynamic Environment

To further evaluate the applicability of StaR in dynamic environments, we conduct experiments with the three multimodal agents on the proposed dynamic evaluation benchmark. The dynamic evaluation benchmark enables to examine not only overall task execution accuracy of toggle control instructions but also the tendencies toward false positive toggling and false negatives toggling. The task success rates of the three multimodal agents are presented in Table 2, providing a quantitative comparison of their performance with and without StaR.






Fig. 7. Trajectory of OS-Atlas-7B with StaR when executing the instruction *turn wifi on* with the toggle initially on.

## 5.5 Case Studies

To demonstrate the effectiveness of StaR-enhanced agents in precisely executing real-world toggle control instructions, we adopt OS-Atlas-7B, which exhibited the most pronounced improvement in Section 5.4, as a representative example. The target instruction is “*turn wifi on*”, with the toggle initially set to *on* thereby serving as a test for false-positive toggling. The trajectories of OS-Atlas-7B without and with StaR are presented in Figure 6 and Figure 7, respectively.

From these examples, we observe the following:

(i) Without StaR, OS-Atlas-7B fails to execute the instruction correctly, resulting in a false positive toggle. The agent mistakenly perceives the current toggle state as *off* and incorrectly clicks the toggle, resulting in an unintended state change. It then repeatedly toggles between *on* and *off*, falling into an infinite loop and ultimately failing the task.

(ii) With StaR, OS-Atlas-7B successfully executes the instruction correctly. At the critical decision step, the agent adaptively applies the state-aware reasoning chain, correctly perceiving the current toggle state as *on* and appropriately deciding to finish the task, thereby completing the instruction as intended.

These case studies illustrate the effectiveness of StaR in enabling agents to precisely execute real-world toggle control instructions in dynamic environments.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we construct a state control benchmark with binary toggle instructions derived from public datasets to evaluate the performance of existing multimodal agents in toggle execution tasks. Results highlight that most existing

agents struggle to precisely execute toggle control instructions, revealing a key bottleneck for effective GUI interaction. To address this challenge, we propose StaR, a training method designed to teach multimodal agents to simulate the human reasoning process. Specifically, StaR refines the reasoning chains of agents, enabling agents to explicitly perceive the current toggle state from the screenshot, analyze the desired toggle state from the user instruction, and decide whether to perform the toggle action based on the comparison. Experimental results demonstrate that StaR significantly enhances agent performance on the state control benchmark, achieving improvements exceeding 30%. Furthermore, evaluations on public agentic benchmarks demonstrate the generalizability of StaR to general agentic tasks. Additionally, tests on dynamic environments highlight the applicability of StaR in real-world toggle control scenarios.

