



From Chatbot to Digital Colleague: The Paradigm Shift Toward Persistent Autonomous AI

Yongheng Zhang*, Ziang Liu*, Jiaxuan Zhu*, Shuai Wang, Xiangqi Chen, Haojing Huang, Jiayi Kuang, Siyu Chen, Ao Shen, Hao Wu, Qiufeng Wang, Qian-Wen Zhang, Junnan Dong, Wenhao Jiang, Ying Shen, Hai-Tao Zheng, Yinghui Li†, Di Yin, Xing Sun, Philip S. Yu


Tencent YouTu Lab Tsinghua University

Sun Yat-sen University Central South University University of Illinois at Chicago

Large Language Models (LLMs) are undergoing a fundamental transformation from conversational generators into integrated AI systems capable of reasoning, action, memory, and self-improvement. We conceptualize this transition as a shift **from Chatbot to Digital Colleague**: from conversational answers to persistent work. We organize this transition along two tightly coupled dimensions. First, at the **cognitive core** level, LLMs are advancing from Chatbot-era “fast thinking” systems driven by next-token prediction toward Thinking LLMs that leverage inference-time computation, Chain-of-Thought reasoning, reflection, process supervision, and reinforcement learning to support more deliberate and reliable cognition. Second, at the **tool-augmented task execution** level, LLMs are progressing from tool-calling Agents that invoke external resources in an ad hoc manner toward OpenClaw-style workstation systems (OpenClaw) equipped with persistent Workspaces, skills, verification loops, and governance. The “**Workspace + Skill**” paradigm makes episodic tool use colleague-like via state persistence, reusable procedures, task closure, and experience reuse. We examine **data construction** shifts from instruction-response pairs to State-Action-Observation trajectories and **evaluation** from static benchmarks to sandboxed, auditable, self-evolving AI ecosystems.

* Equal Contribution. † Corresponding Author.

Project: <https://from-chatbot-to-digital-colleague.github.io>



Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Part I: The Evolution of LLM’s Cognitive Core	6
2.1	The Chatbot Era: Language Generation and Knowledge Compression	7
2.1.1	Scaling-Driven Language Generation and Parametric Knowledge Compression	7
2.1.2	Alignment, Multimodal Expansion, and the Limits of Fast-Response Cognition	12
2.2	The Thinking LLM Era: Reasoning and Reinforcement-Learning-Driven Cognition . .	13
2.2.1	Long Chain-of-Thought and Inference-Time Scaling	13
2.2.2	Reinforcement-Learning-Driven Reasoning and Unified Cognitive Systems . .	15
3	Part II: The Evolution of Tool-Augmented Task Execution	18
3.1	The Agent Era: Environment–Action–Feedback Loops	18
3.1.1	Tool Invocation and Core Agent Capabilities	18
3.1.2	Initial Autonomy: Evaluation and Structural Bottlenecks	23
3.2	The OpenClaw Era: Persistent Workspaces for Task Closure	25
3.2.1	Workspace Intelligence and Skill-Based Task Closure	26
3.2.2	Evaluation, Reliability, and Governance Challenges	28
4	Part III: Why “Workspace + Skill” Is the Key Leap	29
4.1	Workspace as the Execution Substrate for Agentic Work: Stateful Context for Tasks . .	29
4.1.1	From Ephemeral Tool Calls to Persistent State	30
4.1.2	From Answer Generation to Authorized Work Delegation	31
4.2	Skills for Workspace Agents: Reusable Procedures for Repeatable Work	32
4.2.1	From Ad-hoc Prompts to Composable Capability Packages	32
4.2.2	From Skill Libraries to Integrated Digital Workers	33

5	Part IV: Data & Evaluation — Paradigm Shifts Behind the Scenes	35
5.1	Data Paradigm Shift: From “Knowledge Corpus” to “Action Trajectory”	36
5.1.1	Chatbot Era: Human-Annotated Dialogue Data (SFT)	36
5.1.2	Thinking LLM Era: Chain-of-Thought and Process Reward Data (CoT / PRM) .	38
5.1.3	Agent & OpenClaw Era: State–Action–Observation Trajectories	39
5.2	Evaluation Paradigm Shift: From Output Scoring to Task-State Verification	42
5.2.1	Stage I: Final-Output Accuracy and Answer Correctness	44
5.2.2	Stage II: LLM-as-Judge for Long-Chain Reasoning and Process Verification . .	45
5.2.3	Stage III: Agent & OpenClaw Era: Task Closure Rate	46
5.2.4	Stage IV: Workspace/OpenClaw Capability and Safety	47
6	Open Challenges and Future Directions	48
6.1	Open Challenges: Making Autonomy Reliable	48
6.1.1	Long-Horizon Reliability and Task Closure	48
6.1.2	Safety, Governance, and Permission Boundaries	49
6.1.3	Human–AI Collaboration Ethics and Data Boundaries	50
6.1.4	Memory, Context, and Persistent State	50
6.2	Future Directions: Toward Self-Evolving AI Ecosystems	51
6.2.1	From Prompt Engineering to Harness Engineering	52
6.2.2	AI-Native Workspaces as Digital Embodiment	53
6.2.3	Beyond-Gradient Learning and Continual System Maintenance	54
6.2.4	Composable Skill and Multi-Agent Ecosystems	54
6.2.5	Self-Evolving Systems: From Chatbot to Digital Colleague	55
7	Related Work	56
8	Conclusion	57




Figure 1. A roadmap and evolutionary timeline of next-generation LLM systems. The figure summarizes how these AI systems progress from simple conversational chatbots to reasoning cores, tool-using agents, and persistent workspace systems over time. Each node is labeled by its release month. box represents open-source / open platform; box represents closed / commercial system.

1 Introduction

Large Language Models (LLMs) are undergoing a fundamental transformation [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. What began as statistical language generation has expanded into AI systems that can reason, act, remember, and complete tasks in open-ended digital environments [7, 8, 9]. Early progress was driven by scaling autoregressive Transformers and instruction-aligned chat interfaces, enabling systems to compress broad world knowledge into fluent responses [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. More recently, the frontier has shifted toward models that deliberate over difficult problems, invoke tools, interact with environments, and coordinate multi-step workflows [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20]. The central question is therefore *no longer limited to how can a model generate a better answer? Instead*, it is how *can an AI system reliably transform user intent into completed work?* This redefines the human-AI relationship, marking the shift **from Chatbot to Digital Colleague** [21, 22, 23, 24, 25].

This survey organizes and analyzes persistent autonomous AI along two tightly coupled dimensions. ① **The first dimension concerns the cognitive core.** It explores how models generate, understand, and reason, spanning two eras, shown in Figure 1’s Chatbot and Thinking LLM panels. In the *Chatbot Era*, LLMs behave like fast “System-1” generators: they compress parametric knowledge and produce fluent responses, but struggle with deep reasoning, verification, and long-horizon consistency [26, 27, 28, 29]. In the *Thinking LLM Era*, models increasingly leverage inference-time computation, Chain-of-Thought prompting, reflection, process supervision, and reinforcement learning to support slower, more deliberate, and more reliable problem-solving processes [16, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35]. PartI traces the transition to slow, reasoning-centered cognition [36, 37, 38, 39, 40].

② **The second dimension concerns tool-augmented task execution.** This dimension asks how a stronger cognitive core becomes a system that can act in dynamic and complex external environments, and it also contains two eras, as illustrated in the Agent and OpenClaw panels of Figure 1. In the *Agent Era*, LLMs move from passive dialogue systems into active systems that call APIs, browse websites, write code, manipulate files, and collaborate with other agents [4, 5, 7, 17, 18, 19, 20]. Yet, these early agents still remain highly fragile: incorrect action formats, missing observations, failed tool calls, or unrecovered intermediate errors can derail the entire trajectory. In the *OpenClaw Era*, tool use is embedded into persistent workspaces with files, terminals, browsers, logs, permissions, reusable skills, and verification procedures, enabling agents to maintain context, monitor progress, recover from failures, and verify final workspace states [41, 42, 43, 44, 45].

Within this two-dimensional framework, the key thesis of this survey is that **Workspace + Skill** provides the mechanism that turns chatbot-style interaction into durable digital-colleague work [46, 47, 48]. A **Workspace** is a persistent digital environment for AI operations, including files, terminals, browsers, editors, repositories, calendars, documents, databases, and domain-specific applications [46, 48, 49, 50]. A **Skill** is a reusable, parameterizable procedure for completing tasks, including planning, tool sequencing, intermediate checks, error recovery, and validation [32, 33, 51]. Together, they move LLMs beyond episodic responses and atomic tool calls: the workspace provides state, memory, evidence, and consequences, while the skill provides reusable operational knowledge [17, 18, 46, 51].

This perspective reframes data and evaluation paradigms in LLM development. For chatbots, data is often organized as instruction-response pairs and evaluation measures final-answer correctness or human preference. For reasoning models, data includes long-form Chain-of-Thought traces, process supervision, and verifiable rewards, while evaluation expands toward reasoning-process judgment. For agents and workspace-based systems, the fundamental unit of learning becomes the **state-action-observation trajectory**, and evaluation shifts from answer quality to task closure—whether the system reaches the intended final state under reproducible, auditable, and safe conditions [52, 53, 54, 55, 56].

Despite impressive progress, current systems face major structural bottlenecks [49, 50, 57, 58]. Reasoning can remain ungrounded or hallucinated during factual verification [59, 60]; long-horizon execution is brittle as errors accumulate across toolchains[50, 57, 58]; memory and state management often depend on transient context windows[9, 61]; and safety becomes harder when outputs are executable actions with side effects [62, 63, 64]. These challenges highlight that the transition from chatbot to digital colleague requires both stronger foundation models and better execution substrates, skill abstractions, evaluation environments, and governance mechanisms [46, 47, 48, 51, 65, 66].

Accordingly, this survey reviews the field through four parts. Part I examines the evolution of the LLM cognitive core, from chatbot-era language generation to thinking LLMs driven by long reasoning chains and reinforcement-learning-based cognition. Part II studies tool-augmented task execution, from early agents to OpenClaw-style systems oriented toward workspace intelligence, skill-based execution, reliability, and governance. Part III explains why **Workspace + Skill** is a decisive leap from ephemeral interactions to persistent stateful work and from ad-hoc prompts to composable capability packages. Part IV analyzes the accompanying shifts in data and evaluation, from knowledge corpora and instruction data to action trajectories, process verification, and task-closure-oriented benchmarks. We then discuss open challenges and future directions toward reliable, self-evolving AI ecosystems.

The main contributions of this survey are summarized as follows:

- **A two-dimensional view of AI:** We organize this evolution along two complementary dimensions: cognitive-core evolution (Chatbot and Thinking LLM) and tool-augmented task execution (Agent and OpenClaw), with Workspace + Skill as the mechanism for the Chatbot to Digital Colleague.
- **A unified account of Workspace + Skill, data, and evaluation:** We identify workspace persistence and reusable skills as mechanisms for task completion, and connect this shift with the move from instruction-response pairs to state-action-observation trajectories and task-closure evaluation.
- **A socio-technical roadmap for reliable autonomous AI systems:** We summarize challenges in long-horizon reliability, memory, safety, governance, skills, and system maintenance. We also discuss the broader implications of Digital Colleague systems for human-AI collaboration, including questions of ethics, skills, work pace, creativity, privacy, and asset boundaries.

Overall, this survey clarifies how LLMs are moving from conversational chatbots toward dependable digital colleagues. Importantly, the next generation of generative AI will be defined by self-evolving systems: integrated ecosystems in which models, workspaces, tools, skills, memories, evaluators, and governance mechanisms continuously convert operational experience into reusable skills, updated memories, stronger verification signals, safer policies, and more reliable work outcomes.

2 Part I: The Evolution of LLM’s Cognitive Core

From “Fast Response” to “Slow Thinking”

This part examines the model-side cognitive core underlying next-generation generative AI systems. As Figure 2 illustrates this trajectory, we begin with the Chatbot era, where scaling, parametric knowledge compression, instruction alignment, and multimodal expansion turned LLMs into fluent fast-response interfaces that map prompts to plausible answers in one low-latency autoregressive pass. We then enter the Thinking LLM era, where long Chain-of-Thought, inference-time scaling, and reinforcement learning push models toward deliberate System2 reasoning. This progression matters because agentic systems require a reliable cognitive core: before acting in workspaces, a model must become a stronger generator, reasoner, and decision-maker[32, 34, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74].




Figure 2. Time horizon growth of frontier AI agents. Each point reports the 50%-time horizon, i.e., the median length of coding tasks that an agent can complete at release. The trend shows a transition from second-level fast-response models to slow-thinking models capable of sustaining increasingly long and complex tasks¹.

2.1 The Chatbot Era: Language Generation and Knowledge Compression

Represented by ChatGPT

During this stage, as shown in Figure 3, models primarily served as fast-response interfaces: they compressed linguistic and factual regularities into parameters, accepted natural-language prompts, and produced fluent answers through single-pass autoregressive generation [75, 76]. The Chatbot era was not defined by a single model release, but by the convergence of large-scale language generation, implicit knowledge compression, behavioral alignment, and later multimodal expansion. Together, these developments transformed LLMs from next-token predictors into fluent conversational systems, while simultaneously exposing the inherent ceiling of response-oriented generation when tasks require deliberate verification, search, and long-horizon reasoning [77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87].

2.1.1 Scaling-Driven Language Generation and Parametric Knowledge Compression

Scaling-Driven Language Generation. The early development of statistical language models was constrained by the Markov assumption over local contexts. Although distributed representations and recurrent neural networks enhanced generalization, the true paradigm shift began with the Transformer architecture [10], which broke the bottleneck of sequential computation and laid the

¹Data source: <https://theaidigest.org/time-horizons>.




Figure 3. The Chatbot Era: a user inputs a natural-language question, the LLM performs fast, stateless, single-pass processing over compressed parametric knowledge, and immediately returns a fluent response. The figure highlights one-pass inference with no external loop, feedback-driven correction, or persistent memory.

foundation for large-scale parallel training. Building on this architecture, the field established the foundational “pre-training and fine-tuning” paradigm: GPT-1 [88] demonstrated generative pre-training followed by task-specific adaptation, while GPT-2 [89] subsequently revealed that sufficiently large language models could perform zero-shot multitasking through natural-language prompts. In this sense, the first major contribution of the Chatbot era was to make language modeling a universal interface for task specification: instead of designing task-specific architectures, diverse problems could be reformulated as conditional text generation [90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102].

