

χ-Bench: Can AI Agents Automate End-to-End, Long-Horizon, Policy-Rich Healthcare Workflows?

Haolin Chen¹, Deon Metelski¹, Leon Qi¹, Tao Xia¹, Joonyul Lee¹, Steve Brown¹, Kevin Riley¹, Frank Wang¹, T. Y. Alvin Liu, MD², Hank Capps, MD³, Zeyu Tang⁴, Xiangchen Song⁵, Lingjing Kong⁵, Fan Feng⁶, Tianyi Zeng⁷, Zhiwei Liu⁸, Zixian Ma⁹, Hang Jiang¹⁰, Fangli Geng¹¹, Yuan Yuan¹², Chenyu You¹³, Qingsong Wen¹⁴, Hua Wei¹⁵, Yanjie Fu¹⁵, Yue Zhao¹⁶, Carl Yang¹⁷, Biwei Huang⁶, Kun Zhang^{5,19}, Caiming Xiong¹⁸, Sanmi Koyejo⁴, Eric P. Xing^{19,5}, Philip S. Yu²⁰, Weiran Yao¹

¹actAVA.ai, ²Johns Hopkins Medicine, ³Wellstar Health System, ⁴Stanford University, ⁵CMU, ⁶UCSD, ⁷Yale School of Medicine, ⁸Salesforce AI Research, ⁹University of Washington, ¹⁰Northeastern University, ¹¹Brown University, ¹²Boston College, ¹³Stony Brook University, ¹⁴University of Oxford, ¹⁵Arizona State University, ¹⁶University of Southern California, ¹⁷Emory University, ¹⁸Recursive Superintelligence, ¹⁹MBZUAI, ²⁰University of Illinois at Chicago







Figure 1: χ-Bench: Clinical Healthcare In-Situ Environment and Evaluation Benchmark.

Abstract

End-to-end automation of realistic healthcare operations stresses three capabilities underrepresented in current benchmarks: *policy density*, decisions must be grounded in a large library of medical, insurance, and operational rules; *multi-role composition*, a single task requires the agent to play multiple roles with handoffs; and *multilateral interaction*: intermediate workflow steps are multi-turn dialogs, such as peer-to-peer review and patient outreach. We introduce χ-Bench, a benchmark of long-horizon healthcare workflows across three domains: provider prior authorization, payer utilization management, and care management. Each task hands the agent a clinical case in a high-fidelity simulator of 20 healthcare apps exposed via 87 MCP tools, which it must drive to a terminal status through tool calls and writing the role’s artifacts, guided by a 1,279-document *managed-care*

operations handbook skill. Across 30 agent harness/model configurations, the best agent resolves only **28.0%** of tasks, no agent clears **20%** on strict pass^{^3}, and executing all tasks in a single session slumps the performance to **3.8%**. These results raise the hypothesis that similar gaps are likely to surface in other policy-dense, role-composed, irreversible enterprise domains.

 actava.ai/benchmarks  actava-ai/chi-bench  actava/chi-bench

1 Introduction

The U.S. healthcare system is an administrative nightmare [11, 42]. *Prior authorization (PA)*, where providers (e.g., hospitals) prepare clinical documents for payers (e.g., insurers) review to justify a service or medication, is one of the most common yet inefficient workflows [1, 43, 45]. *Care management (CM)*, a long-term patient-assisting program, follows a similar arc [10, 23, 25]: referrals queue for weeks, staff spend hours outreaching patients, and coordination across roles buries nurses in work they didn't sign up for. These are *long-horizon, policy-grounded* tasks where every handoff is a chance for things to stall. AI agents are increasingly proposed as a way to assist or partially automate such work. Already, frontier agents now sustain hundreds of tool calls over hours of execution, automating long-horizon tasks that were out of reach a year ago.

However, end-to-end automation of *realistic healthcare workflows* tells a different story, posing three underexplored challenges that possibility warrants rigorous stress-testing:



Figure 2: Illustration of the three challenges: policy retrieval, multi-role composition (intake clerk → nurse → MD reviewer → peer-to-peer coordinator), and clinician outreach, all occurring in a single utilization management task. More examples can be found at: <https://actava.ai/benchmarks>.

1) Policy density. Every agent decision must be grounded in policy, e.g., medical guidelines, insurance rules, operational procedures that vary across providers and payers and shifts over time. Agents must navigate a large policy library, interpret conditions correctly, and adhere to them across long tool-call chains. **2) Multi-role composition.** An end-to-end workflow is divided among roles such as clinician, coordinator, UM nurse, medical director, and RN care manager. An agent must possess all of their domain knowledge, switch context and goals as the case moves. Handoffs are terminal: once a step is submitted or routed, it cannot be edited or re-run. **3) Multilateral interactions.** Some steps are not tool calls but multi-turn conversations, such as payer-provider peer-to-peer review, requests for information, or care manager outreach to patients. Agents must shift from background execution to live dialog, collect information incrementally from humans, and carry results back to workflow.

These challenges are not edge cases; they are the daily reality of managed-care operations, where the bulk of work centers on prior authorization, utilization management review, and care management.

Inspired by these, we introduce χ -Bench, a benchmark that evaluates frontier agents in these three realistic, end-to-end healthcare workflow settings. As shown in Figure 1, each task hands the agent a case (a provider PA, a payer UM review, or an RN care management) in a high-fidelity simulator of 20 healthcare apps exposed via MCP. The agent must drive the case to a terminal status by issuing tool calls and writing the role’s artifacts (submission packets, review notes, letters, care plans), guided by a *managed-care operations handbook* skill (1,279 markdowns) of workflows, platform usage, and medical/insurance policy. The resulting world state, artifacts and event trail are scored *in-situ* by a composite verifier that combines deterministic checks with rubric-based LLM judge.




Figure 3: pass@1 across the three χ -Bench environments of frontier proprietary LLMs with their first-party agent harness. Error bars are task-level percentile bootstrap 95% confidence intervals.