## References

- [1] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. 2025. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923* (2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2502.13923
- [2] Yuxiang Chai, Siyuan Huang, Yazhe Niu, Han Xiao, Liang Liu, Dingyu Zhang, Shuai Ren, and Hongsheng Li. 2025. Amex: Android multi-annotation expo dataset for mobile gui agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*. Vienna, Austria, 2138–2156. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.findings-acl.110
- [3] Wentong Chen, Junbo Cui, Jinyi Hu, Yujia Qin, Junjie Fang, Yue Zhao, Chongyi Wang, Jun Liu, Guirong Chen, Yupeng Huo, et al. 2025. GUICourse: From General Vision Language Model to Versatile GUI Agent. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Vienna, Austria, 21936–21959. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.1065
- [4] Pengzhou Cheng, Zheng Wu, Zongru Wu, Tianjie Ju, Aston Zhang, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Gongshen Liu. 2025. OS-Kairos: Adaptive Interaction for MLLM-Powered GUI Agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Vienna, Austria, 6701–6725. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.findings-acl.348
- [5] Zihui Cheng, Qiguang Chen, Xiao Xu, Jiaqi Wang, Weiyun Wang, Hao Fei, Yidong Wang, Alex Jinpeng Wang, Zhi Chen, Wanxiang Che, et al. 2025. Visual thoughts: A unified perspective of understanding multimodal chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.15510* (2025).
- [6] Zihui Cheng, Qiguang Chen, Jin Zhang, Hao Fei, Xiaocheng Feng, Wanxiang Che, Min Li, and Libo Qin. 2025. Comt: A novel benchmark for chain of multi-modal thought on large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 39. 23678–23686.
- [7] Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaeckermann, Ice Pasupat, Noveen Sachdeva, Inderjit Dhillon, Marcel Blistein, Ori Ram, Dan Zhang, Evan Rosen, et al. 2025. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.06261* (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.06261>
- [8] Tri Dao. 2024. FlashAttention-2: Faster Attention with Better Parallelism and Work Partitioning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mZn2Xyh9Ec>
- [9] Xiang Deng, Yu Gu, Boyuan Zheng, Shijie Chen, Sam Stevens, Boshi Wang, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. 2024. Mind2web: Towards a generalist agent for the web. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024). [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2023/hash/5950bf290a1570ea401bf98882128160-Abstract-Datasets\\_and\\_Benchmarks.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/5950bf290a1570ea401bf98882128160-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html)
- [10] George Evangelou, Orestis Georgiou, Eddie Brown, Nick Hine, and James Moore. 2024. Mid-Air Haptic Feedback Improves Implicit Agency and Trust in Gesture-Based Automotive Infotainment Systems: a Driving Simulator Study. In *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Automotive User Interfaces and Interactive Vehicular Applications*. New York, NY, USA, 116–124. doi:10.1145/3640792.3676882
- [11] Team GLM, Aohan Zeng, Bin Xu, Bowen Wang, Chenhui Zhang, Da Yin, Dan Zhang, Diego Rojas, Guanyu Feng, Hanlin Zhao, et al. 2024. Chatglm: A family of large language models from glm-130b to glm-4 all tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12793* (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12793>
- [12] Swati Goel. 2024. A systematic literature review on past attack analysis on industrial control systems. *Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies* 35, 6 (2024), e5004. doi:10.1002/ett.5004
- [13] Wenjia Jiang, Yangyang Zhuang, Chenxi Song, Xu Yang, Joey Tianyi Zhou, and Chi Zhang. 2025. Appagentx: Evolving gui agents as proficient smartphone users. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.02268* (2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2503.02268
- [14] Wei Li, William E Bishop, Alice Li, Christopher Rawles, Folawiyi Campbell-Ajala, Divya Tyamagundlu, and Oriana Riva. 2024. On the effects of data scale on ui control agents. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2024/hash/a79f3ef3b445fd4659f44648f7ea8ffd-Abstract-Datasets\\_and\\_Benchmarks\\_Track.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/a79f3ef3b445fd4659f44648f7ea8ffd-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks_Track.html)
- [15] Yang Li, Gang Li, Luheng He, Jingjie Zheng, Hong Li, and Zhiwei Guan. 2020. Widget Captioning: Generating Natural Language Description for Mobile User Interface Elements. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, Bonnie Webber, Trevor Cohn, Yulan He, and Yang Liu (Eds.). Association for Computational Linguistics, Online, 5495–5510. doi:10.18653/v1/2020.emnlp-main.443
- [16] Yuhang Liu, Pengxiang Li, Zishu Wei, Congkai Xie, Xueyu Hu, Xinchun Xu, Shengyu Zhang, Xiaotian Han, Hongxia Yang, and Fei Wu. 2025. Infiguiagent: A multimodal generalist gui agent with native reasoning and reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04575* (2025).
- [17] Yuhang Liu, Pengxiang Li, Congkai Xie, Xavier Hu, Xiaotian Han, Shengyu Zhang, Hongxia Yang, and Fei Wu. 2025. Infigui-r1: Advancing multimodal gui agents from reactive actors to deliberative reasoners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14239* (2025).