The technical simplicity of Next-Token Prediction was central to this transformation. Autoregressive training converts heterogeneous web pages, books, code, dialogues, and documents into a single self-supervised objective: predicting the next token from prior context. Without manually labeled task data, this objective forces the model to absorb statistical regularities across syntax, semantics, factual associations, discourse, and basic procedures. Scaling corpus and model size therefore not only improves fluency, but also increases the density of patterns compressed into parameters. The Chatbot-era LLM is thus a high-capacity compression engine: it stores neither explicit symbolic rules nor database rows, but distributed approximations of linguistic, factual, and commonsense regularities reactivated through prompts [103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116].

As summarized in Table 1, this era witnessed the rapid expansion of non-reasoning LLMs, marked by parameter growth, architectural diversification, and closed-/open-source competition. Scaling Laws formed its empirical foundation: Kaplan et al. [12] revealed power-law relationships between performance and scale; Gopher (280B) [117] analyzed these effects across tasks; and Chinchilla (70B) [13] showed that compute-optimal training requires model size and tokens to scale together. This shift from parameter-centric to compute-optimal scaling showed that under-trained large models

are inefficient, and that fast response quality depends on a balanced allocation of parameters, data, and compute [118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127].

OpenAI advanced this trajectory with GPT-3 (175B) [11], popularizing few-shot In-Context Learning, and later GPT-4 [14], while Google introduced PaLM (540B) [128]. In parallel, open-source models like OPT (175B) [129], BLOOM (176B) [22], and LLaMA [130] democratized LLM research, proving smaller, extensively trained models could rival larger counterparts. This wave also changed empirical methodology: rather than treating LLMs as opaque, researchers could inspect training recipes, adaptation strategies, tokenizers, instruction data, and evaluation behavior, accelerating collective understanding of scaling-driven language generation [131, 132, 133, 134, 135].

A key scale-enabled phenomenon is In-Context Learning. GPT-3 showed that a model can infer a task from a few demonstrations in the prompt without parameter updates [11]. This blurs training and inference: weights provide a broad prior over tasks and knowledge, while the prompt temporarily selects and composes behavior. From the perspective of fast response, In-Context Learning acts as rapid associative retrieval from compressed experience. It requires no explicit search or long-horizon planning, but can quickly map prompt patterns to plausible continuations, making the model appear adaptive and instruction-aware even before explicit alignment training [136, 137, 138, 139, 140].

As dense scaling faced bottlenecks in training cost and inference efficiency, Mixture of Experts (MoE) became a key route for sustaining scale. By activating only a few expert networks per token, MoE preserves massive capacity while reducing computation. Mixtral 8x7B [141] pioneered this direction in the open-source community, while DeepSeek-V2 [142], Grok-1, and DeepSeek-V3 [143] further pushed efficiency and matched GPT-4o [144] on multiple benchmarks. Even as the field shifted toward reasoning-centric paradigms, fast-response models such as Qwen3 [145], MiniMax-01 [146], GPT-4.5 [147], and Grok 4 [148] continued to push the efficiency frontier. This trajectory shows that Scaling Laws increasingly depend on sparse activation and efficient retrieval of compressed knowledge under low-latency constraints, not only dense parameter growth [149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155].

Parametric Knowledge Compression. Unlike traditional AI systems relying on external knowledge graphs, the Chatbot era is defined by implicit knowledge compression. Through Next-Token Prediction over massive corpora, LLMs compress world knowledge, grammatical regularities, commonsense associations, and simple reasoning patterns into neural parameters. Petroni et al. [26] showed with LAMA probes that pre-trained models can function as implicit parametric knowledge bases, while later studies localized factual knowledge to Multilayer Perceptron layers [156, 157]. This parametric-memory view explains both the strength and weakness of Chatbot-era models. Knowledge in parameters is low-latency and flexibly recombinable, enabling open-ended answers without external databases; yet it is lossy, static after training, and difficult to audit or update precisely. Retrieval-augmented methods [158] later compensated for these weaknesses, but the era’s defining capability remained direct invocation of compressed knowledge from model weights [159, 160, 161, 162, 163].

At scale, LLMs exhibited Emergent Abilities [164]: without gradient updates, they could generalize to new tasks through a few prompt examples. Although Schaeffer et al. [165] argued that such emergence may partly reflect non-linear evaluation metrics, the practical consequence was undeniable: sufficiently scaled LLMs could act as general-purpose linguistic problem solvers across translation, summarization, question answering, coding, and simple reasoning. These abilities formed the substrate of ChatGPT-like systems. Before alignment made them helpful and conversational, scaling and parametric compression had endowed them with broad linguistic coverage, rapid associative retrieval, and flexible pattern completion. Thus, the Chatbot era represents the maturation of fast-response intelligence: fluent, knowledge-rich, broadly adaptive, and interaction-ready, yet driven by probabilistic generation rather than deliberate verification or search [166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171].

Table 1. An overview of representative non-reasoning LLMs in the chatbot era.

Model	Rel.	Para.	Type	Acc.	Model	Rel.	Para.	Type	Acc.
GPT-1 [88]	2018-06	117M	Text	Open	Orca [172]	2023-06	13B	Text	Closed
GPT-2 [89, 173]	2019-02	1.5B	Text	Open	Llama 2 [174]	2023-07	7–70B	Text	Open
PLATO [175]	2019-10	132M	Text	Open	InternLM [176]	2023-07	7B/20B	Text	Open
T5 [177]	2019-10	60M–11B	Text	Open	Claude 2 [178]	2023-07	-	Text	Closed
DialoGPT [179]	2019-11	117M/345M/762M	Text	Open	WizardLM [180]	2023-07	7B/13B/30B	Text	Open
Meena [181]	2020-01	2.6B	Text	Closed	Qwen [182]	2023-08	1.8–72B	Text	Open
BlenderBot [183]	2020-04	90M/2.7B/9.4B	Text	Open	Qwen-VL [184]	2023-08	9.6B	Multi	Open
GPT-3 [11]	2020-05	175B	Text	Closed	OpenFlamingo [185]	2023-08	3–9B	Multi	Open
PLATO-2 [186]	2020-06	93M/314M/1.6B	Text	Open	Code Llama-Instruct [187]	2023-08	7B/13B/34B	Code	Open
BlenderBot 2 [188]	2021-07	400M/2.7B	Text	Open	WizardMath [189]	2023-08	7B/13B/70B	Text	Open
Jurassic-1 [190]	2021-08	178B	Text	Closed	WizardCoder [191]	2023-08	7B/13B/34B	Code	Open
Codex [192]	2021-08	12M–12B	Text	Closed	IDEFICS [193]	2023-08	9B/80B	Multi	Open
HyperCLOVA [194]	2021-09	82B	Text	Closed	Phi-1.5 [195]	2023-09	1.3B	Text	Open
PLATO-XL [196]	2021-09	11B	Text	Open	Baichuan 2 [197]	2023-09	7B/13B	Text	Open
Gopher [117]	2021-12	280B	Text	Closed	GPT-4V [198]	2023-09	-	Multi	Closed
ERNIE 3.0 Titan [199]	2021-12	260B	Text	Closed	Mistral 7B [24]	2023-09	7.3B	Text	Open
GLaM [200]	2021-12	1.2T-A97B	Text	Closed	Mixtral [141]	2023-09	7B	Text	Open
LaMDA [201]	2022-01	137B	Text	Closed	Kimi / Moonshot [202]	2023-10	-	Text	Closed
AlphaCode [203]	2022-02	9B/41B	Text	Closed	ERNIE 4.0 [204]	2023-10	-	Multi	Closed
InstructGPT [205]	2022-03	1.3–175B	Text	Closed	Fuyu [206]	2023-10	8B	Multi	Open
Chinchilla [13]	2022-03	70B	Text	Closed	Zephyr-7B [207]	2023-10	7B	Text	Open
CodeGen [208]	2022-03	350M/2B/6B/16B	Text	Open	ChatGLM3-6B [209]	2023-10	6B	Text	Open
PaLM [128]	2022-04	540B	Text	Closed	Skywork-13B [210]	2023-10	13B	Text	Open
Flamingo [211]	2022-04	80B	Multi	Closed	GPT-4 Turbo [212, 213]	2023-11	-	Text	Closed
OPT [129]	2022-05	125M–175B	Text	Open	Grok-1 [214]	2023-11	314B-A78.5B	Text	Open
GODEL [215]	2022-06	220M/770M	Text	Open	Yi [216]	2023-11	6B/34B	Text	Open
BLOOM [22]	2022-07	176B	Text	Open	CogVLM [217]	2023-11	17B	Multi	Open
BlenderBot 3 [218]	2022-08	3B/30B/175B	Text	Open	Claude 2.1 [219]	2023-11	-	Text	Closed
PaLI / PaLI-X [25, 220]	2022-09	17B/55B	Multi	Closed	Inflection-2 [221]	2023-11	-	Text	Closed
Sparrow [222]	2022-09	70B	Text	Closed	DeepSeek Coder Instruct [223]	2023-11	1B–33B	Code	Open
CodeGeeX [224]	2022-09	13B	Text	Open	OpenChat 3.5 [225]	2023-11	7B	Text	Open
GLM-130B [226]	2022-10	130B	Text	Open	DeepSeek LLM [227]	2023-11	7B/67B	Text	Open
Galactica [228]	2022-11	120B	Text	Open	Orca 2 [229]	2023-11	7B/13B	Text	Open
BLIP-2 [230]	2023-01	4B–12B	Multi	Open	Mixtral 8x7B [141]	2023-12	47B-A13B	Text	Open
Llama [130]	2023-02	7–65B	Text	Open	Phi-2 [231]	2023-12	2.7B	Text	Open
Alpaca [232]	2023-03	7B	Text	Open	Gemini 1.0 [233]	2023-12	-	Multi	Closed
Claude 1 [234, 235]	2023-03	-	Text	Closed	InternVL 1.0 [236]	2023-12	6B+	Multi	Open
PanGu- Σ [237]	2023-03	1.085T	Text	Closed	SOLAR-10.7B [238]	2023-12	10.7B	Text	Open
BloombergGPT [239]	2023-03	50B	Text	Closed	GLM-4 [240]	2024-01	-	Text	Closed
ChatGLM-6B [241]	2023-03	~6.2B	Text	Open	GLM-4V [240]	2024-01	9B	Multi	Closed
GPT-4 [14]	2023-03	-	Multi	Closed	LLaVA-NeXT [242]	2024-01	7–34B	Multi	Open
PaLM-E [243]	2023-03	562B	Multi	Closed	Stable LM 2 [244]	2024-01	1.6B	Text	Open
Vicuna [245]	2023-03	7B/13B	Text	Open	Yi-VL [216]	2024-01	6B/34B	Multi	Open
GPT-3.5 Turbo [246]	2023-03	-	Text	Closed	Mistral Large [247]	2024-02	-	Text	Closed
Pythia [248]	2023-04	70M–12B	Text	Open	Qwen 1.5 [249]	2024-02	0.5–72B	Text	Open
LLaVA [250]	2023-04	7B/13B	Multi	Open	Gemini 1.5 [251]	2024-02	-	Multi	Closed
MiniGPT-4 [252]	2023-04	7B/13B	Multi	Open	OLMo [253]	2024-02	1B/7B	Text	Open
Dolly 2.0 [254]	2023-04	12B	Text	Open	StarCoder2 [255]	2024-02	3B/7B/15B	Code	Open
Stable LM [256]	2023-04	3B/7B	Text	Open	Reka Flash [257]	2024-02	21B	Multi	Closed
Falcon [258, 259]	2023-05	7–180B	Text	Open	Gemma [260]	2024-03	2B/7B	Text	Open
MPT [261, 262]	2023-05	7B/30B	Text	Open	Qwen1.5-MoE [249]	2024-03	14B-A2.7B	Text	Open
StarCoder [263]	2023-05	15.5B	Text	Open	DBRX [264]	2024-03	132B-A36B	Text	Open
RedPajama [265]	2023-05	3B/7B	Text	Open	Jamba [266]	2024-03	52B-A12B	Text	Open
InstructBLIP [267]	2023-05	-	Multi	Open	Claude 3 [268]	2024-03	-	Multi	Closed
PaLM 2 [269]	2023-05	-	Text	Closed	Command R [270]	2024-03	35B	Text	Open
CodeT5+ [271]	2023-05	220M–16B	Code	Open	Inflection-2.5 [272]	2024-03	-	Text	Closed
Inflection-1 [273]	2023-06	-	Text	Closed	DeepSeek-VL [274]	2024-03	1.3B/7B	Multi	Open
Phi-1 [275]	2023-06	1.3B	Text	Open	Grok-1.5 [276]	2024-03	-	Text	Closed
Aquila [277]	2023-06	7B/33B	Text	Open	MM1 [278]	2024-03	3B/7B/30B	Multi	Closed
ChatGLM2-6B [279]	2023-06	6B	Text	Open	Yi-9B [216]	2024-03	9B	Text	Open
Baichuan-Chat [280, 281]	2023-06	7B/13B	Text	Open	Phi-3 [282]	2024-04	3.8–14B	Text	Open
XGen-7B [283]	2023-06	7B	Text	Open	Mixtral 8x22B [284]	2024-04	141B-A39B	Text	Open

Table 1. An overview of representative non-reasoning LLMs in the chatbot era (continued).