We evaluated 30 agent harness/model configurations spanning major frontier models and strong agent stacks. As shown in Figure 3, χ -Bench is far from solved. The best configuration, **Claude Code+Claude Opus 4.6**, resolves only **28.0%** of tasks at pass@1; no agent clears **20%** under the strict pass³ reliability metric; and the marathon run, where agents execute all tasks in a single session, drops to **3.8%**, and the end-to-end provider–payer arena collapses the best prior auth agents to **0%**. These results suggest that the long-horizon capabilities frontier agents demonstrate on coding-style benchmarks do not generalize well to realistic healthcare workflows, and we expect similar gaps in other policy-dense, role-composed, irreversible enterprise domains beyond.




Figure 4: Comparing strengths and weaknesses of Codex GPT-5.5 and Claude Code Opus 4.6 across PA, UM, and CM domains. Higher bars = more trials failing that check.

2 Related Work

Healthcare AI Benchmarks. Prior healthcare benchmarks evaluate one of: factual medical knowledge [20, 21, 40, 51, 56, 62], broad clinical LLM proficiency [5, 7], EHR querying [26, 29, 48, 52, 53],

Table 1: Coverage matrix of nine evaluation axes across 29 healthcare and long-horizon agent benchmarks, characterizing the task surface each one targets; per-axis definitions and per-benchmark cell-by-cell justifications are in Appendix . ✓= supported, ○= partially supported, ✗= not supported.

Benchmark	Healthcare	API Tools	Long-horiz.	Policy Density	Multi-role Comp.	Multilateral	Hidden state	In-Situ	LLM judge
MedQA [20]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
MedMCQA [40]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
PubMedQA [21]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
BioASQ [51]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
MIRAGE [56]	✓	○	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
MedCalc-Bench [26]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
EHRSQL [29]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
BioCoder [48]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	○	✗
BioDSBench [52]	✓	✓	○	✗	✗	✗	✗	○	✗
EHRSHOT [53]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
MedHELM [7]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
MedXpertQA [62]	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
HealthBench [5]	✓	○	○	✗	✗	○	✗	✗	✓
MedAgentsBench [49]	✓	○	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
AgentClinic [44]	✓	○	○	✗	○	✓	✓	✗	○
MedChain [32]	✓	✓	○	✗	✗	○	✓	✗	○
MedAgentBench [18]	✓	✓	○	✗	✗	✗	✗	○	✗
MedAgentGym [58]	✓	✓	○	✗	✗	✗	○	○	✓
HealthAdminBench [8]	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✗	✓	✓
SWE-Bench [19]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	○	✗
WebArena [61]	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	○	✗
OSWorld [55]	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
WorkArena [13]	✗	✗	✓	○	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
AppWorld [50]	✗	✓	✓	○	○	○	○	✓	✗
Terminal-Bench [33]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Toolathon [30]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
SkillsBench [31]	○	✓	✓	○	○	✗	✗	✓	✗
τ/τ^2 -Bench [6, 59]	✗	✓	✓	○	○	✓	✓	✓	✗
TheAgentCompany [57]	✗	○	✓	○	○	✓	○	✓	○
χ-Bench (ours)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

short-horizon clinical agents [18, 32, 44, 58], or narrower administrative interactions [8, 18]. χ -Bench is the first to combine, in a single task, long-horizon tool calls, explicit dense policy retrieval, irreversible workflow state, hidden multilateral interaction, and in-situ verification against persisted simulator state. HealthAdminBench [8], the closest peer, focuses on GUI interaction over payer portal via pixel/DOM browsings; while χ -Bench instead exposes apps via structured MCP tools and a large explicit policy handbook skill. We also add the care management domain with patient outreach.

Long-Horizon Agent Benchmarks. General-purpose benchmarks cover GUI control [13, 55, 61], long-horizon code [19, 33], and broad tool-use [30, 31, 50], but rarely model multi-actor workflows. τ/τ^2 -Bench [59] and TheAgentCompany [57] are closest in interaction structure, pairing agents with simulated stakeholders under policy constraints; neither targets healthcare or the long-horizon, policy-dense, information asymmetry that defines prior authorization.

See cell-by-cell details of Table 1 in Appendix .

3 χ -Bench: High-Fidelity Healthcare Environment and Benchmark

χ -Bench evaluates AI agents on clinical healthcare workflows in-situ (χ), automating prior-authorization (PA), utilization-management (UM), and care-management (CM) tasks for U.S. providers and payers. It spans three long-horizon domains, each requiring grounded navigation of a large policy library: **(1) Provider PA submission**—verify coverage, gather evidence, submit the packet, and work the response (RFIs, peer-to-peers, appeals) to terminal status; **(2) Payer UM review**—intake the request, check plan policy, escalate through nurse and physician reviewers, and issue a determination; **(3) RN care management**—review the chart, contact the patient, administer assessments, and author a care plan.

3.1 χ -World Engine: Simulated Worlds for Clinical Healthcare In-Situ Workflows

Healthcare workflows involve four stakeholders: *patients*, *clinicians (provider)*, *payers*, and *care management* entities, and a faithful benchmark must represent each and their interactions. χ -**World Engine** (Figure 5) is a local, high-fidelity simulator of 20 day-to-day healthcare apps, operable via 151 REST APIs and 87 MCP tools across 3 MCP servers, populated with \sim 5,000 chart activities for 50 simulated patients and \sim 90 healthcare workers. Agents operate the apps autonomously through MCP servers, the local database, and the file system.




Figure 5: χ -World Engine: Simulated Worlds for Clinical Healthcare In-Situ Workflows.

3.1.1 Realistic Healthcare Software Environments

We implement the apps¹ across three domains: *provider PA*, *payer UM*, and *care management*. Built in $\sim 115\text{K}$ lines of Python, the simulator captures features absent from general-purpose benchmarks: case state machines with 29 statuses and explicit legal transitions; reviewer-independence constraints across nurse, medical-director, and peer-to-peer review; channel-specific submission semantics; and document authorship, signing, and FHIR-grade encounter linkage. Actions trigger consistent cross-app effects atomically: a provider-side submission spawns a payer intake record, advances the event log, and may produce routing assignments, pend notifications, and outbound letters.




Figure 6: Healthcare apps across three task domains. (a) *Payer – Utilization Management* (10 apps); shown: nurse clinical review. (b) *Provider – Prior Authorization* (5 apps); shown: service-request step. (c) *Population Healthcare – Care Management* (5 apps); shown: patient outreach.