- [18] Yuhang Liu, Zeyu Liu, Shuanghe Zhu, Pengxiang Li, Congkai Xie, Jiasheng Wang, Xueyu Hu, Xiaotian Han, Jianbo Yuan, Xinyao Wang, et al. 2025. InfGUI-G1: Advancing GUI Grounding with Adaptive Exploration Policy Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05731* (2025).
- [19] Quanfeng Lu, Wenqi Shao, Zitao Liu, Fanqing Meng, Boxuan Li, Botong Chen, Siyuan Huang, Kaipeng Zhang, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. 2024. Gui odyssey: A comprehensive dataset for cross-app gui navigation on mobile devices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.08451* (2024).
- [20] Yadong Lu, Jianwei Yang, Yelong Shen, and Ahmed Awadallah. 2024. Omniparser for pure vision based gui agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00203* (2024). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00203>
- [21] Run Luo, Lu Wang, Wanwei He, and Xiaobo Xia. 2025. Gui-r1: A generalist r1-style vision-language action model for gui agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10458* (2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2504.10458
- [22] Xinbei Ma, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Hai Zhao. 2024. Comprehensive Cognitive LLM Agent for Smartphone GUI Automation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Bangkok, Thailand, 9097–9110. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.539
- [23] OpenAI. 2024. GPT-4 System Card. (2024). <https://cdn.openai.com/papers/gpt-4-system-card.pdf>
- [24] OpenAI. 2025. GPT-5 System Card. (2025). <https://cdn.openai.com/gpt-5-system-card.pdf>
- [25] Lihang Pan, Chun Yu, Zhe He, and Yuanchun Shi. 2023. A human-computer collaborative editing tool for conceptual diagrams. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Hamburg, Germany, 1–29.
- [26] Lihang Pan, Chun Yu, Jiahui Li, Tian Huang, Xiaojun Bi, and Yuanchun Shi. 2022. Automatically generating and improving voice command interface from operation sequences on smartphones. In *Proceedings of the 2022 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. New Orleans, USA, 1–21.
- [27] Yujia Qin, Yiming Ye, Junjie Fang, Haoming Wang, Shihao Liang, Shizuo Tian, Junda Zhang, Jiahao Li, Yunxin Li, Shijue Huang, et al. 2025. Ui-tars: Pioneering automated gui interaction with native agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12326* (2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2501.12326
- [28] Christopher Rawles, Sarah Clinckemaiellie, Yifan Chang, Jonathan Waltz, Gabrielle Lau, Marybeth Fair, Alice Li, William E Bishop, Wei Li, Folawiyi Campbell-Ajala, Daniel Kenji Toyama, Robert James Berry, Divya Tyamagundlu, Timothy P Lillicrap, and Oriana Riva. 2025. AndroidWorld: A Dynamic Benchmarking Environment for Autonomous Agents. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*. Singapore. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=il5yUQsrjC>
- [29] Christopher Rawles, Sarah Clinckemaiellie, Yifan Chang, Jonathan Waltz, Gabrielle Lau, Marybeth Fair, Alice Li, William E Bishop, Wei Li, Folawiyi Campbell-Ajala, Daniel Kenji Toyama, Robert James Berry, Divya Tyamagundlu, Timothy P Lillicrap, and Oriana Riva. 2025. AndroidWorld: A Dynamic Benchmarking Environment for Autonomous Agents. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*. Singapore. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=il5yUQsrjC>
- [30] Christopher Rawles, Alice Li, Daniel Rodriguez, Oriana Riva, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2023. Android in the wild: a large-scale dataset for android device control. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*. New Orleans, LA, USA, 59708–59728. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=j4b3l5kOil>
- [31] Qiushi Sun, Kanzhi Cheng, Zichen Ding, Chuanyang Jin, Yian Wang, Fangzhi Xu, Zhenyu Wu, Chengyou Jia, Liheng Chen, Zhoumianze Liu, Ben Kao, Guohao Li, Junxian He, Yu Qiao, and Zhiyong Wu. 2025. OS-Genesis: Automating GUI Agent Trajectory Construction via Reverse Task Synthesis. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Vienna, Austria, 5555–5579. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.277
- [32] Qiushi Sun, Zhangyue Yin, Xiang Li, Zhiyong Wu, Xipeng Qiu, and Lingpeng Kong. 2024. Corex: Pushing the Boundaries of Complex Reasoning through Multi-Model Collaboration. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*. Philadelphia, PA, USA. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=7BCmIWVt0V>
- [33] Liujuan Tang, Shaokang Dong, Yijia Huang, Minqi Xiang, Hongtao Ruan, Bin Wang, Shuo Li, Zhihui Cao, Hailiang Pang, Heng Kong, et al. 2025. MagicGUI: A Foundational Mobile GUI Agent with Scalable Data Pipeline and Reinforcement Fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.03700* (2025).
- [34] Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, et al. 2024. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530* (2024). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.05530>
- [35] Junyang Wang, Haiyang Xu, Haitao Jia, Xi Zhang, Ming Yan, Weizhou Shen, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jitao Sang. 2025. Mobile-Agent-v2: Mobile Device Operation Assistant with Effective Navigation via Multi-Agent Collaboration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37* (2025), 2686–2710. [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2024/hash/0520537ba799d375b8ff5523295c337a-Abstract-Conference.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/0520537ba799d375b8ff5523295c337a-Abstract-Conference.html)
- [36] Junyang Wang, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Weizhou Shen, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jitao Sang. 2024. Mobile-Agent: Autonomous Multimodal Mobile Device Agent with Visual Perception. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*. Vienna, Austria. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=jE6pDYCnVF>
- [37] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. 2024. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191* (2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2409.12191
- [38] Maximiliane Windl, Philipp Thalhammer, David Müller, Albrecht Schmidt, and Sebastian S Feger. 2025. PrivacyHub: A Functional Tangible and Digital Ecosystem for Interoperable Smart Home Privacy Awareness and Control. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Yokohama, Japan, 1–15.
- [39] Hang Wu, Hongkai Chen, Yujun Cai, Chang Liu, Qingwen Ye, Ming-Hsuan Yang, and Yiwei Wang. 2025. DiMo-GUI: Advancing Test-time Scaling in GUI Grounding via Modality-Aware Visual Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.00008* (2025).