Model	Rel.	Para.	Type	Acc.	Model	Rel.	Para.	Type	Acc.
Llama 3 [285]	2024-04	8B-A70B	Text	Open	Hunyuan-Large [286]	2024-11	389B-A52B	Text	Open
Command R+ [287]	2024-04	104B	Text	Open	OLMo 2 [288]	2024-11	7B/13B	Text	Open
InternVL 1.5 [289]	2024-04	26B	Multi	Open	Pixtral Large [290]	2024-11	124B	Multi	Mixed
Reka Core [291]	2024-04	-	Multi	Closed	SmolVLM [292]	2024-11	2B	Multi	Open
CodeQwen1.5 [293]	2024-04	7B	Code	Open	DeepSeek-V3 [143]	2024-12	671B-A37B	Text	Open
IDEFICS2 [294]	2024-04	8B	Multi	Open	Llama 3.3 [295]	2024-12	70B	Text	Open
OpenELM [296]	2024-04	270M-3B	Text	Open	PaliGemma 2 [297]	2024-12	3B/10B/28B	Multi	Open
Snowflake Arctic [298]	2024-04	480B-A17B	Text	Open	DeepSeek-VL2 [299]	2024-12	27B-A4.5B	Multi	Open
Doubao [300]	2024-05	-	Text	Closed	Falcon 3 [301]	2024-12	1B-10B	Text	Open
DeepSeek-V2 [142]	2024-05	236B-A21B	Text	Open	Granite 3.1 [302]	2024-12	1B-8B	Text	Open
GPT-4o [144]	2024-05	-	Multi	Closed	InternVL2.5 [303]	2024-12	1B-78B	Multi	Open
CogVLM2 [304]	2024-05	19B	Multi	Open	MiniMax-Text-01 [146]	2025-01	456B-A45.9B	Text	Open
MiniCPM-V [305]	2024-05	2-8B	Multi	Open	MiniMax-VL-01 [146]	2025-01	456B-A45.9B	Multi	Open
Codestral [306]	2024-05	22B	Code	Open	Qwen2.5-Max [307]	2025-01	-	Text	Closed
Falcon 2 [308]	2024-05	11B	Multi	Open	MiniCPM-o 2.6 [309]	2025-01	8B	Multi	Open
PaliGemma [310]	2024-05	3B	Multi	Open	Qwen2.5-VL [311]	2025-01	3B/7B/72B	Multi	Open
Aya 23 [312]	2024-05	8B/35B	Text	Open	Janus-Pro [313]	2025-01	1B/7B	Multi	Open
Granite Code [314]	2024-05	3B-34B	Code	Open	Mistral Small 3 [315]	2025-01	24B	Text	Open
Qwen 2 [316]	2024-06	0.5-72B	Text	Open	GPT-4.5 [147]	2025-02	-	Text	Closed
GLM-4-9B [317]	2024-06	9B	Text	Open	Phi-4-mini [318]	2025-02	4B	Text	Open
Claude 3.5 Sonnet [319]	2024-06	-	Multi	Closed	Phi-4-multimodal [318]	2025-02	6B	Multi	Open
Cambrian-1 [320]	2024-06	3-34B	Multi	Open	Command A [321]	2025-03	111B	Text	Closed
DeepSeek-Coder-V2 [322]	2024-06	236B-A21B	Code	Open	Mistral Small 3.1 [323]	2025-03	24B	Multi	Open
Nemotron-4 [324]	2024-06	340B	Text	Open	Aya Vision [325]	2025-03	8B/32B	Multi	Open
Gemma 2 [23]	2024-06	2B/9B/27B	Text	Open	Qwen2.5-VL-32B [326]	2025-03	32B	Multi	Open
Skywork-MoE [327]	2024-06	146B-A22B	Text	Open	OLMo 2 32B [328]	2025-03	32B	Text	Open
InternVL 2.0 [329]	2024-07	1-76B	Multi	Open	GPT-4.1 [330]	2025-04	-	Multi	Closed
Llama 3.1 [331]	2024-07	8-405B	Text	Open	GPT-4.1 mini [330]	2025-04	-	Multi	Closed
InternLM 2.5 [332]	2024-07	1.8-20B	Text	Open	GPT-4.1 nano [330]	2025-04	-	Multi	Closed
GPT-4o mini [333]	2024-07	-	Multi	Closed	Granite 3.3 [334]	2025-04	2B/8B	Text	Open
Codestral Mamba [335]	2024-07	7B	Code	Open	Kimi-VL-A3B-Instruct [336]	2025-04	16B-A2.8B	Multi	Open
Mistral NeMo [337]	2024-07	12B	Text	Open	Amazon Nova Premier [338]	2025-04	-	Multi	Closed
SmolLM [339]	2024-07	135M/360M/1.7B	Text	Open	Mistral Medium 3 [340]	2025-05	-	Multi	Closed
Mistral Large 2 [341]	2024-07	123B	Text	Open	Devstral [342]	2025-05	24B	Code	Open
LLaVA-OV [343]	2024-08	0.5-72B	Multi	Open	ERNIE-4.5-300B-A47B [344]	2025-06	300B-A47B	Multi	Open
Grok-2 [345]	2024-08	-	Text	Closed	Qwen3-4B-Instruct [145]	2025-07	4B	Text	Open
Grok-1.5V [346]	2024-08	-	Multi	Closed	Kimi K2 Instruct [347]	2025-07	1T-A32B	Text	Open
Phi-3.5-mini-instruct [282]	2024-08	3.8B	Text	Open	Qwen3-Coder [348]	2025-07	480B-A35B	Text	Open
Phi-3.5-MoE-instruct [282]	2024-08	42B-A6.6B	Multi	Open	FastVLM [349]	2025-07	0.5B/1.5B/7B	Multi	Open
Jamba 1.5 [350]	2024-08	398B-A94B	Text	Open	LFM2-VL [351]	2025-08	450M/1.6B/3B	Multi	Open
Qwen2-VL [352]	2024-09	2-72B	Multi	Open	LongCat-Flash-Chat [353]	2025-08	560B-A27B	Multi	Open
Llama 3.2 Text [354]	2024-09	1B/3B	Text	Open	Qwen3-Next [355]	2025-09	81B-A3B	Text	Open
Llama 3.2 Vision [354]	2024-09	11B/90B	Multi	Open	Qwen3-VL [356]	2025-09	235B-A22B	Multi	Open
Qwen2.5 [357]	2024-09	0.5-72B	Text	Open	Mistral Large 3 [358]	2025-12	675B-A41B	Multi	Open
Pixtral [359]	2024-09	12B	Multi	Open	Ministral 3 Instruct [358]	2025-12	3B/8B/14B	Multi	Open
OLMoE [360]	2024-09	7B-A1B	Text	Open	Devstral 2 [361]	2025-12	123B	Text	Open
Molmo [360]	2024-09	7B/72B	Multi	Open	Devstral Small 2 [361]	2025-12	24B	Text	Open
Claude 3.5 Haiku [362]	2024-10	-	Text	Closed	Youtu-LLM [363]	2026-01	1.96B	Text	Open
Aya Expand [364]	2024-10	8B/32B	Text	Open	Youtu-VL [365]	2026-01	4B	Multi	Open
Granite 3.0 [366]	2024-10	1B-8B	Text	Open	Qwen3-Coder-Next [367]	2026-02	80B-A3B	Text	Open
Yi-Lightning [368]	2024-10	-	Text	Closed	LongCat-Flash-Lite [369]	2026-02	68.5B-A3B	Text	Open
Qwen2.5-Coder [370]	2024-11	0.5-32B	Text	Open	Mistral Small 4-instruct [371]	2026-03	119B-A6B	Multi	Open
Llama-3.1-Nemotron-70B [372]	2024-11	70B	Text	Open	LongCat-Next [373]	2026-03	68.5B-A3B	Multi	Open

2.1.2 Alignment, Multimodal Expansion, and the Limits of Fast-Response Cognition

Behavioral Alignment. However, possessing vast parametric knowledge is insufficient for building a competent conversational system. The critical leap from GPT-3 to ChatGPT was behavioral alignment, which transformed a continuation model into an instruction-following assistant. Works such as FLAN [374] employed Supervised Fine-Tuning across diverse instruction sets, while OpenAI’s InstructGPT [205] established the Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) pipeline to align outputs with human preferences. The finding that a 1.3B InstructGPT model outperformed the 175B GPT-3 in human evaluations highlighted a crucial insight: alignment and capability are orthogonal dimensions. Alignment improves instruction following and interaction quality, whereas larger-scale pretraining remains central to general knowledge and broad task competence [375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380].

Different institutions further refined conversational alignment along different dimensions. Google’s LaMDA (137B) [201] emphasized dialog safety, factuality, and quality. Anthropic’s Claude adopted the Helpful, Honest, and Harmless (HHH) framework [381] and Constitutional AI [235], enabling models to critique and revise their own outputs according to constitutional principles while reducing reliance on direct human annotation. Later, Direct Preference Optimization [382] simplified preference alignment by unifying reward modeling and policy optimization. These collective efforts allowed LLMs to move beyond raw text continuation and interact with users through human-like fluency, helpfulness, and emotional awareness [378, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388].

Multimodal Expansion. Beyond behavioral alignment, the late Chatbot era also expanded the sensory boundary of LLMs through multimodal fusion, gradually transitioning them from purely language intelligence toward a more comprehensive perceptual intelligence [389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394]. Early visual-language models such as LLaVA [250] relied on stitched architectures that connected external visual encoders to LLMs through projection layers, but such designs suffered from cross-modal alignment bottlenecks. By 2024, the field shifted toward native end-to-end multimodality. Models such as GPT-4o [144] and Google’s Gemini series [233] processed text, image, and audio modalities within increasingly unified neural network architectures, while also extending context windows to support long-video and long-context understanding. Open-source models such as InternVL 1.5 [289] and Qwen2-VL [352] rapidly narrowed the gap with closed-source frontiers. In parallel, domain-specific continual pre-training produced strong coding specialists, including DeepSeek-Coder-V2 [322] and Qwen2.5-Coder [370], extending fast-response generation into formal language domains to handle complex software engineering tasks [395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401].

Limits of Fast-Response Cognition. Despite the unprecedented success of conversational and multimodal models, their autoregressive generation paradigm dictates inherent limitations as fast-response systems. These shortcomings are especially visible in deterministic domains requiring rigorous logic. First, standard LLMs tend to primarily rely on surface-level pattern matching rather than strict multi-step deduction. In formal mathematical proofs and long-horizon code generation, local errors in intermediate steps can cascade into global failures [192, 402]. Because mathematical reasoning requires precise intermediate states and combinatorial planning, the inability of standard LLMs to dynamically allocate additional computation for deeper exploration causes accuracy to drop sharply as problem complexity increases [403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409].

Second, because knowledge is implicitly compressed without persistent external grounding, LLMs are prone to hallucinations, often generating fluent but fabricated statements with high confidence [60, 410]. Evaluations further suggest that scaling model size alone may even exacerbate deceptive fluency [411]. Most critically, the autoregressive paradigm lacks intrinsic verification and self-correction mechanisms. As pointed out by Yao et al. [412] and LeCun [413], greedy left-to-right probabilistic

decoding does not naturally support lookahead, backtracking, or global search—the cognitive operations required for hard mathematics, coding, and planning. Empirical studies [414, 415] further show that, without environmental feedback or independent verifiers, LLMs cannot reliably achieve genuine self-correction using only their probability distributions [416, 417, 418, 419, 420].

This fast-response mechanism, therefore, constitutes an insurmountable performance ceiling for tasks that require deliberate reasoning. Prompt engineering techniques such as Chain-of-Thought [15] and Self-Consistency [421] attempted to trade longer token generation for deeper reasoning, but they did not fundamentally alter the training paradigm of unidirectional, response-oriented output. For LLMs to master complex mathematical derivations and algorithmic programming, their cognitive core must transition from immediate answer generation to deliberate, trial-and-error decision-making. This need to inject search, verification, and test-time computation into model reasoning catalyzed the emergence of the Thinking LLM era, driven by Reinforcement Learning and inference-time scaling [422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427].

💡 Key Difference: Fast Response vs. Deliberate Reasoning

- Chatbot-era LLMs turned language generation into a universal interface by compressing massive linguistic, factual, and commonsense patterns into parameters, enabling fluent, low-latency responses and rapid in-context adaptation.
- Their core limitation is that fast autoregressive response lacks intrinsic verification, lookahead, and backtracking, making complex mathematics, coding, and long-horizon planning fragile without additional reasoning mechanisms.

2.2 The Thinking LLM Era: Reasoning and Reinforcement-Learning-Driven Cognition

Represented by OpenAI o1 and DeepSeek R1

As shown in Figure 4, the Thinking LLM era begins when large language models are no longer treated only as fast generators of plausible text, but as systems that can allocate computation to deliberate reasoning before answering [412, 428, 429, 430, 431]. Instead of relying solely on compressed parametric knowledge and shallow pattern completion, reasoning-oriented models generate extended intermediate traces, explore alternatives, verify partial results, and learn from outcome signals [432, 433, 434, 435, 436]. This era therefore upgrades the LLM from a conversational interface into a more reliable cognitive engine for mathematical reasoning, coding, planning, and later agentic decision making. We summarize this transition through two intertwined developments: long Chain-of-Thought with inference-time scaling, and reinforcement-learning-driven reasoning that internalizes search, reflection, and self-correction [437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444].

2.2.1 Long Chain-of-Thought and Inference-Time Scaling

The Chatbot era demonstrated that LLMs, through Next-Token Prediction on massive corpora, could compress world knowledge into neural parameters and serve as effective human-machine interfaces [76]. Yet this capability is fundamentally limited by the fast-response nature of autoregressive generation: it is fluent, associative, and pattern-driven, but does not by itself support deliberate verification or search. The model is not genuinely thinking but performing probabilistic prediction, leading to hallucination, fragile reasoning, and systematic failure on tasks requiring deep multi-step inference [59, 445]. The arrival of OpenAI o1 [446] and DeepSeek R1 [16] provided a decisive




Figure 4. The Thinking LLM Era: the model allocates additional inference-time computation, generates long reasoning traces, explores alternatives, verifies intermediate steps, and then returns a more deliberate answer. The figure contrasts slow, reflective System-2-style reasoning with the chatbot’s fast single-pass response.

shift. Before emitting a final response, these Reasoning LLMs (RLLMs) generate an extended internal deliberation, potentially thousands of tokens long, in which they decompose problems, explore alternative strategies, and detect and correct errors. This constitutes System 2 “slow thinking” [447], deliberate, effortful, and self-monitored, marking a qualitative leap beyond the immediate response generation of the Chatbot era [448, 449, 450, 451, 452].

The technical core of this transition is Long Chain-of-Thought (Long CoT) [453], a qualitatively different mode of reasoning from the traditional Short CoT of the Chatbot era. Short CoT, exemplified by "Let’s think step by step" [31] and few-shot demonstrations [15], introduced intermediate reasoning steps but remained fundamentally shallow: linear, single-path traces with limited logical depth, no branching, and no self-revision. Empirical analysis confirmed that its benefits are largely confined to mathematical and symbolic tasks [454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462].

Long CoT transcends these limitations along three dimensions: deep reasoning, where chains sustain coherent derivations across tens or hundreds of steps, provably expanding Transformer expressiveness beyond fixed-depth computation [463]; extensive exploration, where models branch into alternative approaches within a single generation, internalizing the multi-path search previously requiring external structures like Tree-of-Thought [412] and Graph-of-Thought [464]; and feasible reflection, where models revisit earlier steps to detect and correct errors, a capability that Self-Refine [32] achieved only through iterative multi-call pipelines. These three capabilities were developed independently during the Chatbot era through external frameworks, but reinforcement learning in the o1/R1 generation unified them inside a single model, enabling spontaneous interleaving of derivation, branching, and self-correction within one output sequence [16, 465]. This internalization is the essential breakthrough of the Thinking LLM paradigm [466, 467, 468, 469, 470].