We expose 87 of the 151 backend APIs as MCP tools, manually selected to mirror UI operations available to human users. See appendix for the MCP server and tool details.

3.1.2 Encoding Healthcare Workflows with Managed-Care Operations Handbook Skill

We complement MCP servers with *Agent Skills* [22, 60] to teach agents the specialized healthcare workflows. To simulate realistically how a healthcare worker handles a case, skills must encode the entire operation workflows, external software usage patterns, and the medical and insurance policies that govern each decision (e.g., payer medical-policy criteria, insurance coverage and eligibility, etc.).

In this paper, we propose a core skill, the *Managed-Care Operations Handbook* with **1,279** markdown documents in a skill/sub-skill structure, developed with clinicians and operations leaders at Johns Hopkins Medicine to ensure clinical fidelity and alignment with real-world workflows. We treat skill authoring as writing the onboarding guide for a new hire. As shown in Figure 7, we organize the skill as a wiki manual, where a top-level skill routes the agent to one of three role sub-skills (PA specialist, UM reviewer, care manager), each opening with a workflow chapter before diving into role-specific

¹Using FastAPI, SQLite, SQLAlchemy, and MCP over streamable HTTP.





Figure 7: *Managed-Care Operations Handbook Skill* is organized as a progressive-disclosure manual. The top-level `SKILL.md` acts as a table of contents that routes the agent to one of three role sub-skills (`provider-pa`, `payer-um`, `care-manager`); the two shared `medical-library` (clinical lookup) and `platform` (role-specific tutorials) are reachable from any sub-skill via the dashed access bus.

chapters and templates. Two appendices: a *medical library* of policies, drug criteria, and guidelines curated and validated with subject-matter experts, and *platform tutorials* on how to use MCP for specialized workflows. To our knowledge, although skill context can be in theory unbounded, the largest skills published to date are a handful of files; this is the *first time* agent with skills have been evaluated at the scale of a real healthcare operational workflow library. The handbook details, and provenance and licensing information are in Appendix .

3.2 The χ -Bench Construction

3.2.1 Task Definition

A χ -Bench task is a quadruple: instructions, the containerized χ -World environment, role-scoped tool surfaces, and a two-layer verifier—formalized as a hierarchical POMDP [24] $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{O}, P, Z, R, \rho_0; \mathcal{H})$, where the latent state \mathcal{S} spans patient charts, payer/provider records, workflow status, communications, artifacts, and event history; \mathcal{A} comprises role-scoped MCP and default-agent tool actions; \mathcal{O} comprises the role-scoped observations returned through MCP outputs, messages, policy passages, and shared-workspace files; P and Z are the transition and observation kernels induced by the environment and its tools; R is the verifier-induced reward; and ρ_0 is the distribution over initial task states. The hierarchy $\mathcal{H} := (\mathcal{G}, \nu, \mathcal{W})$ uses role-agent specifications $\mathcal{G} := \{(G_i, u_i, \mathcal{K}_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, where G_i is a role agent, u_i its instruction, and \mathcal{K}_i its available skill set; ν defines the handoff order and \mathcal{W} the shared workspace. Each \mathcal{K}_i is a set of options [47], i.e. temporally extended procedures (e.g., *nurse criterion review*: policy retrieval \rightarrow chart read \rightarrow structured-payload write). Instructions specify role, case, workspace, and rules; procedural detail must be recovered from the handbook. Handoffs are irreversible: outgoing commits to \mathcal{W} become incoming input, and the accumulating state and event log calculate reward (Section 3.2.3).



(a) Instruction the agent reads at task entry.

(b) The per-stage ground-truth bundle.

Figure 8: Example of a Payer UM task for hereditary breast-cancer genomic sequencing.

3.2.2 Task Construction and Composition

Each task annotation consists of sampling an initial state $s_0 \sim \rho_0$, a role assignment over \mathcal{G} , and a ground-truth trajectory clicked through the χ -World UI.

Step 1 – Case generation. The pipeline first samples a terminal world state of a case, then uses Claude Opus 4.7 + structured JSON sampling, conditioned on the relevant system state graph and the matching section of the *Managed-Care Operations Handbook* to emit the upstream artifacts, including chart specifications, submission packets or personas, and per-stage rubric prompts, each of which is anchored to an explicit policy or state graph citation. **Step 2 – Human walkthrough.** An annotator works on each case candidate end-to-end on the live X-World UI with the handbook. The recorded trajectories, db states, workspace commits, and role handoffs become the ground truth. **Step 3 – Multi-reviewer review.** Each trajectory is reviewed by at least 1 practicing healthcare worker and 5 authors for clinical precision, and must clear a residual-PHI scan and a clinical-realism check before admission. The detailed human validation protocols are described in Appendix .

The annotation pipeline has produced 523 tasks, each assigned a difficulty band from tool-call length, decision-tree depth. Candidates are retained only when every expected action resolves to a cited policy section, and the chart and rubric mutually entail without leaking the chosen path. We filter down to 75 representative, long-horizon tasks for quality and diversity, where the human on average needs 21 steps, and at most 40 steps to finish. The task categories are depicted in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Task breakdown. Inner: Domain; Middle: PA/UM terminal state, CM patient persona; Outer: clinical/service category.

3.2.3 Reward

The verifier (Figure 10) scores each trial off the record the simulator itself persisted: world store, event log, and multi-turn transcripts, combining a **deterministic contract** with a **rubric LLM judge** into a binary reward $R = \text{DeterministicPass} \wedge \text{JudgePass}$, with a fractional scorecard for diagnostics.




Figure 10: **Verification pipeline.** Each trial emits a persisted record to *deterministic contract* verifier and *rubric-based LLM judge* under strict-majority vote. A trial passes only when both layers pass.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experiment Setup

We evaluate 30 agent harness/model configurations across two stacks: a *proprietary stack* pairing each frontier lab’s first-party CLI (*Claude Code* [3], *OpenAI Codex* [37], *Gemini CLI* [15]) with that lab’s closed-weight models [4, 16, 38], plus an *open-source stack* sweeping four agent frameworks (*OpenClaw* [39], *Hermes* [35], *OpenAI Agents SDK* [36] (*OAI Agents*), and *DeepAgents* [28]) over five OpenRouter-served open-weight models [12, 14, 27, 41, 54], plus an additional OpenClaw + Claude Opus 4.7 reference cell. For each task we run 3 independent trials and report pass@1 [9], pass@3, and pass^3 [59]. The evaluation protocol is shown in Figure 10. Detail configurations like sandbox, judge, and runtime are deferred to Appendix .