- [40] Zongru Wu, Pengzhou Cheng, Zheng Wu, Tianjie Ju, Zhuosheng Zhang, and Gongshen Liu. 2025. Smoothing grounding and reasoning for mllm-powered gui agents with query-oriented pivot tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.00401* (2025).
- [41] Zhiyong Wu, Chengcheng Han, Zichen Ding, Zhenmin Weng, Zhoumianze Liu, Shunyu Yao, Tao Yu, and Lingpeng Kong. 2024. OS-Copilot: Towards Generalist Computer Agents with Self-Improvement. In *ICLR 2024 Workshop on Large Language Model (LLM) Agents*. Vienna, Austria. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3WWFrg8UJJ>
- [42] Zhiyong Wu, Zhenyu Wu, Fangzhi Xu, Yian Wang, Qiushi Sun, Chengyou Jia, Kanzhi Cheng, Zichen Ding, Liheng Chen, Paul Pu Liang, and Yu Qiao. 2025. OS-ATLAS: Foundation Action Model for Generalist GUI Agents. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*. Singapore. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=n9PDaFNi8t>
- [43] Shilin Xu, Yanwei Li, Rui Yang, Tao Zhang, Yueyi Sun, Wei Chow, Linfeng Li, Hang Song, Qi Xu, Yunhai Tong, Xiangtai Li, and Hao Fei. 2025. Mixed-r1: Unified reward perspective for reasoning capability in multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.24164* (2025).
- [44] Yiheng Xu, Zekun Wang, Junli Wang, Dunjie Lu, Tianbao Xie, Amrita Saha, Doyen Sahoo, Tao Yu, and Caiming Xiong. 2025. Aguis: Unified Pure Vision Agents for Autonomous GUI Interaction. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*. Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=PlihOwfx4r>
- [45] Yan Yang, Dongxu Li, Yutong Dai, Yuhao Yang, Ziyang Luo, Zirui Zhao, Zhiyuan Hu, Junzhe Huang, Amrita Saha, Zeyuan Chen, et al. 2025. Gta1: Gui test-time scaling agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.05791* (2025).
- [46] Yuan Yao, Li Huang, Yi He, Zhijun Ma, Xuhai Xu, and Haipeng Mi. 2023. Reviewing and Reflecting on Smart Home Research from the Human-Centered Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Hamburg, Germany) (*CHI '23*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 143, 21 pages. doi:10.1145/3544548.3580842
- [47] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, et al. 2024. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01800* (2024). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2408.01800
- [48] Jiabo Ye, Xi Zhang, Haiyang Xu, Haowei Liu, Junyang Wang, Zhaoqing Zhu, Ziwei Zheng, Feiyu Gao, Junjie Cao, Zhengxi Lu, et al. 2025. Mobile-Agent-v3: Foundational Agents for GUI Automation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.15144* (2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2508.15144
- [49] Chaoyun Zhang, Liqun Li, Shilin He, Xu Zhang, Bo Qiao, Si Qin, Minghua Ma, Yu Kang, Qingwei Lin, Saravan Rajmohan, et al. 2025. UFO: A UI-Focused Agent for Windows OS Interaction. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the Nations of the Americas Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*. Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, 597–622. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.naacl-long.26
- [50] Chi Zhang, Zhao Yang, Jiaxuan Liu, Yanda Li, Yucheng Han, Xin Chen, Zebiao Huang, Bin Fu, and Gang Yu. 2025. Appagent: Multimodal agents as smartphone users. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. Yokohama, Japan, 1–20. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713600
- [51] Jiwen Zhang, Jihao Wu, Yihua Teng, Minghui Liao, Nuo Xu, Xiao Xiao, Zhongyu Wei, and Duyu Tang. 2024. Android in the zoo: Chain-of-action-thought for gui agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*. Miami, Florida, USA, 12016–12031. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.702
- [52] Yongheng Zhang, Xu Liu, Ruihan Tao, Qiguang Chen, Hao Fei, Wanxiang Che, and Libo Qin. 2025. ViTCoT: Video-Text Interleaved Chain-of-Thought for Boosting Video Understanding in Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09876* (2025).
- [53] Zhong Zhang, Yaxi Lu, Yikun Fu, Yupeng Huo, Shenzi Yang, Yesai Wu, Han Si, Xin Cong, Haotian Chen, Yankai Lin, Jie Xie, Wei Zhou, Wang Xu, Yuanheng Zhang, Zhou Su, Zhongwu Zhai, Xiaoming Liu, Yudong Mei, Jianming Xu, Hongyan Tian, Chongyi Wang, Chi Chen, Yuan Yao, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2025. AgentCPM-GUI: Building Mobile-Use Agents with Reinforcement Fine-Tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01391* (2025). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2506.01391
- [54] Zhuosheng Zhang and Aston Zhang. 2024. You Only Look at Screens: Multimodal Chain-of-Action Agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Bangkok, Thailand, 3132–3149. doi:10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.186
- [55] Yaowei Zheng, Richong Zhang, Junhao Zhang, Yanhan Ye, Zheyuan Luo, Zhangchi Feng, and Yongqiang Ma. 2024. LlamaFactory: Unified Efficient Fine-Tuning of 100+ Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Bangkok, Thailand. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2403.13372>
- [56] Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Uri Alon, and Graham Neubig. 2024. WebArena: A Realistic Web Environment for Building Autonomous Agents. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*. Vienna, Austria. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=oKn9c6yTLx>




Fig. 8. Examples from the test split of state control benchmark.

## A Additional Experimental Setup

This section provides additional experimental setup details. Section A.2 presents details for the state control benchmark. Section A.2 presents details for the agentic benchmark. Section A.3 presents the details for the dynamic evaluation Benchmark. Section A.4 outlines the detailed evaluation process for AMR.

### A.1 Details of State Control Benchmark

We construct the state control benchmark from the public agentic datasets, including AMEX [2], RICOSCA [15], GUIAct [3], AndroidWorld [29], AITW [30], and the grounding dataset of OS-Atlas [42].

After the three-step construction pipeline illustrated in Section 3.1, we obtain 40,918 screenshots with annotations. To comprehensively evaluate multimodal agent performance, each record is extended with both positive and negative instructions generated by the annotated target toggle feature. Positive instructions require toggling to change the state, while negative ones require maintaining the current state. This results in 81,836 samples. Finally, we randomly split the whole Benchmark into 73,652 positive-negative balanced training samples and 8,184 balanced testing samples.

Examples of test samples are provided in Figure 8, with target toggles highlighted in red boxes for clarity.