The Thinking LLM paradigm has given rise to several distinctive phenomena. The first is *inference-time scaling*: rather than improving performance solely through larger models and more training data, Thinking LLMs invest additional computation at inference time [30], either sequentially by generating longer reasoning chains or in parallel by sampling multiple paths and selecting the best. Strikingly, with sufficient inference-time compute a 1B model can surpass a 405B model on mathematical benchmarks [471], shifting the paradigm from "scaling up models" to "scaling up reasoning." The second phenomenon concerns *reasoning boundaries* and *overthinking*: longer chains do not monotonically improve performance, as each model has a capability upper bound beyond which errors accumulate and accuracy degrades [472, 473], motivating efficiency techniques such as Long-to-Short distillation. The third is the *Aha moment* reported during DeepSeek-R1's pure RL training, where the model spontaneously produced self-reflective utterances within its reasoning traces [16]. This finding remains contested, as subsequent analysis suggested such behavior may reflect pretraining biases amplified by GRPO's length optimization rather than genuine emergent reflection [474]. These phenomena collectively define the empirical landscape of Thinking LLMs and motivate the technical routes examined below [475, 476, 477, 478, 479].

2.2.2 Reinforcement-Learning-Driven Reasoning and Unified Cognitive Systems

The technical evolution of Thinking LLMs can be traced along two intertwined threads: how reasoning capabilities are elicited, and how models are trained to acquire them.

Elicitation of Reasoning: From External Scaffolding to Internal Autonomy. The earliest attempts to elicit reasoning relied on prompt engineering. Few-shot CoT [15] and zero-shot CoT [31] demonstrated that inserting intermediate reasoning steps could improve performance, but the resulting traces remained shallow and single-path. Subsequent work introduced external search structures: Tree-of-Thought [412] enabled multi-candidate generation with evaluation and backtracking, Graph-of-Thought [464] generalized reasoning to arbitrary graph structures, and Self-Consistency [421] improved robustness by sampling multiple reasoning paths and selecting the most frequent answer through majority voting. While effective, all of these methods depended on external orchestration rather than learned reasoning behavior [480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485].

The decisive shift came with RL-driven internalization in OpenAI o1 [446] and DeepSeek R1 [16], where models trained with reinforcement learning spontaneously generated deep, branching, self-correcting reasoning within a single output, eliminating the need for any external scaffold. Most recently, reasoning has evolved from a standalone capability into an adjustable mode within unified systems. Early theoretical groundwork by Dualformer [486] demonstrated that a single Transformer could be trained to flexibly switch between fast and slow reasoning modes. This idea was realized at scale when Qwen3 [145] introduced seamless thinking/non-thinking mode switching, allowing dynamic allocation of reasoning effort based on task complexity. This trajectory, from prompt-elicited to externally structured to RL-internalized to hybrid-mode reasoning, represents a progressive movement toward fully autonomous deliberation [487, 488, 489, 490, 491].

Training Paradigm: From Imitation to Self-Evolution. Early training for reasoning relied on supervised fine-tuning (SFT) over human-annotated or model-generated CoT data [414], which taught models to imitate reasoning formats but could not push them beyond the patterns present in the training set. The distillation of Long CoT from stronger models offered a more efficient path: DeepSeek itself released the R1-Distill series by distilling R1's reasoning traces into smaller models [16], while LIMO [492] demonstrated that merely 817 curated examples could elicit strong mathematical reasoning, and s1 [493] achieved comparable results with 1,000 samples. These

findings suggest that reasoning capabilities are already latent in pretrained models and require activation rather than creation from scratch, a hypothesis with significant, profound, and practical implications for the efficiency of reasoning training [494, 495, 496, 497, 498].

The true leap came with RL-based self-learning, especially through reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards (RLVR), where rule-based answer matching and format constraints provide scalable outcome-level supervision for mathematics, coding, and other self-verifiable domains. Algorithmically, this line evolved from PPO [499], which relies on a clipped surrogate objective and, in RLHF-style implementations, typically requires separate policy, reference, reward, and value models, to GRPO [35], which removes the value model and estimates advantages by comparing multiple responses sampled for the same prompt. This critic-free design substantially reduced the memory burden of PPO and became the foundation of R1-style reasoning RL [465, 500, 501, 502, 503].

After GRPO, policy optimization for long-CoT reasoning developed rapidly along an outcome-reward trajectory. DAPO [504] turned the reproduction of R1-like RL into a practical large-scale recipe by introducing decoupled clipping, dynamic sampling, token-level policy-gradient loss, and overlong reward shaping. Shortly afterward, Dr. GRPO [474] revisited GRPO from an optimization-bias perspective, showing that response-length normalization and group-level standard-deviation normalization can introduce length and difficulty biases, and proposing a simplified objective that improves token efficiency while maintaining reasoning performance. CISPO [505] further modified the clipping mechanism by clipping importance-sampling weights rather than token-level policy updates, thereby preserving gradient contributions from rare but reasoning-critical tokens. GSPO [506] moved the trust-region mechanism from token level to sequence level, defining importance ratios by sequence likelihood and aligning clipping, reward, and optimization with the sequence-level nature of outcome rewards. SAPO [507] continued this trend by replacing hard clipping with a smooth, temperature-controlled adaptive gate, preserving sequence coherence while selectively down-weighting highly off-policy tokens [508, 509, 510, 511, 512]. A key empirical finding is that the simplest reward designs, rule-based answer matching plus format checking, proved most effective, as demonstrated by DeepSeek-R1's success. While process reward models [34] theoretically offer finer-grained supervision than outcome-based rewards, they face challenges of annotation cost and reward hacking, and outcome supervision has proven sufficient in practice [513, 514, 515, 516, 517].

Beyond algorithms, the complex interplay between SFT and RL has proven critical: SFT provides stable formatting and cold-start initialization, while RL expands the capability boundary through exploration. DeepSeek-R1 instantiated this synergy through a four-stage pipeline of cold-start SFT, reasoning RL, rejection sampling SFT, and general RL, and Qwen3 further refined it into Long CoT cold-start, reasoning RL, thinking-mode fusion, and general RL, representing the most complete publicly documented hybrid training workflows to date. The overarching trend is clear: training has progressed from single-stage imitation to multi-stage synergy, with open-source frameworks such as OpenRLHF [603] and verl [604] alongside reproduction initiatives like TinyZero [550] and open-r1 [605] enabling the broader academic and developer community to successfully reproduce R1-level reasoning training at relatively modest compute cost [166, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610].

The progression from independent reasoning models toward unified systems has unfolded rapidly across the industry. Models such as o1 [446], R1 [16], and QwQ [560] were initially released as dedicated reasoning products separate from general-purpose dialogue systems. This separation dissolved as o3/o4-mini enabled tool invocation during reasoning [570], Qwen3 introduced hybrid thinking/non-thinking modes [145], and GPT-5 unified reasoning and dialogue through internal routing [532]. Open-source frameworks further democratized R1-level training at modest cost [166]. Reasoning has thus transformed from an isolated model family into a tunable capability dimension

Table 2. An overview of representative reasoning LLMs in the Thinking LLM era.

Model	Rel.	Para.	Type	Acc.	Model	Rel.	Para.	Type	Acc.
o1-preview [518]	2024-09	–	Text	Closed	Claude 4 Opus [519]	2025-05	–	Multi	Closed
o1-mini [518]	2024-09	–	Text	Closed	MiniMax-M1 [505]	2025-06	456B/46B	Text	Open
Marco-o1 [520]	2024-11	7B	Text	Open	Kimi-Dev-72B [521]	2025-06	72B	Code	Open
QwQ-32B-Preview [522]	2024-11	32B	Text	Open	MiMo-VL-7B [523]	2025-06	7B	Multi	Open
Skywork-o1 Open [524]	2024-11	8B	Text	Open	Hunyuan-A13B-Instruct [525]	2025-06	80B-A13B	Text	Open
o1 [518]	2024-12	–	Text	Closed	Kimi K2 [347]	2025-07	1T/32B	Multi	Open
o1-pro [526]	2024-12	–	Text	Closed	Qwen3-Coder [348]	2025-07	480B/35B	Code	Open
Gemini 2.0 Flash Thinking [527]	2024-12	–	Multi	Closed	Qwen3-235B-Thinking-2507 [528]	2025-07	235B/22B	Text	Open
QVQ-72B-Preview [529]	2024-12	72B	Multi	Open	Grok 4 [530]	2025-07	–	Multi	Closed
DeepSeek-R1-Zero [16]	2025-01	671B/37B	Text	Open	SmolLM3 [531]	2025-07	3B	Text	Open
DeepSeek-R1 [16]	2025-01	671B/37B	Text	Open	GPT-5 [532]	2025-08	~300B	Multi	Closed
R1-Distill-Qwen [16]	2025-01	1.5B–32B	Text	Open	DeepSeek-V3.1 [533]	2025-08	685B/37B	Text	Open
R1-Distill-Llama [16]	2025-01	8B/70B	Text	Open	GPT-oss-120B [534]	2025-08	117B/5.1B	Text	Open
Kimi k1.5 [535]	2025-01	–	Multi	Closed	GPT-oss-20B [534]	2025-08	20B	Text	Open
Sky-T1-32B [536]	2025-01	32B	Text	Open	Claude Opus 4.1 [537]	2025-08	–	Multi	Closed
o3-mini [538]	2025-01	–	Text	Closed	ERNIE 4.5-Thinking [539]	2025-09	21B/3B	Text	Open
s1 [493]	2025-02	32B	Text	Open	Claude Sonnet 4.5 [540]	2025-09	–	Multi	Closed
LIMO [492]	2025-02	32B	Text	Open	Grok 4 Fast [148]	2025-09	–	Multi	Closed
Grok 3 [541]	2025-02	–	Multi	Closed	MiniMax-M2 [542]	2025-10	230B/10B	Multi	Open
Grok 3 mini [541]	2025-02	–	Text	Closed	Claude Haiku 4.5 [543]	2025-10	–	Multi	Closed
Claude 3.7 Sonnet [544]	2025-02	–	Multi	Closed	Grok 4.1 Fast [545]	2025-10	–	Multi	Closed
Hunyuan-T1-Preview [546]	2025-02	–	Text	Closed	Ring-1T [547]	2025-10	1T-A50B	Text	Open
Open-Reasoner-Zero [548]	2025-02	7B/32B	Text	Open	GPT-5.1 [549]	2025-11	–	Multi	Closed
TinyZero [550]	2025-02	3B	Text	Open	Gemini 3 Pro [551]	2025-11	–	Multi	Closed
Eurus-2-PRIME [552]	2025-02	7B	Text	Open	Grok 4.1 [553]	2025-11	–	Multi	Closed
Bespoke-Stratos [554]	2025-02	7B	Text	Open	Claude Opus 4.5 [555]	2025-11	–	Multi	Closed
Light-R1 [556]	2025-02	7B/14B	Text	Open	DeepSeek-V3.2 [557]	2025-12	671B/37B	Text	Open
Hunyuan-TurboS [558]	2025-02	560B-A56B	Text	Closed	DeepSeek-V3.2-Speciale [557]	2025-12	671B/37B	Text	Open
Gemma 3 [401]	2025-03	4B/12B/27B	Multi	Open	Gemini 3 Flash [559]	2025-12	–	Multi	Closed
QwQ-32B [560]	2025-03	32B	Text	Open	MiMo-V2-Flash [561]	2025-12	309B/15B	Text	Open
Hunyuan-T1 [546]	2025-03	–	Text	Closed	GLM-4.7 [562]	2025-12	358B	Text	Open
Gemini 2.5 Pro [563]	2025-03	–	Multi	Closed	Devstral 2 [361]	2025-12	123B	Code	Open
DeepSeek-V3-0324 [564]	2025-03	671B/37B	Text	Open	GPT-5.2 [565]	2025-12	–	Multi	Closed
Phi-4-reasoning [566]	2025-04	14B	Text	Open	LongCat-Flash-Thinking-2601 [567]	2026-01	560B-A27B	Text	Open
Phi-4-reasoning-plus [566]	2025-04	14B	Text	Open	Step 3.5 Flash [568]	2026-02	–	Text	Open
Qwen3 [145]	2025-04	0.6B–235B	Text	Open	Kimi K2.5 [569]	2026-02	1T/32B	Multi	Open
o3 [570]	2025-04	–	Multi	Closed	Qwen3.5 [571]	2026-02	397B/17B	Multi	Open
o4-mini [570]	2025-04	–	Multi	Closed	Gemini 3.1 Pro [572]	2026-02	–	Multi	Closed
Kimi-VL-A3B-Thinking [336]	2025-04	2.8B act.	Multi	Open	GPT-5.3-Codex [573]	2026-02	–	Code	Closed
GLM-Z1-32B [574]	2025-04	32B	Text	Open	Claude Opus 4.6 [575]	2026-02	–	Multi	Closed
Z1-Rumination-32B [574]	2025-04	32B	Text	Open	MiniMax-M2.5 [576]	2026-02	230B-A10B	Text	Open
GLM-Z1-9B [574]	2025-04	9B	Text	Open	GPT-5.4 [577]	2026-03	–	Multi	Closed
Llama 4 Maverick [578]	2025-04	400B/17B	Multi	Open	Nemotron-Cascade-2 [579]	2026-03	30B/3B	Code	Open
Llama 4 Scout [578]	2025-04	109B/17B	Multi	Open	GPT-5.3 [580]	2026-03	–	Multi	Closed
Seed-Thinking-v1.5 [581]	2025-04	–	Text	Open	MiniMax-M2.7 [582]	2026-03	230B-A10B	Text	Open
Nemotron-Ultra-253B [583]	2025-04	253B/17B	Text	Open	MiMo-V2.5-Pro [584]	2026-04	–	Multi	Open
ERNIE-4.5-VL [344]	2025-04	424B-A47B	Multi	Open	Kimi K2.6 [585]	2026-04	1T/32B	Multi	Open
Codex-1 [586]	2025-05	–	Code	Closed	GLM-5.1 [587]	2026-04	754B	Text	Open
DeepSeek-R1-0528 [588]	2025-05	671B/37B	Text	Open	DeepSeek-V4 [589]	2026-04	1.6T	Text	Open
R1-Distill-Qwen3-8B [588]	2025-05	8B	Text	Open	Qwen3.6 [590]	2026-04	35B/3B+	Multi	Open
R1-Distill-Qwen3-32B [588]	2025-05	32B	Text	Open	Gemma 4 [591]	2026-04	2B–26B	Multi	Open
MiMo-7B-RL [592]	2025-05	7B	Text	Open	GPT-5.5 [593]	2026-04	–	Multi	Closed
MiMo-7B-RL-0530 [592]	2025-05	7B	Text	Open	Claude Opus 4.7 [594]	2026-04	–	Multi	Closed
Doubao 1.5 Pro Thinking [595]	2025-05	–	Text	Closed	Claude Mythos Preview [596]	2026-04	–	Multi	Closed
Gemini 2.5 Flash [597]	2025-05	–	Multi	Closed	Grok 4.3 [598]	2026-05	–	Multi	Closed
InternVL3 [599]	2025-05	2B–78B	Multi	Open	Ring-2.6-1T [600]	2026-05	1T-A63B	Text	Open
Devstral [342]	2025-05	24B	Code	Open	ERNIE 5.1 [601]	2026-05	–	Multi	Closed
Claude 4 Sonnet [519]	2025-05	–	Multi	Closed	Claude Opus 4.8 [602]	2026-05	–	Multi	Closed

within general-purpose systems. Table 2 summarizes representative reasoning LLMs that mark this shift from isolated reasoning products to unified cognitive systems. This fusion with tool use and environmental interaction means modern Thinking LLMs already exhibit rudiments of agentic behavior, naturally raising the question of what further architectural support is needed to move from a powerful "brain" to a reliable autonomous agent [611, 612, 613, 614, 615].