4.2 X-Bench Results

Table 2 summarizes benchmark performance across agent harnesses and frontier models.

Table 2: X-Bench results across agent harnesses and frontier models. Per-column maxima are bolded. The three **Overall** columns show task-level bootstrap 95% CIs in $value_{-lo}^{+hi}$ form; per-domain pass cells show mean only and the two *Efficiency* columns are averaged over all 225 trials per row.

Agent Harness	Model	Overall			Prior Authorization			Utilization Management			Care Management			Efficiency	
		pass@1	pass@3	pass^3	pass@1	pass@3	pass^3	pass@1	pass@3	pass^3	pass@1	pass@3	pass^3	Steps	Cost (\$)
Codex	GPT-5.5	20.9 ^{+8.4}	30.7 ^{+10.7}	9.3 ^{+8.0}	29.3	40.0	16.0	32.0	48.0	12.0	1.3	4.0	0.0	54	\$1.29
Codex	GPT-5.4	16.0 ^{+7.1}	25.3 ^{+9.3}	8.0 ^{+5.7}	24.0	32.0	16.0	17.3	24.0	8.0	6.7	20.0	0.0	58	\$1.30
Codex	GPT-5.4 Mini	8.4 ^{+4.4}	20.0 ^{+10.7}	0.0 ^{+0.0}	10.7	24.0	0.0	13.3	32.0	0.0	1.3	4.0	0.0	58	\$0.27
Claude Code	Claude Opus 4.7	24.4 ^{+8.4}	41.3 ^{+10.7}	10.7 ^{+8.0}	24.0	32.0	16.0	17.3	28.0	8.0	32.0	64.0	8.0	68	\$9.91
Claude Code	Claude Opus 4.6	28.0 ^{+8.9}	38.7 ^{+10.7}	18.7 ^{+9.3}	18.7	24.0	12.0	41.3	44.0	40.0	24.0	48.0	4.0	76	\$6.47
Claude Code	Claude Sonnet 4.6	26.2 ^{+7.6}	41.3 ^{+10.7}	12.0 ^{+8.0}	24.0	28.0	20.0	34.7	52.0	16.0	20.0	44.0	0.0	82	\$1.30
Claude Code	Claude Haiku 4.5	6.2 ^{+5.3}	10.7 ^{+8.0}	2.7 ^{+4.0}	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.7	24.0	8.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	41	\$0.16
Gemini CLI	Gemini 3.1 Pro	7.1 ^{+4.9}	13.3 ^{+8.0}	1.3 ^{+2.7}	14.7	24.0	4.0	6.7	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	82	\$2.11
Gemini CLI	Gemini 3 Flash	12.4 ^{+7.1}	17.3 ^{+8.0}	8.0 ^{+5.3}	18.7	28.0	8.0	18.7	24.0	16.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	142	\$0.33
OpenClaw	Claude Opus 4.7	17.3 ^{+6.2}	37.3 ^{+10.7}	4.0 ^{+5.3}	18.7	28.0	8.0	13.3	32.0	4.0	20.0	52.0	0.0	41	\$11.48
OpenClaw	Kimi K2.6	10.2 ^{+5.8}	18.7 ^{+10.7}	2.7 ^{+4.0}	12.0	20.0	4.0	18.7	36.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	72	\$0.91
OpenClaw	DeepSeek V4 Pro	11.1 ^{+6.9}	24.0 ^{+10.7}	1.3 ^{+2.7}	14.7	28.0	4.0	12.0	28.0	0.0	6.7	16.0	0.0	42	\$0.53
OpenClaw	GLM-5.1	16.9 ^{+7.1}	30.7 ^{+10.7}	6.7 ^{+5.7}	13.3	24.0	4.0	26.7	36.0	16.0	10.7	32.0	0.0	116	\$0.96
OpenClaw	Qwen 3.6 Max	4.9 ^{+4.0}	10.7 ^{+8.0}	0.0 ^{+0.0}	10.7	24.0	0.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	79	\$2.80
OpenClaw	Grok 4.3	0.4 ^{+0.9}	1.3 ^{+2.7}	0.0 ^{+0.0}	1.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65	\$2.66
OAI Agents	Kimi K2.6	15.1 ^{+7.1}	22.7 ^{+9.3}	8.0 ^{+5.3}	17.3	28.0	12.0	25.3	36.0	12.0	2.7	4.0	0.0	60	\$0.43
OAI Agents	DeepSeek V4 Pro	14.2 ^{+7.1}	22.7 ^{+9.3}	9.3 ^{+5.3}	10.7	16.0	8.0	28.0	40.0	20.0	4.0	12.0	0.0	52	\$0.25
OAI Agents	GLM-5.1	18.7 ^{+8.4}	26.7 ^{+10.7}	12.0 ^{+8.0}	18.7	24.0	12.0	33.3	44.0	24.0	4.0	12.0	0.0	58	\$0.27
OAI Agents	Qwen 3.6 Max	15.6 ^{+8.0}	22.7 ^{+9.3}	9.3 ^{+5.7}	16.0	20.0	12.0	26.7	36.0	16.0	4.0	12.0	0.0	48	\$0.58
OAI Agents	Grok 4.3	5.8 ^{+4.4}	10.7 ^{+8.0}	1.3 ^{+2.7}	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	28.0	4.0	1.3	4.0	0.0	32	\$1.54
Hermes	Kimi K2.6	15.6 ^{+7.6}	24.0 ^{+10.7}	6.7 ^{+5.7}	18.7	24.0	12.0	21.3	36.0	8.0	6.7	12.0	0.0	31	\$1.07
Hermes	DeepSeek V4 Pro	13.8 ^{+7.1}	22.7 ^{+9.3}	8.0 ^{+5.3}	8.0	16.0	4.0	25.3	32.0	20.0	8.0	20.0	0.0	26	\$2.19
Hermes	GLM-5.1	18.7 ^{+8.0}	28.0 ^{+10.7}	10.7 ^{+8.0}	10.7	16.0	8.0	34.7	44.0	24.0	10.7	24.0	0.0	30	\$1.04
Hermes	Qwen 3.6 Max	16.4 ^{+6.7}	28.0 ^{+10.7}	5.3 ^{+5.3}	9.3	16.0	4.0	26.7	36.0	12.0	13.3	32.0	0.0	29	\$4.12
Hermes	Grok 4.3	4.4 ^{+4.4}	8.0 ^{+5.7}	1.3 ^{+2.7}	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.3	24.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32	\$1.05
DeepAgents	Kimi K2.6	3.1 ^{+5.1}	8.0 ^{+5.7}	0.0 ^{+0.0}	8.0	20.0	0.0	1.3	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	39	\$0.55
DeepAgents	DeepSeek V4 Pro	10.7 ^{+6.2}	18.7 ^{+10.7}	2.7 ^{+4.0}	14.7	24.0	4.0	10.7	20.0	4.0	6.7	12.0	0.0	15	\$0.21
DeepAgents	GLM-5.1	11.1 ^{+5.8}	17.3 ^{+8.0}	5.3 ^{+5.3}	17.3	24.0	12.0	10.7	16.0	4.0	5.3	12.0	0.0	21	\$0.26
DeepAgents	Qwen 3.6 Max	9.3 ^{+5.8}	16.0 ^{+9.3}	4.0 ^{+5.3}	12.0	16.0	8.0	10.7	16.0	4.0	5.3	16.0	0.0	18	\$0.57
DeepAgents	Grok 4.3	2.2 ^{+2.7}	5.3 ^{+5.3}	0.0 ^{+0.0}	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	12.0	0.0	1.3	4.0	0.0	21	\$1.43