### A.2 Details of Agentic Benchmark

The agentic benchmarks adopted in our paper are described below:

- AndroidControl [14] is a mobile agent benchmark comprising 15,283 demonstrations with step-wise instructions. Data are collected from human raters performing various tasks on 833 apps across 40 categories on Android devices. The training subset of AndroidControl includes 89,144 step-wise samples.

| Benchmark      | CLICK | COMPLETE | SCROLL | TYPE | OPENAPP | PRESS | Others | Total Step | Trajectory |
|----------------|-------|----------|--------|------|---------|-------|--------|------------|------------|
| AndroidControl | 5074  | 1543     | 1211   | 632  | 608     | 343   | 576    | 9987       | 1543       |
| AITZ           | 2736  | 504      | 601    | 500  | /       | 265   | 118    | 4724       | 506        |
| GUI-Odyssey    | 16658 | 1572     | 2622   | 2666 | /       | 2044  | 89     | 25651      | 1666       |

Table 3. Statistical information for the test subsets of all three agentic benchmarks.

- AITZ [51] is a mobile agent benchmark derived from a subset of AITW [30] and annotated by GPT-4o [23] for chain-of-action-thought (CoAT) components. AITZ consists of 2,504 operation trajectories across 18,643 steps. AITZ is categorized into five subsets based on application domain: General, Install, GoogleApps, Single, and Web Shopping. The training subset of AITZ contains 13,919 step-wise samples.
- GUI-Odyssey [29] is a mobile benchmark for training and evaluating cross-app navigation agents on complex, long-chain tasks. It consists of 8,334 episodes from 6 mobile devices, covering 6 cross-app task types, 212 apps, and over 1,400 app combinations. The training subset of GUI-Odyssey includes 101,486 step-wise samples.

Detailed statistics for the test subsets of all three benchmarks are provided in Table 3.

### A.3 Details of Dynamic Evaluation Benchmark

To evaluate the real-world applicability of StaR, we construct a dynamic evaluation benchmark consisting of 20 real-world toggle control tasks, evaluating the task execution accuracy and the tendency of false positive and false negative. The benchmark is implemented on the Android emulator from AndroidStudio<sup>2</sup> and built on the AndroidWorld [28]. The task name and the user instruction templates are provided in Table 4, where the *Verify* suffix indicates the scenarios where the target toggle state already matches the desired state.

We follow the task success rate metric from AndroidWorld [28] to evaluate the performance of this benchmark. Specifically, the task success rate ranges from  $[0, 1]$  and reflects the success ratio of a real-world task. For example, the task “*Turn off WiFi, then enable Bluetooth*” contains two subtasks: “*Turn off WiFi*” and “*Turn on Bluetooth*”. If one succeeds and the other fails, the task success rate is recorded as 0.5.

### A.4 Evaluation of Action Match Rate

The exact action match rate (AMR) is a key metric for evaluating step-wise action prediction, as it requires both the action type  $t$  and parameters  $p$  (e.g., coordinates, app name, text input) to match the ground truth. An action is considered an exact match only when both  $t$  and  $p$  exactly match the ground truth. The calculation of AMR varies depending on the action type, as outlined below:

For action without additional parameters, like PRESS, evaluation relies solely on matching the action type  $t$ . AMR is equivalent to type match rate (TMR) for these actions.

For SCROLL, where the direction is limited to up, down, left, or right, we evaluate both the action type  $t$  and the scroll direction to ensure they perfectly align with the ground truth.

For TYPE, we adopt a comparatively less stringent evaluation. After verifying that the predicted action type  $t$  is TYPE, both the ground truth and predicted text are converted to lowercase and trimmed of leading and trailing spaces. The action is considered a match if the normalized predicted text exactly matches the normalized ground truth.

<sup>2</sup><https://developer.android.com/studio>

| Task Name                              | User Instruction Template  |
|--|--|
| SystemBluetoothTurnOff                 | Turn bluetooth off.  |
| SystemBluetoothTurnOffVerify           | Turn bluetooth off.  |
| SystemBluetoothTurnOn                  | Turn bluetooth on.   |
| SystemBluetoothTurnOnVerify            | Turn bluetooth on.   |
| SystemWifiTurnOff                      | Turn wifi off.   |
| SystemWifiTurnOffVerify                | Turn wifi off.   |
| SystemWifiTurnOn                       | Turn wifi on.  |
| SystemWifiTurnOnVerify                 | Turn wifi on.  |
| TurnOffWifiAndTurnOnBluetooth          | Turn off WiFi, then enable bluetooth                             |
| TurnOnWifiAndOpenApp                   | Turn on Wifi, then open the {app_name} app                       |
| TurnOnAlarm9AM                         | Trun on alarm at 9:00 AM.  |
| TurnOffAlarm9AM                        | Trun off alarm at 9:00 AM.                                       |
| TurnOnCaptionYoutube                   | Turn on captions in Youtube’s settings.                          |
| TurnOffCaptionYoutube                  | Turn off captions in Youtube’s settings.                         |
| TurnOnDoNotDisturb                     | Turn on Do not Disturb   |
| TurnOffDoNotDisturb                    | Turn off Do not Disturb  |
| TurnOnSaveAndFillPaymentMethodsChrome  | Turn on save and fill payment methods in Chrome’s settings.      |
| TurnOffSaveAndFillPaymentMethodsChrome | Turn off save and fill payment methods in Chrome’s settings.     |
| TurnOnAlwaysSecureConnChrome           | Turn on Always use the secure connections in Chrome’s settings.  |
| TurnOffAlwaysSecureConnChrome          | Turn off Always use the secure connections in Chrome’s settings. |

Table 4. Task name and user instruction templates of the dynamic evaluation benchmark.