🔍 Trend: From Long CoT to Agentic Decision Cores

- Thinking LLMs shift scaling from parameter growth alone to inference-time computation, using long reasoning traces, alternative exploration, and self-correction to support harder mathematical, coding, and planning tasks.
- Reinforcement learning internalizes search and reflection into the model, but real-world autonomy still requires persistent state, environmental feedback, and multi-step execution beyond single-turn reasoning.

3 Part II: The Evolution of Tool-Augmented Task Execution

From “Experimental Tool User” to “Workstation Expert”

This part shifts the focus from the model’s internal cognition to its external ability to act. Once LLMs acquire stronger reasoning capabilities, the next question is whether they can use that cognition to operate tools, interact with environments, and complete external tasks [362, 616, 617, 618, 619]. We first revisit the Agent era, where perception, planning, memory, and tool invocation are organized into an environment–action–feedback loop. We then examine the OpenClaw era, where this loop is embedded into persistent workspaces with reusable skills, stateful execution, and stronger requirements for task closure, reliability, and governance [620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626].

3.1 The Agent Era: Environment–Action–Feedback Loops

General Intelligent Body: tool invocation and initial autonomy

As shown in Figure 5, the Agent era marks the first major attempt to turn LLMs from passive conversational systems into active problem solvers. Instead of producing a single answer and stopping, an agent observes an environment, reasons about the next step, invokes a tool or action, receives feedback, and iterates. This loop gives LLMs an initial form of autonomy: they can search, call APIs, write code, browse pages, remember intermediate information, and adjust plans from external results [627, 628, 629, 630, 631]. However, this autonomy remains fragile because the environment is still treated as a sequence of disconnected tool responses rather than as a persistent workspace. We therefore review the core capabilities that define this era, followed by the evaluation evidence and structural bottlenecks that motivate the transition to OpenClaw-style workstation agents.

3.1.1 Tool Invocation and Core Agent Capabilities

Agentic Interaction Loop. The Agent era marks the first organized and systematic effort to extend pretrained LLMs from single-turn question answering into sustained, multi-step interaction with complex external environments. Different from traditional LLMs, the agent operates within an environment loop, observing the world, selecting actions that may invoke external tools, receiving




Figure 5. The Agent Era: the model observes an external environment, plans the next step, invokes tools or actions, receives feedback, and iterates toward the task goal. The figure illustrates the observe–think–act–observe loop that gives LLMs an initial form of autonomy beyond single-turn answering.

feedback, and iterating. This closed loop of observing, thinking, acting, and observing again is what fundamentally distinguishes an agent from a chatbot. ReAct [7] established the canonical form of this loop by interleaving *Thought*, *Action*, and *Observation* in an alternating chain, demonstrating that synergizing reasoning and acting outperforms either in isolation on knowledge-intensive and decision-making tasks. The pattern became so influential that nearly every later agent system can be read as an extension, refinement, or specialization of the ReAct loop [632, 633, 634, 635, 636].

Agent Architecture. Several influential frameworks have sought to formalize what makes a system an agent rather than merely an LLM with tools. Wang et al. [4] proposed a four-module architecture consisting of *Profile*, *Memory*, *Planning*, and *Action*, establishing the vocabulary that subsequent work has largely adopted. Xi et al. [5] approached the same question from cognitive science, drawing parallels between LLM agents and theories of human cognition. The CoALA framework [637] further refined this direction by mapping agent capabilities onto constructs from cognitive psychology, including working memory and long-term memory such as episodic, semantic, and procedural memory, as well as a decision-making cycle. More recently, Buyya et al. [638] identified six modular dimensions of LLM agents, including *Perception*, *Memory*, *Action*, *Planning*, *Reflection*, and *Learning*, offering a control-theoretic lens through a POMDP formulation that complements the cognitive perspective. Despite terminological differences, these frameworks converge on four essential capabilities. *Perception* refers to observing and interpreting the environment. *Planning* involves decomposing goals and reasoning about action sequences. *Memory* concerns maintaining context and accumulating experience. *Tool use* means invoking external APIs to effect change. We trace these developments below [639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647].

Perception. An agent’s effectiveness is fundamentally bounded by what it can observe. Early agents operated in purely textual environments, parsing structured outputs from APIs or web scrapers.

A first generation of multi-modal perception delegated sensory processing to external specialist models orchestrated by the LLM. For example, HuggingGPT [648] treats the LLM as a controller that selects models from the Hugging Face ecosystem for sub-tasks such as image captioning and object detection. Along similar lines, Visual ChatGPT [649] chains visual foundation models via a prompt manager to handle diverse visual interactions. Taking a program-synthesis approach, ViperGPT [650] generates Python programs that compose vision-API calls for compositional visual reasoning. While effective as proof-of-concept demonstrations, these indirect pipelines suffer from error compounding, since each specialist model introduces its own failure modes and the LLM has no direct access to raw sensory signals. The emergence of powerful vision language models has since enabled agents to perceive environments directly through screenshots. Set-of-Mark (SoM) prompting [651] overlays numbered markers onto UI elements, enabling GPT-4V to refer to specific interface components by index. A dedicated line of GUI agents has pushed this further: CogAgent [652] employs a dual-resolution visual encoder for fine-grained UI recognition, ShowUI [653] unifies vision, language, and action in a single model that directly outputs UI operations from screenshots, and UI-TARS [654] achieves context-aware understanding of both desktop and mobile interfaces through large-scale GUI training. Despite these advances, agent perception remains fragmented: most agents observe one snapshot at a time, without persistent visual working memory across steps and tasks [647, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667].

Planning. Planning, broadly defined as the ability to break a complex goal into achievable sub-steps and recover when things go wrong, has progressed through several generations [668, 669, 670, 671]. The foundational insight came from Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [15], which demonstrated that generating intermediate reasoning steps dramatically improves multi-step performance and now forms the backbone of most agent planning systems. Building on this foundation, Tree of Thoughts (ToT) [412] extended the paradigm by allowing multiple reasoning branches and backtracking, effectively casting planning as a search problem. Graph of Thoughts (GoT) [464] generalized this idea further by supporting arbitrary graph topologies over reasoning steps. Complementary to search-based methods is the strategy of task decomposition. Decomposed Prompting [672] breaks problems into modular sub-problems handled by specialized prompts, while Least-to-Most Prompting [673] takes an incremental approach by solving progressively harder sub-problems, using earlier solutions as building blocks. Beyond forward planning, a distinguishing feature of effective agents is their capacity for in-episode learning from failure. Reflexion [33] addresses this by generating natural-language reflections on failed attempts and incorporating them into subsequent tries. Similarly, Self-Refine [32] uses iterative self-feedback to improve outputs without external supervision. Taking a more formal approach, Reasoning via Planning (RAP) [674] brings classical search into the picture by combining Monte Carlo Tree Search with the LLM serving as both world model and value function. More recently, a paradigm shift has emerged through the use of reinforcement learning to train models that autonomously interleave reasoning with tool use at inference time.

Memory. LLMs are fundamentally stateless, as each inference call starts with a blank slate and the only memory available is whatever fits within the context window [61, 675, 676, 677, 678]. For agents operating over extended horizons, this poses a severe limitation. A useful cognitive framing distinguishes semantic, episodic, and procedural memory: agents must access external knowledge, preserve task experiences, and reuse learned procedures over time [9, 679]. In practice, agent memory has moved from retrieval-based knowledge access to persistent experience accumulation, multimodal environmental memory, and scalable learned management [680, 681, 682, 683, 684].

Moving beyond retrieval, Generative Agents [8] introduced the influential memory stream architecture, where agents record observations as timestamped entries and periodically synthesize high-level reflections from low-level experiences. Subsequent work explored more structured forms of long-term

memory: MemoryBank [685] proposed persistent memory with forgetting mechanisms, while ChatDB [686] used databases as symbolic external memory accessible via SQL. These systems shift memory from external knowledge access to persistent experience accumulation [687, 688, 689, 690, 691].

Drawing on cognitive science, the Memory Mechanism Survey [9] provides a systematic taxonomy distinguishing between semantic, episodic, and procedural memory for agents, and the Episodic Memory position paper [679] further argues that episodic memory is the missing piece for maintaining logical consistency across extended interactions. This framing clarifies that agent memory is not a monolithic storage buffer, but a set of distinct mechanisms for preserving facts, experiences, procedures, and self-consistency [692, 693, 694, 695, 696].

As autonomous agents become increasingly multimodal, their memory must also preserve perceptual experience rather than only textual interaction histories. MEIA [697] introduces a multimodal environmental memory that stores object-level, spatial, and temporal information for embodied agents. MIRIX [698] proposes a modular multi-agent memory system covering semantic, episodic, procedural, and resource memories across heterogeneous text and visual inputs. M3-Agent [699] further studies long-term multimodal memory for agents that perceive visual and auditory streams, showing how such memories can support future reasoning and downstream interaction [700, 701, 702, 703, 704].

More recently, a new generation of production-scale systems has advanced agent memory toward practical deployment. Mem0 [705] implements a scalable memory-centric architecture achieving 91% lower p95 latency and over 90% token cost savings compared to full-context baselines, and its enhanced variant Mem0g introduces graph-based representations to capture relational structure. Taking a different perspective, A-MEM [706] draws inspiration from the Zettelkasten method, enabling agents to build interconnected knowledge networks through dynamic indexing and linking. Perhaps most significantly, reinforcement learning is now being applied to teach agents how to manage their own memory autonomously. MEM1 [707] enables agents to operate with constant memory across long multi-turn tasks through end-to-end RL, achieving $3.5\times$ performance improvement while reducing memory usage by $3.7\times$. Along a complementary line, Memory-R1 [708] trains a Memory Manager with structured operations (ADD, UPDATE, DELETE, NOOP) using only 152 training pairs, yet outperforms strong baselines across three benchmarks. Mem- α [709] and MemMachine [710] represent further points in this design space, with the former learning memory construction via RL and the latter preserving factual integrity through sentence-level episode storage. The trend is clear: memory is evolving from static retrieval and heuristic storage into an adaptive capability for knowledge access, multimodal experience, and long-horizon context management [711, 712, 713, 714, 715].

Tool Use. If perception is the agent’s eyes and systematic planning its brain, then tool use is its hands: it is the mechanism through which large language models (LLMs) translate internal reasoning into tangible external operations. The paradigm shift of tool use in LLM agents is understood as a progression from executable calls to large-scale API grounding, long-horizon trajectory-level control, and standardized tool infrastructures [716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722].

The first problem is *executable tool use*: how can a large language model move beyond textual answers and produce operations that can be successfully executed by an external system? Early tool-integrated reasoning methods established this crucial bridge between language generation and execution. Toolformer [17] proposed a self-supervised approach that augments text with tool calls at positions where external tools improve prediction, enabling the model to learn when and how to invoke tools. PAL [723] and Program of Thoughts (PoT)[724] take code execution as a meta-tool: the model generates executable programs while exact computation is delegated to an interpreter. These works mark the first step beyond pure text generation: the model can effectively externalize its reasoning into an executable substrate[725, 726, 727, 728, 729].

Once successful tool invocation becomes possible, the primary bottleneck shifts from *whether* a model can call a tool to *which* tool it should call and *how* the call should be constructed. This gives rise to the problem of *API grounding at scale*. In complex realistic environments, tools are not a small hand-written set of functions but large API ecosystems with complex documentation, argument schemas, and usage constraints. Gorilla [730] addresses this problem by fine-tuning LLMs on API documentation, enabling them to generate accurate calls for both familiar and unseen endpoints. ToolLLM [18] scales this direction with ToolBench, a benchmark containing over 16,000 real-world RESTful APIs across 49 categories, and introduces search-based decision procedures for selecting and chaining tools. ToolACE [731] further shows that high-quality synthetic tool-calling data can produce compact language models with strong zero-shot function-calling ability. This work reframes tool use as interface grounding: the model must map intent to the right API, respect schemas, and produce valid arguments [732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742].

However, correct local calls do not by themselves produce reliable agents. In multi-step tasks, tool use becomes a *trajectory-level control* problem. The agent must decide when external execution is necessary, avoid unnecessary calls, incorporate tool feedback, recover from failed executions, and stop when the task is complete. SMART [743] studies this issue from the perspective of tool overuse, training agents to balance parametric reasoning with external tool dependence. START [744] shows that tool-integrated reasoning traces can be bootstrapped through hint-based self-learning rather than relying only on manually written demonstrations. Reinforcement-learning-based methods push this direction further by treating tool invocation as part of the rollout environment. ReTool [745] trains models to interleave natural-language reasoning with real-time code execution, while ToRL [746] scales tool-integrated reinforcement learning with code interpreters inside the rollout process. ToolRL [747] highlights the importance of reward design, especially the granularity and temporal structure of rewards for tool selection and application. ARTIST [748], Tool-Star [749], and AutoTIR [750] extend this line toward multi-turn or multi-tool settings, where models coordinate reasoning, invocation, and execution feedback within one trajectory. The central shift is from isolated tool calls to policies that control tool use over time [751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759].

As tool-augmented agents move toward commercial deployment, the primary bottleneck shifts again from model-side tool use to infrastructure-level standardization. Fragmented tool interfaces make agents difficult to scale, secure, and govern, because each tool may expose different schemas, authentication mechanisms, context formats, and execution constraints. The Model Context Protocol (MCP) [760], introduced by Anthropic in November 2024, represents a coordinated effort to standardize how LLMs connect to external tools and data sources, analogous to how common peripheral protocols standardize hardware connectivity. Since its release, both OpenAI and Google have announced MCP support, signaling a trend toward industry-wide convergence. In parallel, major commercial LLM APIs now widely support native function calling as a first-class interface, moving tool invocation from ad-hoc prompting toward structured execution [735, 761, 762, 763, 764].