Figure 11: (a) Each marker is one row of Table 2: x = mean per-trial cost in USD (log scale), y = Overall pass@1. Dashed cross-hairs at the median cost and median pass@1 split the plane into four quadrants (*Sweet Spot*, *Premium*, *Budget*, *Overpriced*); the Pareto-optimal frontier is connected with a dark line. (b) pass@ k (dotted) and pass k (solid) for $k \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ pooled across all 75 tasks.

Performance, Reliability and ROI. Claude Code paired with Claude Opus 4.6 tops Overall pass@1 at 28.0%, with Sonnet 4.6 (26.2%), Opus 4.7 (24.4%), and Codex + GPT-5.5 (20.9%) close behind; the best domain-level rows are split across Opus 4.6 for UM (41.3%), Opus 4.7 for CM (32.0%), and Codex + GPT-5.5 for PA (29.3%). Reliability further collapses on repeat trials (Figure 11b): pass 3 sits well below pass@1 for the main cells (Opus 4.6 28.0 \rightarrow 18.7, GPT-5.5 20.9 \rightarrow 9.3, OAI Agents + GLM-5.1 18.7 \rightarrow 12.0, Hermes + Grok 4.3 4.4 \rightarrow 1.3), exposing run-to-run inconsistency that any production deployment would need to close.

The ROI quadrants in Figure 11a separate absolute capability from cost-normalized value: high-performing configurations (e.g. Claude Code + Opus 4.6) sit in *Premium*, while OAI Agents + GLM-5.1 stands out as a strong cost-normalized point, anchoring the *Sweet Spot* and the low-cost end of the Pareto frontier. The *Overpriced* quadrant collects all Grok 4.3 cells, OpenClaw + Qwen 3.6 Max, and Gemini 3.1 Pro + Gemini CLI; the *Budget* quadrant contains low-cost rows whose savings come with below-median completion rates.

4.3 χ -Bench-Arena: Can Prior Authorization Workflows be Automated End-to-End?

The arena runs a provider agent and a payer agent, both running Codex + GPT-5.5 (our best PA configuration) as a two-player game end-to-end on 23 PA tasks.² Each holds its own role-scoped MCPs and state, and they exchange information only through MCP tools. Each side is scored independently; a trial passes only when every check on both sides passes. Pass@1 collapses from 30.4% to 0% once the payer agent and cross-role checks join: 2 tasks did not get submitted; 18 did not finish MD decision, and 5 failed the final judge. P2P tasks fail in both sides: 0 P2P request on 5 P2P-required tasks appears and 2 spontaneous P2Ps happen.

Configuration	pass@1
PA provider-only (23 tasks)	30.4
E2E two-agent	0.0

Table 3: E2E two-agent PA vs. same-tasks single-agent baseline.

4.4 χ -Bench-Marathon: Can Long-Running Agents Stay on Track Across All 25 Tasks?

χ -Bench-Marathon stress-tests long-horizon capabilities by loading all 25 tasks of a domain into a shared χ -World. The agent is instructed to finish all tasks, lists them via MCP tools and attempts in any order, in one agent run. Context compaction follows the harness’s default setting. Each case is scored individually after the agent reports completion. We evaluate Claude Code + Opus 4.7 and Codex + GPT-5.5. Pass@1 slumps for both configurations regardless of baseline (Table 4). On PA, neither agent submits a single authorization across any of the 25 queued cases, despite touching most cases via write-side tool calls. On UM and CM, agents reach a finalized determination or care plan on only 3-8 of 25 cases per session. Codex + GPT-5.5 reaches its context window and auto-compacts 4-6 times per PA session and 1-2 times on UM; Claude Code + Opus 4.7, with a 1M-token context, never compacts yet completes a similar number of cases. However both agents fan out across the queue, save partial work, and fail to drive most cases to a terminal action.

Table 4: χ -Bench-Marathon pass@1 vs. the per-task baseline. Marathon = all 25 tasks queued in a single agent session, pass@1 averaged over 3 independent sessions; Per-task = isolated single-task trials from Table 2. Δ = Marathon – Per-task (percentage points).