For OPENAPP, we also adopt a comparatively less stringent evaluation. This is due to ambiguity in app names (e.g., voice recorder-unrecorder vs. voice recorder) and inconsistencies between ground truth actions and the low-level instructions of AndroidControl (e.g. OPENAPP *Flipsnack*) vs. *open the flipsnack magazine app*. Specifically, we first verify that the predicted action type  $t$  is OPENAPP, then normalize all words in the predicted and ground truth app names by converting them into lowercase and applying stemming to reduce variations in tense and person. If either normalized app name is a substring of the other, the action is considered an exact match.

For CLICK actions, we slightly modify the evaluation method from OS-Atlas [42], leveraging the availability of widget bounding boxes. Specifically, when both the predicted and ground truth action types  $t$  are CLICK, we first inspect the corresponding screenshot layout to identify the bounding box containing the ground truth coordinates. If such a box exists, the action is considered correct if the predicted coordinates fall within it; otherwise, we measure the relative distance. If no bounding box is found, correctness is determined solely by the relative distance between the predicted and ground truth coordinates. For the state control benchmark, the fine-grained nature of GUI toggles makes the commonly adopted 14% threshold overly permissive, as even such deviations may lead to failed toggling. We therefore consider a toggle action correct only if the relative distance is below 4% of the screen. For agentic benchmarks, we maintain the commonly adopted 14% threshold, as agentic tasks generally permit higher deviation.

## B Additional Experimental Results

This section reports the additional experimental results and provide further analysis. Section B.1 presents additional performance on the agentic benchmark.

### B.1 Additional Performance on Agentic Benchmarks

We provide the additional performance of AgentCPM-GUI-8B on agentic benchmarks in Figure 9.




Fig. 9. The performance of zero-shot and StaR-enhanced AgentCPM-GUI-8B on agentic benchmarks.

From the evaluation results, the StaR-enhanced AgentCPM-GUI-8B demonstrates performance that is comparable to its zero-shot baseline across four agentic benchmarks. Notably, on AndroidControl-H and AndroidControl-L, StaR yields consistent improvements across all four metrics, with particularly pronounced gains in AMR and GMR on AndroidControl-L. While AITZ and GUI-Odyssey show slightly lower performance, the overall performance remains comparable. These results suggest that the StaR-enhanced model maintains competitive performance across diverse agentic tasks, even in scenarios where task complexity and length increases.

Overall, the results indicate that integrating StaR does not compromise model capability. Additionally, in several settings, StaR leads to measurable improvements, highlighting its generalizability on general agentic tasks.

### C Prompts

This section presents the meticulously designed prompt templates. Specifically, the prompt template for toggle identification, state-feature annotation, UI-TARS, OS-Atlas, and AgentCPM-GUI are provided in Figure 10, Figure 11, Figure 12, Figure 13, and Figure 14, respectively.

Received 20 February 2007; revised 12 March 2009; accepted 5 June 2009

### Prompt Template for Toggle Identification

You are in Switch Detection Mode. Your task is to determine whether the UI element fully enclosed in the red box (\_\_BBOX\_\_) is a switch-type control.

# Inputs:

1. Screenshot: <image> (red box highlights the target)
2. Click Action: "CLICK within red box \_\_BBOX\_\_"
3. Instruction: \_\_INSTRUCTION\_\_ (only extract the object being acted on; ignore action verbs like "enable/disable" and "turn on/off")

# Scope:

- Only analyze the element fully inside the red box.
- Completely ignore surrounding or adjacent elements.
- Do not infer function from layout, instruction, or context.

# Valid Switch Criteria:

An element is a **switch** only if it satisfies **all** of the following:

1. **It is a UI control**, not a label or plain text.
2. **It has a visible binary state** (e.g., ON vs OFF, Enabled vs Disabled, Checked vs Unchecked).
3. **It supports persistent toggle** — clicking must flip state, not trigger one-time action.
4. **It gives visual feedback** that indicates current state before and after the click (e.g., toggle position, color, icon, label change).

# Common Switch Types:

- Checkbox (✓ / empty box)
- Toggle slider
- Dual-state labeled button (e.g., text/icon flips between Enabled / Disabled)

# Not a Switch If:

- The red box contains **plain text**, such as "Vibrate", "Always" or "Choose text color"
- It is a **button** used for **single-use action** (e.g., "Subscribe", "Skip", "Continue")
- It lacks clear binary state indication
- It has no visual change after click
- It is a **static label**, description, or non-interactive UI
- No valid UI element is fully inside the red box

# Rules:

- Do NOT guess based on text like "Subscribe" or "Start"
- Do NOT treat standalone text, button labels, or descriptions as switches
- Do NOT infer behavior from nearby UI elements
- Do NOT treat labels or descriptions as switches
- Only consider visual evidence of **binary toggle capability** inside the red box

# Output Format:

If it is a switch (visual toggle or toggle-button):

```
{
  "is_switch": true
}
```

If not:

```
{
  "is_switch": false
}
```

Output:

Fig. 10. Prompt template for toggle identification.