The overall trajectory is therefore not simply from fewer tools to more tools. Rather, tool use evolves from executable calls to grounded API use, from locally valid calls to trajectory-level tool-use policies, and from fragmented interfaces to standardized tool infrastructures. This progression also exposes the boundary of the Agent era. Tool use gives agents the ability to act, but the effects of these actions often remain fragmented across isolated calls and transient tool responses. The next step, developed in the OpenClaw era, is to embed tool use inside persistent workspaces where files, sessions, skills, logs, permissions, and verification procedures can support durable task closure in real deployments.

3.1.2 Initial Autonomy: Evaluation and Structural Bottlenecks

To assess the practical reliability of LLM-based agents, several benchmarks have been developed. AgentBench [57] evaluates agents across eight environments, revealing a performance gap between commercial and open-source models in multi-step settings. WebArena [50] uses realistic web environments where GPT-4 achieved only 14% success. SWE-bench [58] focuses on GitHub issue resolution for coding, while GAIA [618] tests general assistants on multi-step reasoning and tool use. Across these benchmarks, success rates decay super-linearly with complexity and horizon length, prompting systematic failure analysis. The LLM Agent Failure study [765] identifies four archetypes: premature ungrounded action, over-helpfulness with plausible but incorrect details, distractor-induced context pollution, and fragile execution under load. Similarly, the Agent Hallucination survey [766] notes that "hallucinated actions"—such as calling incorrect APIs or operating wrong files—cause irreversible failures, unlike text-level hallucinations [767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773].

Synthesizing the empirical evidence from existing benchmarks and failure analyses, we identify four critical structural bottlenecks of the Agent era:

- **Fragmented perception.** Agents observe the environment through narrow, episodic windows—a single API response, a single screenshot, a single tool output. They lack a persistent, holistic model of the environment’s state and how it evolves over time.
- **Ephemeral tool invocation.** Each tool call is an isolated transaction. No stable workspace exists where intermediate artifacts persist: files created in one step may be inaccessible in the next; terminal sessions are not preserved; browser state is lost between actions.
- **Brittleness under environmental uncertainty.** Real-world environments are noisy, asynchronous, and adversarial. Network timeouts, UI changes, API responses, and permission errors compound across long sequences, sharply lowering success rates.
- **Absence of long-term task closure.** Agents can attempt tasks but rarely complete them reliably end-to-end. They lack the persistent state, error recovery mechanisms, and verification loops needed to deliver finished work products rather than best-effort attempts.

These bottlenecks are not mere engineering issues solved by prompting or scaling, but a fundamental architectural limitation: current agents treat environments as external oracles to query, rather than persistent workspaces to inhabit. Overcoming this requires shifting from tool-calling agents to agents working inside workstations. Here, we strictly define LLM-based agents as systems operating through an environment-action-feedback loop with external tools. Earlier techniques—like chain-of-thought, retrieval-augmented generation, and memory—are not agents themselves, but foundational capabilities. Table 3 summarizes both agent systems and these enabling capabilities.

💡 Key Difference: From Tool Calls to Agentic Loops

- The Agent era extends LLMs beyond single-turn text generation by organizing perception, planning, memory, and tool use into an environment–action–feedback loop.
- Its limitation is that tool calls remain fragmented and ephemeral: agents can attempt multi-step tasks, but lack persistent state, robust recovery, and reliable end-to-end closure.

Table 3. Representative works related to LLM-based agents and their enabling capabilities.

Work	Year	Category	Role	Key Contribution
ReAct [7]	2022	Agent Architecture	Agent Framework	Thought–Action–Observation loop
Wang et al. [4]	2024	Agent Architecture	Conceptual Framework	Profile/Memory/Planning/Action architecture
Xi et al. [5]	2023	Agent Architecture	Conceptual Framework	Cognitive-science perspective on agents
CoALA [637]	2023	Agent Architecture	Conceptual Framework	Cognitive psychology mapping for agents
Buyya et al. [638]	2026	Agent Architecture	Conceptual Framework	Six dimensions with POMDP formulation
HuggingGPT [648]	2023	Perception	Agent System	LLM orchestrating Hugging Face models
Visual ChatGPT [649]	2023	Perception	Agent System	Chaining visual models via prompt manager
ViperGPT [650]	2023	Perception	Agent System	Program synthesis for visual reasoning
Set-of-Mark [651]	2023	Perception	Enabling Capability	Numbered markers for UI grounding
CogAgent [652]	2024	Perception	Agent Model	Dual-resolution encoder for UI recognition
ShowUI [653]	2025	Perception	Agent Model	Unified vision–language–action for UI ops
UI-TARS [654]	2025	Perception	Agent Model	Context-aware desktop/mobile GUI understanding
CoT [15]	2022	Planning	Enabling Capability	Intermediate reasoning steps
ToT [412]	2023	Planning	Enabling Capability	Multi-branch reasoning with backtracking
GoT [464]	2024	Planning	Enabling Capability	Graph topologies over reasoning steps
Decomposed Prompting [672]	2022	Planning	Enabling Capability	Modular sub-problem decomposition
Least-to-Most [673]	2022	Planning	Enabling Capability	Incremental sub-problem solving
Reflexion [33]	2023	Planning	Agent Framework	Language reflections on failed attempts
Self-Refine [32]	2023	Planning	Enabling Capability	Iterative self-feedback improvement
RAP [674]	2023	Planning	Enabling Capability	MCTS with LLM as world model
Search-R1 [774]	2025	Planning	Agent Model	RL-trained search in reasoning chains
R1-Searcher [775]	2025	Planning	Agent Model	Two-stage RL for search–reasoning
ReSearch [776]	2025	Planning	Agent Model	Supervision-free RL with search ops
RAG [158]	2020	Memory	Enabling Capability	Retrieval-augmented generation
Self-RAG [777]	2024	Memory	Enabling Capability	Adaptive retrieval with self-reflection
CRAG [778]	2024	Memory	Enabling Capability	Retrieval evaluation and correction
Adaptive-RAG [779]	2024	Memory	Enabling Capability	Strategy routing by query complexity
Generative Agents [8]	2023	Memory	Agent System	Memory stream with reflections
MemoryBank [685]	2024	Memory	Enabling Capability	Persistent memory with forgetting
ChatDB [686]	2023	Memory	Enabling Capability	Database as external memory via SQL
MEIA [697]	2024	Memory	Agent System	Multimodal environmental memory
MIRIX [698]	2025	Memory	Memory Infrastructure	Multi-agent multimodal memory system
M3-Agent [699]	2025	Memory	Agent System	Long-term visual-auditory memory
Memory Survey [9]	2025	Memory	Conceptual Framework	Semantic/episodic/procedural taxonomy
Episodic Memory [679]	2025	Memory	Conceptual Framework	Position paper on episodic consistency
Mem0 [705]	2025	Memory	Memory Infrastructure	Scalable memory; graph-based Mem0g
A-MEM [706]	2026	Memory	Memory Infrastructure	Zettelkasten-inspired knowledge networks
MEM1 [707]	2025	Memory	Agent Model	End-to-end RL for constant memory
Memory-R1 [708]	2025	Memory	Agent Model	RL-trained structured memory manager
Mem- α [709]	2025	Memory	Agent Model	Memory construction via RL
MemMachine [710]	2026	Memory	Memory Infrastructure	Sentence-level episode storage
Toolformer [17]	2023	Tool Use	Agent Model	Self-supervised tool-call learning
PAL [723]	2023	Tool Use	Enabling Capability	Code execution as meta-tool
PoT [724]	2022	Tool Use	Enabling Capability	Multi-step reasoning via programming
Gorilla [730]	2024	Tool Use	Agent Model	Fine-tuning on API documentation
ToolLLM [18]	2023	Tool Use	Agent Framework	16K+ APIs; DFS-based decision trees
SMART [743]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Tool overuse mitigation
START [744]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Self-taught tool-integrated reasoning
ReTool [745]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	RL for strategic tool invocation
ToRL [746]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Tool-integrated RL with code execution
ToolRL [747]	2026	Tool Use	Agent Model	Reward design for tool learning
ARTIST [748]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Agentic reasoning with tool integration
Tool-Star [749]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Multi-tool reasoning via RL
AutoTIR [750]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Autonomous tool-integrated reasoning
MCP [760]	2024	Tool Use	Infrastructure	Universal LLM–tool connectivity protocol
ToolACE [731]	2025	Tool Use	Agent Model	Synthesized data for compact tool callers
AgentBench [57]	2023	Benchmark	Evaluation	8-environment agent evaluation
WebArena [50]	2023	Benchmark	Evaluation	Realistic web task environments
SWE-bench [58]	2024	Benchmark	Evaluation	GitHub issue resolution benchmark
GAIA [618]	2023	Benchmark	Evaluation	Multi-step reasoning & tool use QA
Agent Failure [765]	2025	Benchmark	Evaluation	Four archetypal agent failure modes
Agent Hallucination [766]	2025	Benchmark	Evaluation	Hallucinated actions & system failures




Figure 6. The OpenClaw Era: the agent works inside a persistent workspace with files, terminals, browsers, logs, permissions, reusable skills, and verification loops. The figure illustrates how workspace state and skill-based execution turn fragmented tool use into inspectable, recoverable, and deliverable task closure.

3.2 The OpenClaw Era: Persistent Workspaces for Task Closure

Workspace intelligence: workspace hosting and task closure

Boundary from the Agent Era to the OpenClaw Era. As shown in Figure 6, the boundary between the Agent era and the OpenClaw era is not simply whether a model can call tools. A system belongs to the Agent era when its minimal architecture is an environment–action–feedback loop: it observes a state, reasons about the next move, invokes an external tool or action, and incorporates the returned observation into the next step. This definition captures the first break from chatbot-style response generation, but it does not guarantee durable state, reusable procedures, recoverable execution, or final-state verification. The environment remains something the agent queries from the outside.

By contrast, the OpenClaw era begins when the environment becomes a persistent host. The defining condition is that agents work inside a managed workspace where files, sessions, logs, tools, project instructions, permissions, and reusable skills persist across the trajectory. In this setting, actions are not merely tool calls; they are workspace operations whose effects can be inspected, validated, rolled back, and governed. The conceptual unit therefore shifts from an agent that attempts a sequence of actions to a workstation system delivering a correct, auditable final state. Table 4 summarizes this.

The OpenClaw era denotes the point at which agent research becomes inseparable from the workstation in which the agent is deployed. Earlier agents mainly demonstrated that LLMs could reason, choose tools, and react to observations. OpenClaw-style systems instead make the workspace itself the organizing abstraction: the agent is connected to persistent files, terminals, browsers, messaging channels, credentials, project instructions, local memory, and reusable skills [780]. The result is

Table 4. Boundary between the Agent Era and the OpenClaw Era.

Dimension	Agent Era	OpenClaw Era
Organizing abstraction	Environment–action–feedback loop	Persistent workspace for task hosting
Unit of action	Tool call or external API invocation	Workspace operation over files, terminals, browsers, services, and skills
State model	Episodic observations and short-horizon memory	Durable files, sessions, logs, repositories, local memory, and snapshots
Knowledge reuse	Prompt patterns, retrieved memory, or ad-hoc demonstrations	Reusable skill packages with instructions, scripts, dependencies, examples, and checks
Task objective	Produce useful intermediate actions or responses	Deliver a correct, inspectable, and recoverable final workspace state
Evaluation focus	Action correctness and trajectory success rate	Task closure, final-state verification, repeatability, and auditability
Failure recovery	Best-effort retry or prompt-level reflection	Structured verification, rollback, rerun, sandboxing, and state repair
Safety boundary	Prompt-level guardrails and tool-use policies	Runtime permissions, provenance tracking, audit logs, and governance over workspace changes

a shift from *tool use* to *task hosting*. An agent is no longer evaluated only by whether it emits a plausible next action, but by whether it can leave a durable, inspectable, and safe final state in a real software environment. We therefore summarize this era along two axes: the emergence of workspace intelligence and skill-based task closure, and the new reliability, verification, and governance problems created by persistent computer use. Table 5 summarizes representative works that define these workspace, skill, task-closure, evaluation, reliability, and governance dimensions.

3.2.1 Workspace Intelligence and Skill-Based Task Closure

The central architectural change is the move from isolated tool invocation to situated work inside a persistent workstation. OpenClaw is best read as a representative engineering manifestation of this transition rather than as its sole conceptual origin: it packages a local personal assistant around a gateway, workspace, communication channels, prompt files, skills, and tool integrations [780]. Related software-engineering agents show why this matters. OpenHands provides an open platform in which agents edit code, run shell commands, browse, and execute programs inside controlled development environments [46]. SWE-agent further argues that the agent-computer interface is itself a decisive design object: repository navigation, file editing, command execution, and test feedback must be shaped for language-model agents rather than inherited unchanged from human-facing tools [47]. Together, these systems make clear that the next step after API calling is not merely adding more tools, but constructing a stable workbench in which intermediate artifacts, environmental state, and verification signals can persist across the trajectory.

A second defining feature is the rise of skills as modular, reusable units of agent capability. The underlying idea predates OpenClaw: Voyager demonstrated that agents can build and reuse an executable skill library from environmental feedback [51]. What changes in contemporary workstation agents is that skills become file-system-level packages rather than only memories or prompt snippets. Anthropic’s Agent Skills formalize this pattern as folders containing a `SKILL.md` file, instructions, scripts, and resources that can be dynamically loaded only when relevant [783, 784]. OpenClaw adopts a similar operational pattern through workspace-local skills organized around `SKILL.md`

Table 5. Representative works related to the OpenClaw era and workspace-level task execution.