Agent Harness	Model	🏠 Prior Authorization			🏠 Utilization Management			🏠 Care Management		
		Marathon	Per-task	Δ	Marathon	Per-task	Δ	Marathon	Per-task	Δ
🏠 Codex	🏠 GPT-5.5	8.0	29.3	-21.3	2.7	32.0	-29.3	0.0	1.3	-1.3
🏠 Claude Code	🏠 Claude Opus 4.7	8.0	24.0	-16.0	1.3	17.3	-16.0	2.7	32.0	-29.3

4.5 Effects of Handbook Skills Components

We trimmed the 1,279-document *Managed-Care Operations Handbook Skill* three ways (*-Domain* drops the domain handbook, *-Medical* drops the medical library, *-Both* drops both), ran all tasks with Codex + GPT-5.5, and found that the handbook’s effect is domain-dependent (Figure 12). **UM is handbook-bound:** *-Domain* collapses pass@1 from 32.0 to 17.3, while *-Medical* barely moves it. **PA inverts:** *-Both* modestly beats the other two trimming settings because, with one handbook present, the agent enters an exhaustive verification mode and refuses to submit when uncertain; with no handbook, it commits and the verifier accepts the packet. **CM stays near the**




Figure 12: Pass@1 under trimmed skills.

²Two tasks not applicable to the two-agent setting are excluded.

floor regardless: the complexity is conversation driving, not policy. The finding is that large skills can help policy-heavy reviews, but can also induce over-verification, refusal, or cognitive overload.

4.6 MCP vs. CLI for Healthcare Agent Workflows

As an exploratory probe, we re-surface every MCP tool as a CLI bash command via MCPorter [46] and re-run Codex + GPT-5.5, on the 75-task suite with 3 trials per task. Table 5 shows a small PA regression, a clear UM drop, and a small CM gain. On this configuration, MCPorter-style CLI re-surfacing is neutral-to-worse rather than uniformly beneficial. We hypothesize that the effect of tool surface format is neutral for OOD tasks like healthcare workflows.

Domain	MCP	CLI	Δ
PA	29.3	28.0	-1.3
UM	32.0	25.3	-6.7
CM	1.3	4.0	+2.7

Table 5: pass@1 of MCP vs. CLI.

4.7 Failure Mode Analysis

We analyze all 5,886 failed trials with the two-layer taxonomy defined in Appendix : first-level categories capture the broad failure source, while second-level modes specify how the failure occurred. Figure 13 reports the first-level distribution, separating non-agent *Harness-Fault* (1.0%) from agent-side failures: *Clinical-Reasoning* (35.4%, medical or protocol judgment errors), *Workflow-Completion* (23.3%, a required terminal action was never invoked), *Abstain-or-Stuck* (15.6%, wall-clock timeouts, looping, premature closes, and explicit refusal to act), *Policy-Compliance* (13.2%, dominantly literal misreading of cited criterion text), *Tool-Use-Error* (10.7%, concentrated in DeepAgents, where a single malformed tool call escalates into a trial-fatal exit), and *Hallucination* (0.8%).




Figure 13: Failure-mode distribution sorted by overall pass@1.

Abstain-or-Stuck concentrates in PA/CM and in DeepAgents + Kimi K2.6 and OpenClaw-based configurations. Nearly half simply exhaust the 1800 s wall-clock cap, and the rest are loops, premature closes, or refusals to act. We therefore read this category as a reliability and termination problem, whereas *Policy-Compliance* captures completed decisions based on misread criteria.

Figure 14 shows that the dominant second-level modes are *criteria misapplication*, where agents see the relevant evidence but make the wrong medical or protocol judgment, *skipped required steps*

(18.7%), and *policy criteria misreading* (13.2%). We distinguish policy criteria misreading from criteria misapplication by the locus of error: the former misreads the rule text itself, while the latter applies the correct rule or evidence to the case incorrectly. A separate CM-specific mode, *illegitimate consent* (337 failures, 5.7%), captures concern-mining: the agent repeatedly reframes and expands care program scopes until an initially refusing member says “yes,” instead of using autonomy-first engagement. Detailed failure-mode definitions, analysis, and case examples are in Appendix .




Figure 14: Second-level failure modes. % is over failed trials; colors show first-level categories.

5 Conclusion

We developed χ -Bench, a high-fidelity benchmark that evaluates agents on long-horizon healthcare operations: prior authorization, utilization management, and care management, grounded in a 1,279-document managed-care operations handbook. The strongest agent (Claude Code + Opus 4.6) resolves only **28.0%** of tasks at pass@1, no agent exceeds **20%** at pass^3. Our analysis attributes most failures to three first-level categories: *Clinical-Reasoning* (35.4%), *Workflow-Completion* (23.3%), and *Policy-Compliance* (13.2%). Second level modes, e.g. *criteria misapplication*, *skipped required steps*, and *policy criteria misreading* show that failures arise from distinct bottlenecks. The CM-specific *illegitimate consent* mode further shows that an agent can advance the workflow while violating autonomy-first engagement, so completion alone is not an adequate safety criterion.

Limitations. χ -Bench evaluates language-only agents; real-world healthcare operations often require multimodal reasoning over imaging and speech. Additionally, while χ -World workflows are high-impact, the healthcare industry encompasses hundreds of long-tail workflows with empirical values. Extending coverage along both axes is our immediate next step. Besides, Opus 4.7 is the only judge model, and the effects of using different judge models are yet to be studied.

Broader Impacts. χ -Bench is intentionally a stress test: 28% pass@1 on a static benchmark might be risky for live patient care. The failures our analysis surfaces translate directly into clinical, financial, and regulatory harm if left unchecked. We release χ -Bench to expose these gaps and to encourage caution before agents are deployed on irreversible workflows where the affected party is a patient.

References

- [1] American Medical Association. 2024 AMA prior authorization physician survey. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Medical Association, Chicago, IL, 2024. URL <https://www.ama-assn.org/system/files/prior-authorization-survey.pdf>.
- [2] Anthropic. Introducing the Model Context Protocol. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/model-context-protocol>, 2024. Accessed: 2026-04-30.