## Prompt Template for State-feature Annotation

You are in Switch Status Perception Mode. Your task is to determine whether the UI element fully enclosed in the red box (\_\_\_BBOX\_\_\_) is a binary switch control that changes state (Enabled or Disabled) when clicked.

# Inputs:

1. Screenshot: "image" (the red box highlights the clickable element)
2. Click Action: "CLICK" within red box \_\_\_BBOX\_\_\_ (coordinates normalized to [0, 1000])
3. Instruction: \_\_\_INSTRUCTION\_\_\_ (used only to name the feature; ignore action verbs like "enable/disable" and "turn on/off")

# Evaluation Scope:

- Analyze ONLY the element fully contained within the red box.
- Completely IGNORE any content outside or partially inside the box.
- Use the instruction ONLY to identify the target feature (noun only, e.g., "Wi-Fi", "Notifications").
- Do NOT infer behavior from instruction verbs or surrounding layout.

# Valid Switch Criteria:

An element is a **switch** only if it satisfies **all** of the following:

1. **It is an interactive UI control**, not a label, icon, or plain text.
2. **It has a visible binary state** (e.g., ON vs OFF, Enabled vs Disabled, Checked vs Unchecked).
3. **It supports persistent toggle** — clicking must flip state reliably, not just trigger an one-time action.
4. **It gives immediate visual feedback** that indicates current state before and after the click (e.g., toggle position, color, icon, label change).

# Common Switch Types:

- Checkbox (✓ / empty box)
- Toggle slider
- Dual-state labeled button (e.g., text/icon flips between Enabled / Disabled)

# Not a Switch if:

- The red box contains **plain text**, such as "Vibrate", "Always" or "Choose text color"
- It is a **button** used for **single-use action** (e.g., "Subscribe", "Skip", "Continue")
- It lacks clear binary state indication
- It has no visual change after click
- It is a **static label**: description, or non-interactive UI
- No valid UI element is fully inside the red box

# Decision Procedure:

1. Locate the UI element fully within the red box.
2. Decide whether it is a switch with binary, persistent states.
3. Extract the controlled feature name from \_\_\_INSTRUCTION\_\_\_ (use noun only).
4. Determine the current state **before** the click.
5. Determine the expected state **after** the click.
6. Output structured result as specified.

# Output Format:

If it is a switch and clicking it changes state:

```
{
  "is_switch": true,
  "feature": "[Feature name in noun form]",
  "state_before_action": "Enabled" or "Disabled",
  "state_after_action": "Enabled" or "Disabled",
  "action_effect": "The action [turn on|turn off] [feature] by changing the switch from [state_before_action] to [state_after_action]"
}
```

If it is not a switch or does not toggle state:

```
{
  "is_switch": false,
  "action_effect": "The red box element is not a switch; it triggered [e.g., navigation, selection, or no state change]"
}
```

# Examples

Instruction: Turn on Bluetooth

```
{
  "is_switch": true,
  "feature": "Bluetooth",
  "state_before_action": "Disabled",
  "state_after_action": "Enabled",
  "action_effect": "The action turn on Bluetooth by changing the switch from Disabled to Enabled"
}
```

Instruction: Tap profile icon

```
{
  "is_switch": false,
  "action_effect": "The red box element is not a switch; it triggered navigation"
}
```

# Important:

- The red box defines the evaluation boundary — never go outside.
- Do NOT infer meaning from verbs in the instruction.
- Only report a switch if the element shows two visual states and persistent toggle behavior.
- Precision is critical: misclassifying labels or buttons as switches is unacceptable.

Outputs:

Fig. 11. Prompt template for state-feature annotation.

### Prompt Template for UI-TARS

You are a GUI agent. You are given a task and your action history, with screenshots. You need to perform the next action to complete the task.

## Output Format

...

Thought: ...

Action: ...

...

## Action Space

click(start\_box='\<|box\_start|>(x1,y1)<|box\_end|>')

long\_press(start\_box='\<|box\_start|>(x1,y1)<|box\_end|>', time='\')

type(content='\')

scroll(direction='\down or up or right or left')

open\_app(app\_name='\')

press\_back()

press\_home()

wait()

finished() # Submit the task regardless of whether it succeeds or fails.

## Note

- Use English in `Thought` part.
- Summarize your next action (with its target element) in one sentence in `Thought` part.

## User Instruction

{instruction}

Fig. 12. Prompt template for UI-TARS.

### Prompt Template for OS-Atlas

You are now operating in Executable Language Grounding mode. Your goal is to help users accomplish tasks by suggesting executable actions that best fit their needs. Your skill set includes both basic and custom actions.

**1. Basic Actions**  
 Basic actions are standardized and available across all platforms. They provide essential functionality and are defined with a specific format, ensuring consistency and reliability.