Work	Year	Category	Role	Key Contribution
OpenClaw [780]	2026	Workspace	Agent Framework	Persistent workspace with tools, channels, and skills
OpenHands [46]	2024	Workspace	Agent Platform	Code editing, shell execution, browsing in controlled environments
SWE-agent [47]	2024	Workspace	Agent-Computer Interface	Repository navigation and test-feedback interface for agents
SemaClaw [781]	2026	Workspace	Harness Architecture	Auditable execution substrate decoupled from UI surfaces
Sema Code [782]	2026	Workspace	Coding Harness	Controllable workspace harness for software agents
Voyager [51]	2023	Skill	Agent System	Executable skill library learned from environment feedback
Anthropic Agent Skills [783, 784]	2026	Skill	Skill Infrastructure	Folder-based skills with instructions, scripts, and resources
OpenClaw Skills [785, 786]	2026	Skill	Skill Infrastructure	Workspace-local <code>SKILL.md</code> packages for reusable procedures
Awesome OpenClaw Skills [787]	2026	Skill	Skill Repository	Public registry of reusable OpenClaw skill packages
Agent Skills Analysis [788]	2026	Skill	Conceptual Analysis	Composable capability packages for data-driven agents
SkillFortify [789]	2026	Skill	Security Analysis	Metadata, dependency, provenance, and sandboxing requirements
SWE-bench [58]	2024	Task Closure	Benchmark	Real GitHub issue resolution verified by tests
Terminal-Bench [790]	2026	Task Closure	Benchmark	Long-horizon command-line task execution
OSWorld [49]	2024	Evaluation	Benchmark	Real OS tasks with execution-based checking scripts
WebArena [50]	2023	Evaluation	Benchmark	Realistic web environments with stateful task success
WorkArena [48]	2024	Evaluation	Benchmark	Enterprise-software workflow evaluation
TheAgentCompany [791]	2024	Evaluation	Benchmark	Simulated software-company work tasks
Reliability of Computer-Use Agents [792]	2026	Reliability	Reliability Study	Repeated-run instability in computer-use agents
Science of Agent Reliability [793]	2026	Reliability	Reliability Agenda	Consistency, robustness, recoverability, and error severity
Verifiers for Computer-Use Agents [794]	2026	Reliability	Verification Framework	Trajectory-wide process and outcome verification
Your Agent Can Hurt You [795]	2026	Security	Threat Analysis	Capability, identity, and knowledge poisoning risks
Systematic OpenClaw Security [796]	2026	Security	Security Evaluation	Runtime risks beyond isolated model behavior
Taming OpenClaw [797]	2026	Governance	Lifecycle Analysis	Security risks across initialization, reasoning, and execution
Don't Let the Claw Grip Your Hand [798]	2026	Governance	Defense Framework	OpenClaw-specific threat modeling and defense
OS-Harm [799]	2026	Security	Safety Benchmark	Misuse, prompt injection, exfiltration, and system harm
OpenClaw PRISM [65]	2026	Governance	Defense Layer	Defense-in-depth over the OpenClaw lifecycle
ClawGuard [66]	2026	Governance	Runtime Guardrail	File, command, network, and skill boundary enforcement
Agentic Forensics [800]	2026	Governance	Forensics Framework	Trace reconstruction across nondeterministic agent loops

files and shared public skill repositories [785, 786, 787]. Recent empirical analysis of Claude skills frames this development as a data-driven shift from monolithic agents toward composable capability packages [788]. However, skill modularity also changes the trust model: reusable skills can encode domain expertise, but they can also become stale, over-specific, incompatible, or malicious. Formal and supply-chain analyses of agentic skills therefore treat metadata, dependencies, versioning, provenance, and sandboxing as first-class requirements rather than engineering details [789].

The third feature is closed-loop task closure. A workstation agent must not only plan a trajectory but also inspect the environment after each action, repair failures, rerun commands, validate outputs, and produce deliverable artifacts. This makes reliability an emergent property of the whole harness: model, workspace, tools, skills, permission boundaries, verification scripts, and recovery policies. Coding and terminal benchmarks make this requirement concrete. SWE-bench evaluates whether agents can modify real repositories and pass tests for GitHub issues [58], while Terminal-Bench targets hard, realistic command-line tasks where success depends on sustained shell interaction and environment management [790]. SemaClaw and Sema Code explicitly formulate this trend as harness engineering: the agent should be decoupled from any single user interface and embedded into a controllable, auditable execution substrate that can power IDEs, CLIs, and multi-channel personal assistants [781, 782]. In this sense, OpenClaw’s significance lies less in a new reasoning algorithm than in productizing a complete workstation stack around the model.

3.2.2 Evaluation, Reliability, and Governance Challenges

Workspace intelligence also fundamentally changes what counts as evaluation. A useful workstation agent must leave the target environment in a correct, verifiable final state, not merely generate plausible reasoning. OSWorld evaluates multimodal autonomous agents in real operating-system environments with desktop applications, file operations, browsers, and execution-based checking scripts [49]. WebArena and WorkArena extend this state-based evaluation perspective to realistic websites and complex enterprise software workflows [48, 50]. TheAgentCompany pushes the same idea toward a simulated software company environment, where agents must browse the web, write code, run programs, and communicate with coworkers to complete consequential professional work tasks [791]. These benchmarks show that the frontier research problem is no longer simply language understanding or isolated, single-step tool selection; it is robust long-horizon task execution in environments that are asynchronous, stateful, and only partially observable.

Recent reliability work sharpens this point. Computer-use agents may succeed once and fail on a repeated run because execution is stochastic, task specifications are underspecified, and small environmental changes compound over long trajectories [792]. A broader reliability agenda therefore argues that single success rates should be decomposed into consistency, robustness, predictability, recoverability, and bounded error severity [793]. Verification becomes a bottleneck of its own: the system must decide whether the final state actually satisfies the user intent, whether the process was safe, and whether success occurred for the right reason. Verifier design for computer-use agents consequently emphasizes trajectory-wide evidence, the separation of process and outcome signals, and the distinction between controllable and uncontrollable failures [794]. For OpenClaw-style assistants, these findings imply that evaluation should include repeated execution, perturbation tests, state inspection, and post-hoc auditability, not only one-off demonstrations.

The same persistent workspace that enables task closure also expands the attack surface. OpenClaw-style agents may hold credentials, local files, identity tokens, tool permissions, communication channels, and long-term memory. Recent safety analyses show that poisoning an agent’s capabilities, identity, or knowledge can turn useful autonomy into attacker-controlled authority [795]. Systematic security evaluations of OpenClaw and its variants further report that agentized runtimes can be riskier than the underlying models in isolation, because persistent context, orchestration, and multi-step execution amplify model weaknesses into concrete system-level failures [796]. Taming OpenClaw analyzes these risks through the lifecycle of autonomous agents, including initialization, input handling, reasoning, decision making, and execution [797]; Don’t Let the Claw Grip Your Hand similarly proposes a defense framework for OpenClaw-specific threats [798]. Beyond OpenClaw, OS-Harm shows that computer-use agents must be evaluated for misuse, indirect prompt injection, data exfiltration, and system-level harm rather than only helpfulness [799].

The security response is therefore moving from prompt-level safety toward runtime governance. OpenClaw PRISM proposes a defense-in-depth layer over the agent lifecycle, including message ingress, prompt construction, tool execution, tool-result persistence, outbound messaging, sub-agent spawning, and gateway startup [65]. ClawGuard takes a tool-boundary view, checking file, command, network, and skill operations against user-confirmed constraints and audit policies before execution [66]. These defenses reflect a broader lesson: once an agent can act through a workstation, policy must be enforced where actions become real, not merely expressed as natural-language instructions. Forensics becomes part of the same agenda. Because a personal agent can modify files, invoke services, update memory, and choose tools nondeterministically over time, investigations must reconstruct traces across the entire agent loop rather than inspect a single prompt-response pair [800].

In summary, the OpenClaw era fundamentally reframes agentic AI as situated task execution. Its core technological contribution is not simply broader tool access, but the integration of persistent workspaces, modular skills, closed-loop execution, verification, and runtime governance into a single harness. The next generation of autonomous agents will therefore be differentiated not only by model scale but by the maturity of their underlying workspace stack: state management, skill provenance, permission control, repeated-execution reliability, audit trails, and safety enforcement.

💡 Key Difference: From Tool Use to Task Hosting

- OpenClaw-style systems shift the organizing abstraction from isolated API calls to persistent workspaces containing files, terminals, browsers, credentials, memory, and reusable skills.
- This transition makes task closure, verification, skill provenance, permission control, and runtime governance central requirements for building reliable workstation agents.

4 Part III: Why “Workspace + Skill” Is the Key Leap

From Tool Use to Reusable Digital Work

The preceding parts describe two necessary but incomplete advances: stronger cognitive cores and more capable tool-using agents. This part argues that the next qualitative leap comes from combining reusable skills with persistent workspaces. A workspace defines the durable environment in which an agent works: files, terminals, browsers, repositories, logs, memories, permissions, and execution contexts where task state persists, as illustrated by OpenClaw-style workstation agents and software-engineering platforms [46, 47, 780, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805]. A skill defines how an agent repeatedly performs a class of work: reusable procedures, scripts, examples, checks, dependencies, and safety constraints that turn one-off instructions into operational knowledge [51, 783, 785, 788, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810]. Together, they transform LLM systems from answering models or tool-calling agents into digital workers that inherit procedures, operate in bounded environments, and deliver verifiable outcomes [49, 58, 791, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821]. We therefore develop this thesis through two complementary dimensions: workspace as the execution substrate for agentic work, including the delegation patterns through which users authorize and supervise that work, and skills as reusable procedures for workspace-based agents.

4.1 Workspace as the Execution Substrate for Agentic Work: Stateful Context for Tasks

Persistent environments for durable task delivery

As shown in Figure 7, the interactive workspace represents the first half of this paradigm leap because complex real-world work cannot be reduced to isolated, stateless API calls. While earlier generation agents could invoke tools, isolated tool invocation alone does not provide system continuity, process inspectability, or state recoverability. In contrast, executing complex long-horizon work requires a persistent, stateful environment where generated artifacts can safely survive, failures can be diagnosed, failed commands can be rerun, and final workspace states can be rigorously inspected [46, 47, 780, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826]. This subsection explains why the workspace becomes the execution substrate that turns agentic behavior from episodic action into durable task delivery.




Figure 7. Simple tool invocation: the LLM can call external tools to handle local sub-tasks, but these calls remain limited when the task requires persistent files, terminal sessions, execution logs, intermediate artifacts, and recoverable state. The figure highlights why a workspace is needed to support more complex, long-horizon task completion beyond isolated tool calls.

4.1.1 From Ephemeral Tool Calls to Persistent State

Tool APIs give agents the ability to affect the external world, but they do not by themselves provide a stable place for work to accumulate. When each tool call is treated as an isolated transaction, the agent must repeatedly reconstruct context from limited observations, allowing small inconsistencies to compound across long trajectories [827, 828, 829, 830, 831]. A persistent workspace changes this by giving the agent durable state: editable files, persistent terminals, browser history, versioned repositories, process logs, and local memory for task context [46, 780, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836]. The result is a shift from calling tools around the model to embedding the model inside an environment where work has continuity over time. In this setting, the important question is no longer only whether the agent can choose the right next action, but whether the environment after many actions remains coherent, inspectable, and recoverable [808, 837, 838, 839, 840].

This change also clarifies why workspace-level design is not merely an engineering detail. A workspace determines which state is visible to the agent, which operations are executable, which artifacts persist, and which traces can be audited after failure. It therefore shapes the agent’s practical intelligence as much as the underlying model does in deployment. For software tasks, for instance, the gap between a stateless code-generation prompt and a workspace with editable files, tests, terminals, dependency managers, and version control is the gap between plausible code and repairable engineering task completion [47, 58, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845]. For knowledge work, the same distinction appears in document editing, data analysis, project coordination, and research assistance: useful work needs artifacts that can be opened, revised, checked, and handed off [846, 847, 848, 849, 850]. Persistent workspace is therefore the material substrate of task closure.

4.1.2 From Answer Generation to Authorized Work Delegation

Human professional work is rarely a single input-output mapping. It involves preparing context, following procedures, coordinating diverse tools, checking intermediate results, documenting decisions, and handing off deliverables. The Workspace + Skill paradigm imports this structure into complex digital environments: the agent does not merely answer questions, but joins a workflow with state, process, accountability, and completion criteria [851, 852, 853, 854, 855]. This reframes next-generation AI systems as work-oriented systems whose performance depends on how well they model and execute the structure of real work. The evaluation target consequently shifts from mere textual plausibility to task delivery: whether the final workspace state satisfies the user’s intent and whether the process can be inspected [48, 49, 50, 791, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860].

Once agents inhabit persistent workspaces, the dominant human–AI interaction pattern also shifts from instruction to delegation. In the chatbot setting, interaction is primarily instructional: the user writes a prompt, the model returns an answer, and correction happens through another prompt. For workspace-based agents, the user no longer specifies every micro-step, but delegates a bounded objective together with constraints, permissions, success criteria, and acceptable risk. The interface must therefore support task scoping, authority assignment, progress monitoring, intervention, and final acceptance, not only message exchange. This turns the agent from a reactive respondent into a collaborative worker whose actions are evaluated through both its final artifacts and the trajectory that produced them [48, 49, 791, 811].

This delegation pattern changes what humans need to observe. In command-style interaction, the user mainly inspects the next textual answer. In authorized collaboration, the user instead watches process summaries, reasoning states, tool actions, file diffs, execution logs, checkpoints, unresolved assumptions, and the evolving workspace state. Human control shifts from continuously telling the model what to do next toward granting authority, adjusting constraints, interrupting unsafe or unproductive paths, and auditing whether the final state satisfies the delegated intent. The system must decide what authority the agent has, where execution boundaries are drawn, which actions require confirmation, how failures are rolled back, and how responsibility is recorded. Different tasks can therefore adopt different autonomy levels: direct instruction for short reversible actions, supervised delegation for medium-risk multi-step work, and conditional autonomy for well-specified procedures with strong verification and rollback. The key interaction unit is no longer a single response, but an inspectable work episode in which intent, authority, action, observation, verification, and accountability are jointly represented [46, 65, 66, 780, 800]. In this setting, competition between AI systems shifts from raw tool coverage to delivery quality: whether the agent completes work reliably, safely, and transparently under realistic constraints [792, 793, 794]. Workspace design therefore becomes inseparable from governance design, because persistence enables task closure while also determining how actions can be constrained, audited, and recovered [65, 66, 796, 800].

💡 Key Shift: From Tool Calls to Delegated Workspaces

- Atomic tool calls allow an agent to act, but they do not preserve enough state for long-horizon work to remain coherent, inspectable, or recoverable.
- Persistent workspaces provide durable files, terminals, logs, repositories, and execution contexts, turning episodic actions into verifiable task delivery.
- Delegation interfaces expose authority, progress, intermediate reasoning state, and final workspace state so that humans can supervise work without specifying every micro-step.




Figure 8. Workspace + Skill paradigm: persistent workspaces provide the stateful place where work happens, while skills package reusable procedures, scripts, checks, and safety constraints. The figure shows how agents combine workspace context with skill assets to produce verifiable digital work instead of one-off responses.

4.2 Skills for Workspace Agents: Reusable Procedures for Repeatable Work

Procedural memory for repeatable workspace execution

As shown in Figure 8, skills are the procedural half of the leap because a persistent workspace alone does not explain how agents accumulate reusable operational knowledge. Prompts describe what the user wants in a particular moment, but skills encode how a system should repeatedly perform a family of tasks. A useful skill can package procedural instructions, scripts, examples, dependencies, verification checks, rollback strategies, and safety constraints [51, 783, 784, 785, 786]. This subsection explains how skills turn ad-hoc instruction following into reusable capability packages, and why their value becomes fully visible only when they are executed inside persistent workspaces.