- [3] Anthropic. Claude Code. <https://github.com/anthropics/claude-code>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [4] Anthropic. Claude Opus 4.7 system card. <https://www.anthropic.com/system-cards>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-30. Covers Claude Opus 4.7, Sonnet 4.6, and Haiku 4.5.
- [5] R. K. Arora, J. Wei, R. S. Hicks, P. Bowman, J. Quiñero-Candela, F. Tsimpourlas, M. Sharman, M. Shah, A. Vallone, A. Beutel, J. Heidecke, and K. Singhal. Healthbench: Evaluating large language models towards improved human health, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.08775>.
- [6] V. Barres, H. Dong, S. Ray, X. Si, and K. Narasimhan. τ^2 -bench: Evaluating conversational agents in a dual-control environment, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.07982>.
- [7] S. Bedi, H. Cui, M. Fuentes, A. Unell, M. Wornow, J. M. Banda, N. Kotecha, T. Keyes, Y. Mai, M. Oez, et al. Medhelm: Holistic evaluation of large language models for medical tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23802*, 2025.
- [8] S. Bedi, R. Welch, E. Steinberg, M. Wornow, T. M. Kim, H. Ahmed, P. Sterling, B. Purohit, Q. Akram, A. Acosta, et al. Healthadminbench: Evaluating computer-use agents on healthcare administration tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.09937*, 2026.
- [9] M. Chen, J. Tworek, H. Jun, Q. Yuan, H. P. d. O. Pinto, J. Kaplan, H. Edwards, Y. Burda, N. Joseph, G. Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [10] A. Cuellar, A. H. Krist, L. M. Nichols, and A. J. Kuzel. Facilitators and barriers to care coordination in patient-centered medical homes (PCMHs) from coordinators’ perspectives. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, 31(1):90–101, 2018. doi: 10.3122/jabfm.2018.01.170133. PMC4809054.
- [11] D. Cutler, E. Wikler, and P. Basch. Reducing administrative costs and improving the health care system. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 367(20):1875–1878, 2012. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp1209711.
- [12] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V4 Pro model card. <https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-V4-Pro>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [13] A. Drouin, M. Gasse, M. Caccia, I. H. Laradji, M. D. Verme, T. Marty, L. Boisvert, M. Thakkar, Q. Cappart, D. Vazquez, N. Chapados, and A. Lacoste. WorkArena: How capable are web agents at solving common knowledge work tasks? In *Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07718>.
- [14] GLM-5 Team. GLM-5: From vibe coding to agentic engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.15763*, 2026.
- [15] Google. Gemini CLI. <https://github.com/google-gemini/gemini-cli>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [16] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.1 Pro model card. <https://deepmind.google/models/model-cards/gemini-3-1-pro/>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-30. Covers Gemini 3.1 Pro and Gemini 3 Flash.
- [17] Harbor Framework. Harbor: A framework for agent evaluations and RL environments. <https://github.com/harbor-framework/harbor>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [18] Y. Jiang, K. C. Black, G. Geng, D. Park, J. Zou, A. Y. Ng, and J. H. Chen. Medagentbench: a virtual ehr environment to benchmark medical llm agents. *Nejm Ai*, 2(9):A1dbp2500144, 2025.
- [19] C. E. Jimenez, J. Yang, A. Wettig, S. Yao, K. Pei, O. Press, and K. Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues?, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06770>.

- [20] D. Jin, E. Pan, N. Oufattole, W.-H. Weng, H. Fang, and P. Szolovits. What disease does this patient have? a large-scale open domain question answering dataset from medical exams. *Applied Sciences*, 11(14):6421, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.13081>.
- [21] Q. Jin, B. Dhingra, Z. Liu, W. W. Cohen, and X. Lu. PubMedQA: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2567–2577. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.06146>.
- [22] A. Jones and C. Kelly. Code execution with mcp: Building more efficient agents, 2025.
- [23] H.-H. Ju. Improving care coordination of patients with chronic diseases. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, 18(9):926–929, 2022. doi: 10.1016/j.nurpra.2022.07.005.
- [24] L. P. Kaelbling, M. L. Littman, and A. R. Cassandra. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial intelligence*, 101(1-2):99–134, 1998.
- [25] M. Karam, M.-C. Chouinard, M. Kevork, R. Fleming, and A. Duhoux. Nurses’ and patients’ perspectives on care coordination across health care and social services sectors: A qualitative study. *SAGE Open Nursing*, 2026. doi: 10.1177/08445621251395347.
- [26] N. Khandekar, Q. Jin, G. Xiong, S. Dunn, S. S. Applebaum, Z. Anwar, M. Sarfo-Gyamfi, C. W. Safranek, A. A. Anwar, A. Zhang, A. Gilson, M. B. Singer, A. Dave, A. Taylor, A. Zhang, Q. Chen, and Z. Lu. MedCalc-Bench: Evaluating large language models for medical calculations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37: Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12036>.
- [27] Kimi Team. Kimi K2: Open agentic intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.20534*, 2025.
- [28] LangChain. DeepAgents. <https://github.com/langchain-ai/deepagents>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [29] G. Lee, H. Hwang, S. Bae, Y. Kwon, W. Shin, S. Yang, M. Seo, J.-Y. Kim, and E. Choi. EHRSQL: A practical text-to-SQL benchmark for electronic health records. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.07695>.
- [30] J. Li, W. Zhao, J. Zhao, W. Zeng, H. Wu, X. Wang, R. Ge, Y. Cao, Y. Huang, W. Liu, et al. The tool decathlon: Benchmarking language agents for diverse, realistic, and long-horizon task execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.25726*, 2025.
- [31] X. Li, W. Chen, Y. Liu, S. Zheng, X. Chen, Y. He, Y. Li, B. You, H. Shen, J. Sun, et al. Skillsbench: Benchmarking how well agent skills work across diverse tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12670*, 2026.
- [32] J. Liu, W. Wang, Z. Ma, G. Huang, Y. Su, K.-J. Chang, W. Chen, H. Li, L. Shen, and M. R. Lyu. MedChain: Bridging the gap between LLM agents and clinical practice through interactive sequential benchmarking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.01605>.
- [33] M. A. Merrill, A. G. Shaw, N. Carlini, B. Li, H. Raj, I. Bercovich, L. Shi, J. Y. Shin, T. Walshe, E. K. Buchanan, et al. Terminal-bench: Benchmarking agents on hard, realistic tasks in command line interfaces. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.11868*, 2026.
- [34] Modal Labs. Modal: High-performance serverless infrastructure for AI and data. <https://modal.com>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [35] Nous Research. Hermes Agent: The agent that grows with you. <https://github.com/NousResearch/hermes-agent>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [36] OpenAI. OpenAI Agents SDK (python). <https://github.com/openai/openai-agents-python>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.