**Basic Action 1: CLICK**  
 - purpose: Click at the specified position.  
 - format: CLICK <point>[[x-axis, y-axis]]</point>  
 - example usage: CLICK <point>[[101, 872]]</point>

**Basic Action 2: TYPE**  
 - purpose: Enter specified text at the designated location.  
 - format: TYPE [input text]  
 - example usage: TYPE [Shanghai shopping mall]

**Basic Action 3: SCROLL**  
 - purpose: SCROLL in the specified direction.  
 - format: SCROLL [direction [UP/DOWN/LEFT/RIGHT]]  
 - example usage: SCROLL [UP]

**2. Custom Actions**  
 Custom actions are unique to each user's platform and environment. They allow for flexibility and adaptability, enabling the model to support new and unseen actions defined by users. These actions extend the functionality of the basic set, making the model more versatile and capable of handling specific tasks.

**Custom Action 1: PRESS\_BACK**  
 - purpose: Press a back button to navigate to the previous screen.  
 - format: PRESS\_BACK  
 - example usage: PRESS\_BACK

**Custom Action 2: PRESS\_HOME**  
 - purpose: Press a home button to navigate to the home page.  
 - format: PRESS\_HOME  
 - example usage: PRESS\_HOME

**Custom Action 3: IMPOSSIBLE**  
 - purpose: Indicate the task is impossible.  
 - format: IMPOSSIBLE  
 - example usage: IMPOSSIBLE

**Custom Action 4: COMPLETE**  
 - purpose: Indicate the task is finished.  
 - format: COMPLETE  
 - example usage: COMPLETE

**Custom Action 5: OPENAPP**  
 - purpose: Open an app.  
 - format: OPENAPP <APP\_NAME>  
 - example usage: OPENAPP Zoho Meeting

**Custom Action 6: WAIT**  
 - purpose: Wait a set number of seconds for something on screen (e.g., a loading bar).  
 - format: WAIT  
 - example usage: WAIT

**Custom Action 7: LONG\_CLICK**  
 - purpose: Long click at the specified position.  
 - format: LONG\_CLICK <point>[[x-axis, y-axis]]</point>  
 - example usage: LONG\_CLICK <point>[[101, 872]]</point>

In most cases, task instructions are high-level and abstract. Carefully read the instruction and action history, then perform reasoning to determine the most appropriate next action. Ensure you strictly generate two sections: Thought and Action.  
 Thought: Clearly outline your reasoning process for current step.  
 Action: Specify the actual actions you will take based on your reasoning. You should follow action format above when generating.

And your final goal, previous actions and associated screenshot are as follows:

Final goal: {finalGoal}  
 Previous actions: {previousActions}  
 \_\_LOW\_LEVEL\_PLACEHOLDER\_\_  
 Screenshot: <image>

**# Instructions for Determining the Next Action**  
 - Carefully analyze the final goal, previous actions, and the current screenshot.  
 - Identify the most suitable action based on the context and the goal.  
 - Make sure the action you suggest aligns with the desired outcome, considering the previous steps.

Fig. 13. Prompt template for OS-Atlas.

## Prompt Template for AgentCPM-GUI

```

# Role
你是一名熟悉安卓系统触屏GUI操作的智能体，将根据用户的问题，分析当前界面的GUI元素和布局，生成相应的操作。
# Task
针对用户问题，根据输入的当前屏幕截图，输出下一步的操作。
# Rule
- 以紧凑JSON格式输出
- 输出操作必须遵循Schema约束
# Schema
{
  "type": "object",
  "description": "执行操作并决定当前任务状态",
  "additionalProperties": false,
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "type": "string",
      "description": "智能体的思维过程"
    },
    "POINT": {
      "$ref": "#/$defs/Location",
      "description": "点击屏幕上的指定位置"
    },
    "to": {
      "description": "移动，组合手势参数",
      "oneOf": [
        {
          "enum": [
            "up",
            "down",
            "left",
            "right"
          ],
          "description": "从当前点（POINT）出发，执行滑动手势操作，方向包括向上、向下、向左、向右"
        },
        {
          "$ref": "#/$defs/Location",
          "description": "移动到某个位置"
        }
      ]
    },
    "duration": {
      "type": "integer",
      "description": "动作执行的时间或等待时间，毫秒",
      "minimum": 0,
      "default": 200
    },
    "PRESS": {
      "type": "string",
      "description": "触发特殊按键，HOME为回到主页按钮，BACK为返回按钮，ENTER为回车按钮",
      "enum": [
        "HOME",
        "BACK",
        "ENTER"
      ]
    },
    "TYPE": {
      "type": "string",
      "description": "输入文本"
    },
    "STATUS": {
      "type": "string",
      "description": "当前任务的状态。特殊情况：satisfied, 无需操作；impossible, 任务无法完成；interrupt, 任务中断；need_feedback, 需要用户反馈；",
      "enum": [
        "continue",
        "finish",
        "satisfied",
        "impossible",
        "interrupt",
        "need_feedback"
      ],
      "default": "continue"
    }
  },
  "$defs": {
    "Location": {
      "type": "array",
      "description": "坐标为相对于屏幕左上角位原点的相对位置，并且按照宽高比例缩放到0~1000，数组第一个元素为横坐标x，第二个元素为纵坐标y",
      "items": {
        "type": "integer",
        "minimum": 0,
        "maximum": 1000
      },
      "minItems": 2,
      "maxItems": 2
    }
  }
}
<Question>{instruction}</Question>

```

Fig. 14. Prompt template for AgentCPM-GUI.