- [37] OpenAI. OpenAI Codex CLI. <https://github.com/openai/codex>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [38] OpenAI. GPT-5.5 system card. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-5-5-system-card/>, 2026. Accessed: 2026-04-30. Covers the GPT-5.5, GPT-5.4, and GPT-5.4 Mini family.
- [39] OpenClaw. OpenClaw: Your own personal ai assistant. <https://github.com/openclaw/openclaw>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [40] A. Pal, L. K. Umapathi, and M. Sankarasubbu. MedMCQA: A large-scale multi-subject multi-choice dataset for medical domain question answering. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Health, Inference, and Learning (CHIL)*, volume 174 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 248–260. PMLR, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.14371>.
- [41] Qwen Team. Qwen3 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*, 2025.
- [42] N. R. Sahni, P. Gupta, M. Peterson, and D. M. Cutler. Active steps to reduce administrative spending associated with financial transactions in US health care. *Health Affairs Scholar*, 1(5):qxad053, 2023. doi: 10.1093/haschl/qxad053.
- [43] N. R. Sahni, B. Istvan, and D. M. Cutler. Perceptions of prior authorization burden and solutions. *Health Affairs Scholar*, 2(9):qxae096, 2024. doi: 10.1093/haschl/qxae096.
- [44] S. Schmidgall, R. Ziaei, C. Harris, E. Reis, J. Jopling, and M. Moor. AgentClinic: a multimodal agent benchmark to evaluate AI in simulated clinical environments, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07960>.
- [45] C. A. Sinsky, L. Colligan, L. Li, M. Prgomet, S. Reynolds, L. Goeders, J. Westbrook, M. Tutty, and G. Blike. Allocation of physician time in ambulatory practice: A time and motion study in 4 specialties. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 165(11):753–760, 2016. doi: 10.7326/M16-0961.
- [46] P. Steinberger. MCPorter: TypeScript runtime and CLI for connecting to MCP servers. <https://github.com/steipete/mcporter>, 2025. npm package mcporter; accessed 2026-05-03.
- [47] R. S. Sutton, D. Precup, and S. Singh. Between mdps and semi-mdps: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artificial intelligence*, 112(1-2):181–211, 1999.
- [48] X. Tang, B. Qian, R. Gao, J. Chen, X. Chen, and M. Gerstein. BioCoder: a benchmark for bioinformatics code generation with large language models. *Bioinformatics*, 40(Supplement_1):i266–i276, 2024. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btae230. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.16458>.
- [49] X. Tang, D. Shao, J. Sohn, J. Chen, J. Zhang, J. Xiang, F. Wu, Y. Zhao, C. Wu, W. Shi, A. Cohan, and M. Gerstein. MedAgentsBench: Benchmarking thinking models and agent frameworks for complex medical reasoning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.07459>.
- [50] H. Trivedi, T. Khot, M. Hartmann, R. Manku, V. Dong, E. Li, S. Gupta, A. Sabharwal, and N. Balasubramanian. AppWorld: A controllable world of apps and people for benchmarking interactive coding agents. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.18901>.
- [51] G. Tsatsaronis, G. Balikas, P. Malakasiotis, I. Partalas, M. Zschunke, M. R. Alvers, D. Weisenborn, A. Krithara, S. Petridis, D. Polychronopoulos, Y. Almirantis, J. Pavlopoulos, N. Baskiotis, P. Gallinari, T. Artières, A.-C. N. Ngomo, N. Heino, E. Gaussier, L. Barrio-Alvers, M. Schroeder, I. Androutsopoulos, and G. Paliouras. An overview of the BIOASQ large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 16(1):138, 2015. doi: 10.1186/s12859-015-0564-6. URL <https://bmcbioinformatics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12859-015-0564-6>.
- [52] Z. Wang, B. Danek, Z. Yang, Z. Chen, and J. Sun. Can large language models replace data scientists in biomedical research?, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21591>.

- [53] M. Wornow, R. Thapa, E. Steinberg, J. A. Fries, and N. H. Shah. EHRSHOT: An EHR benchmark for few-shot evaluation of foundation models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.02028>.
- [54] xAI. Grok 4 model card. <https://data.x.ai/2025-08-20-grok-4-model-card.pdf>, 2025. Accessed: 2026-04-30.
- [55] T. Xie, D. Zhang, J. Chen, X. Li, S. Zhao, R. Cao, T. J. Hua, Z. Cheng, D. Shin, F. Lei, Y. Liu, Y. Xu, S. Zhou, S. Savarese, C. Xiong, V. Zhong, and T. Yu. OSWorld: Benchmarking multimodal agents for open-ended tasks in real computer environments. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37: Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07972>.
- [56] G. Xiong, Q. Jin, Z. Lu, and A. Zhang. Benchmarking retrieval-augmented generation for medicine. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.13178>.
- [57] F. F. Xu, Y. Song, B. Li, Y. Tang, K. Jain, M. Bao, Z. Z. Wang, X. Zhou, Z. Guo, M. Cao, M. Yang, H. Y. Lu, A. Martin, Z. Su, L. Maben, R. Mehta, W. Chi, L. Jang, Y. Xie, S. Zhou, and G. Neubig. TheAgentCompany: Benchmarking LLM agents on consequential real world tasks, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.14161>.
- [58] R. Xu, Y. Zhuang, Y. Zhong, Y. Yu, Z. Wang, X. Tang, H. Wu, M. D. Wang, J. C. Ho, Y. Xiao, W. Shi, and C. Yang. MedAgentGym: A scalable agentic training environment for code-centric reasoning in biomedical data science. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.04405>.
- [59] S. Yao, N. Shinn, P. Razavi, and K. Narasimhan. τ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12045*, 2024.
- [60] B. Zhang, K. Lazuka, and M. Murag. Equipping agents for the real world with agent skills. *Anthropic Engineering Blog*, 2025.
- [61] S. Zhou, F. F. Xu, H. Zhu, X. Zhou, R. Lo, A. Sridhar, X. Cheng, T. Ou, Y. Bisk, D. Fried, U. Alon, and G. Neubig. WebArena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13854>.
- [62] Y. Zuo, S. Qu, Y. Li, Z. Chen, X. Zhu, E. Hua, K. Zhang, N. Ding, and B. Zhou. Medxpertqa: Benchmarking expert-level medical reasoning and understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.18362*, 2025.