4.2.1 From Ad-hoc Prompts to Composable Capability Packages

Prompts are temporary and local: they guide a single interaction, but they rarely become durable assets that can be tested, versioned, reused, or governed. As complex tasks become longer and more specialized, repeatedly encoding all relevant procedures in the prompt becomes inefficient and unreliable. Skills address this limitation by externalizing procedural knowledge into modular reusable packages. Instead of asking the model to rediscover a task each time, a skill provides a detailed recipe for a task family, including tools, inputs, steps, failure modes, validation criteria, and safety constraints [783, 785]. This changes capability accumulation from transient prompt engineering into a maintainable asset layer outside the pretrained model weights [51, 788].

The key advantage of such skills is their composability. A skill can be parameterized for different projects, combined with other skills, refined through experience, and inspected by expert humans

before reuse [783, 786, 788]. It can also contain executable components, such as scripts or templates, that reduce unnecessary dependence on fragile natural-language reasoning. In this sense, skills are neither simple prompts nor ordinary tools. They sit between model cognition and workspace execution: they translate task intent into repeatable procedures that the agent can invoke when operating in a concrete digital environment. As skill libraries mature, agent systems can inherit organizational know-how in a form that is modular, reviewable, and portable across tasks.

4.2.2 From Skill Libraries to Integrated Digital Workers

Modular skills become most powerful when coupled with persistent workspaces. The workspace provides state, context, tools, and artifacts; the skill provides procedure, constraints, and verification logic. A skill without a workspace risks remaining a static instruction template, while a workspace without skills forces the autonomous agent to improvise repeatedly. Their combination enables stronger task closure: the agent can load a reusable procedure, operate over persistent artifacts, check results, repair failures, and leave an inspectable final state [46, 58, 780]. This is the point at which an LLM system begins to resemble a digital worker rather than an assistant.

OpenClaw provides a concrete lens because it combines a persistent local environment, skill directories, tool integrations, and task-oriented execution in one unified architecture [780, 785, 786]. Rather than treating OpenClaw as a single isolated product, we use it as a representative example of a broader system pattern: a model is wrapped by a harness that manages workspace state, loads reusable procedures, routes actions through tools, and exposes the resulting work process to evaluation and governance. This pattern shows why competition among next-generation autonomous AI systems is not merely about more tools or larger models, but about transforming reusable procedures into reliable, bounded, inspectable work [789, 792, 794]. In this view, the Workspace + Skill paradigm is the bridge from agentic capability to practical delivery-grade AI labor: skills define reusable ways of working, while workspaces make those ways reliably executable, verifiable, and accountable.

Case study: OpenClaw as a Workspace + Skill system. OpenClaw illustrates how the Workspace + Skill paradigm can be translated from an abstract design principle into a concrete computational workstation architecture. At the workspace layer, the system exposes persistent files, local project context, terminals, browsers, tool integrations, communication channels, logs, and task-specific instructions to the autonomous agent [780]. These components give the model a bounded digital worksite rather than a simple collection of disconnected API calls. A task can therefore leave intermediate artifacts in the file system, reuse command outputs, preserve verifiable execution evidence, and support later inspection by users or evaluators. This workspace substrate is what allows the agent to move from producing a plan to actually changing a target environment.

At the skill layer, OpenClaw follows the emerging pattern of packaging reusable procedures as directory-level assets, often centered around a `SKILL.md` file and accompanied by scripts, resources, examples, dependencies, and operational instructions [785, 786, 787]. Such a skill is more than a prompt because it can encode preconditions, tool choices, expected intermediate artifacts, validation routines, common failure modes, and safety constraints. It is also more than a tool because it does not merely expose one callable function; it describes a repeatable way of working inside a workspace. In this sense, skills function as procedural memory that can be loaded only when relevant, inspected by humans, revised over time, and shared across related task families.

A typical OpenClaw-style execution loop consists of four stages. First, the system interprets user intent and maps it to the workspace state, including available files, tools, permissions, and context.

Second, it retrieves or activates relevant skills that provide procedural guidance for the task family. Third, it executes actions inside the workspace, producing observable state changes such as edited files, command outputs, browser states, or generated artifacts. Finally, it verifies whether the final state satisfies the task objective, using tests, file diffs, logs, state inspection, or human confirmation when necessary. The key point is that the unit of intelligence is no longer a single response but the combined trajectory of skill selection, workspace operation, verification, and recovery.

This case study clarifies why delivery-grade agents require governance at the same level as capability. Because OpenClaw-style systems can operate over local files, external services, credentials, and third-party skills, their reliability depends on permission boundaries, provenance tracking, sandboxing, audit logs, and rollback mechanisms [65, 66, 800]. The same architecture that enables task closure also amplifies the consequences of wrong actions. Therefore, OpenClaw should be seen not only as an example of more capable tool use but as a broader shift toward managed work execution: persistent environments and reusable skills must be paired with verification and runtime control.

💡 Key Difference: Skills as Operational Memory

- Prompts specify immediate intent, but they rarely become reusable assets that can be tested, versioned, governed, and applied across repeated task families.
- Skills package procedures, scripts, checks, and safety constraints so that workspace-based agents can convert reusable know-how into accountable digital work.

Limitations of the Workspace + Skill paradigm. Although Workspace + Skill is a useful lens for understanding next-generation agentic systems, it should not be interpreted as a complete solution to reliable autonomy. The paradigm improves continuity and reuse, but it also introduces new failure modes at the level of skills, workspaces, and their interaction. A balanced view is therefore necessary: persistent environments and reusable procedures can raise the ceiling of agentic work, but they also increase the need for lifecycle management, security review, and operational discipline [861, 862].

Skill brittleness and environmental drift. In practice, skills are often written for particular tools, file layouts, APIs, software versions, permission settings, and organizational conventions. When any of these conditions change, a previously useful reusable skill may silently become invalid. For example, a browser workflow can break after a UI redesign, a command-line skill can fail after a minor dependency update, and an API-oriented skill can produce incorrect downstream actions after a schema change. This makes skill maintenance an ongoing requirement rather than a simple one-time authoring problem. Robust skill systems therefore typically need versioning, dependency declarations, compatibility checks, regression tests, and deprecation mechanisms [789, 863, 864].

Skill overfitting and negative transfer. Reusable procedures can also become too specialized. A skill that encodes a highly specific workflow may perform well in the environment where it was created but mislead the autonomous agent in a slightly different target workspace. This creates a form of procedural overfitting: the system mechanically follows a familiar recipe even when the current task requires adaptation. Negative transfer is especially risky when skill retrieval is entirely automatic, because the agent may load an irrelevant or partially relevant skill and anchor subsequent planning on inappropriate assumptions [865, 866]. Future systems must therefore evaluate not only whether a skill succeeds on its original task family, but also when it should not be invoked.

Workspace contamination and state inconsistency. Persistent digital workspaces preserve useful context, but they also preserve stale files, failed intermediate artifacts, obsolete logs, corrupted caches, and misleading partial outputs. Unlike a simple stateless prompt, a workspace can accumulate noise

across time. If the autonomous agent cannot distinguish authoritative artifacts from accidental leftovers, persistence may reduce rather than improve reliability. This problem becomes harder in collaborative or multi-agent settings, where several agents may modify shared files, update memory, or operate on overlapping resources. Workspace hygiene, state summarization, provenance labeling, snapshotting, and rollback are therefore central to making persistence trustworthy [862, 867].

Security and supply-chain risk. Skills can contain natural-language instructions, executable scripts, dependencies, credentials, assumptions, and tool permissions. They present a supply-chain attack surface. A malicious or poorly reviewed skill may exfiltrate data, request excessive authority, modify files unexpectedly, or steer the model toward unsafe tool use. Similarly, a compromised workspace can poison the agent through files, web pages, tool outputs, or memory entries. Therefore, skill registries and workspace agents require provenance tracking, permission manifests, sandboxed execution, user confirmation for high-risk actions, and continuous audit trails [65, 66, 796, 868, 869, 870].

Governance overhead and evaluation cost. Finally, the practical benefits of Workspace + Skill come with substantial engineering overhead. Reliable deployment requires not only stronger language models, but also controlled environments, reproducible state snapshots, verifier scripts, permission policies, logging infrastructure, skill tests, and failure recovery procedures. Evaluation also becomes more expensive because success must be judged over trajectories and final workspace states rather than single responses [867, 871]. Thus, the paradigm shifts the primary bottleneck from prompt design to system operations. The most successful future systems will likely be those that make this operational layer scalable: skills must be easy to test and share, workspaces must be easy to safely reset and audit, and task closure must be verifiable without excessive manual human intervention.

⚠ Limitation: Reuse Requires Governance

- Workspace + Skill improves task continuity and procedural reuse, but it also introduces brittleness, stale state, negative transfer, and supply-chain risks.
- Reliable deployment therefore requires skill lifecycle management, workspace hygiene, permission control, sandboxing, rollback, and trajectory-level evaluation.

5 Part IV: Data & Evaluation — Paradigm Shifts Behind the Scenes

From static labels to verifiable trajectories and task closure

Data and evaluation serve as the dual pillars of AI development, fundamentally shaping both what a generation of models can learn during training and how the scientific community defines benchmarks for progress. As large language models transition from conversational chatbots to advanced reasoning systems, autonomous agents, and persistent, OpenClaw-style workstation platforms, both the required training signals and the corresponding evaluation methodologies must undergo a substantial paradigm shift to support these complex architectures. While static text corpora and traditional answer-level benchmarks remain effective for measuring linguistic fluency, they are inherently inadequate for assessing dynamic systems that must reason over long execution traces, dynamically orchestrate tool calls, interact with and modify environments, and consistently produce verifiable final states [872, 873, 874, 875, 876]. Consequently, this section examines the underlying infrastructure required to support this evolutionary shift: data curation must transition from flat instruction-response pairs to complex state-action-observation trajectories, while evaluation must move beyond simple semantic similarity to prioritize end-to-end task closure, system reliability, and overall operational safety under diverse real-world conditions [877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882].




Figure 9. Data paradigm shift: training and evaluation data evolve from static prompt–response pairs to reasoning traces and state–action–observation trajectories. The figure shows why agentic and OpenClaw-style systems require tool outputs, UI states, workspace changes, and final-state evidence rather than only labels.

5.1 Data Paradigm Shift: From “Knowledge Corpus” to “Action Trajectory”

From prompt–response pairs to state–action–observation traces

As shown in Figure 9, LLM evolution is not only about architectures or inference-time reasoning. It is also about what counts as training data and evidence that a model works. Across the chatbot, Thinking LLM, and Agent/OpenClaw stages, the data paradigm moves from knowledge corpora to instruction pairs, then to reasoning-process data, and finally to action trajectories. In the chatbot era, training and evaluation revolved around static text: one user input and one model answer. The answer is judged for correctness, fluency, helpfulness, or preference. Thinking LLMs moved part of the supervision into the reasoning trace itself. Agent and OpenClaw-style systems go further by placing the model inside a workspace with tools, files, browsers, terminals, permissions, and persistent state. In that setting, the data are no longer just prompts and answers. They are state–action–observation traces with tool outputs, UI states, environment feedback, and final-state evidence. The evaluation target is no longer a single response, but whether the system can finish a task end to end, reliably, efficiently, and safely in practice [883, 884, 885, 886, 887]. Table 6 summarizes how the core data unit, supervision signal, resources, and evaluation focus change across these stages.

5.1.1 Chatbot Era: Human-Annotated Dialogue Data (SFT)

In the chatbot and early instruction-tuning stage, the core data were still static language data. Pre-training compressed information from web pages, books, encyclopedias, code, and other text sources into model parameters. Alignment then turned this base model into a dialogue system through human-annotated input-output pairs: a user instruction or context on one side, and a preferred

Table 6. Summary of the data paradigm shift from static knowledge corpora to verifiable action trajectories.

Stage	Core Data Unit	Training / Supervision Signal	Representative Resources	Evaluation Focus
Chatbot	Static corpora and instruction–response pairs	Human demonstrations, preference comparisons, safety labels and dialogue corrections	InstructGPT/RLHF [205], FLAN/T0 [374, 888], Instruct and open data [889, 890, 891]	Answer correctness, fluency, Self-helpfulness, preference alignment, and instruction following on mostly static inputs
Thinking LLM Era	Reasoning-process and intermediate solution paths	Chain-of-thought traces generated reasoning, step-wise preference optimization	Self-CoT / zero-shot CoT [15, 31], Self-Consistency and ToT [412, 421], and Math-Shepherd [34, 892], DeepSeek-R1 [16]	Reliability of the reasoning and path, verifiable math/code performance, step-level correctness, and robustness beyond final-answer accuracy
Agent Era	State–action–observation trajectories with tool feedback	Tool-call traces, API arguments, execution results, environment feedback, and multi-step recovery signals	Toolformer [17], Gorilla / ToolBench [18, 730, 893], WebArena and World [49, 50]	API-Bank Task success in interactive environments, correct selection, argument generation, state tracking, and feedback-driven continuation
OpenClaw Workspace Era	/Workspace-level trajectories plus reusable skills and final-state evidence	File, shell, browser, UI, mission, snapshot, skill-package and safety-policy traces with executable verification	per-SWE-bench [58], Sandbox [894], ATBench-Claw and ClawSafety [895, 896, 897]	Tool-End-to-end task closure, state verifiability, reproducibility, efficiency, rollback behavior, and trajectory-level safety

assistant response on the other. These data required large amounts of human labor, including demonstrations, preference comparisons, safety labels, and instruction-following corrections. InstructGPT established the now-standard pipeline of supervised fine-tuning, reward modeling, and RLHF [205]. Its training mixture made the shift explicit: demonstrations support SFT, comparison data train a reward model, and PPO uses that reward model to optimize the policy rather than merely imitate an answer [205, 499, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906].

Instruction-tuning data then diversified along several routes. The FLAN and T0/P3 lines converted existing NLP tasks into natural-language instructions and showed that broad multi-task prompted training improves zero-shot generalization [374, 888, 907]. Super-NaturalInstructions expanded this idea to more than 1,600 task definitions, making the task description a reusable supervision object [908]. Self-Instruct, Alpaca, Dolly, Vicuna, OpenAssistant, UltraChat, and LIMA explored another axis: self-generated instructions, low-cost open reproduction, open human instruction data, ShareGPT-style dialogue distillation, crowdsourced dialogue trees, synthetic conversations, and small curated SFT data [245, 254, 889, 890, 891, 909, 910]. WizardLM and Orca further moved SFT data from simple answer imitation toward complex instruction evolution and teacher explanation traces [172, 180]. At the same time, preference and feedback datasets became central: summarization feedback, WebGPT, Anthropic HH-RLHF, OpenAssistant rankings, Stanford Human Preferences, UltraFeedback, and related open resources framed alignment data as comparisons, critiques, and fine-grained judgments rather than only gold responses [381, 891, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928].

These benchmarks were mostly static as well. Earlier NLP metrics such as BLEU and ROUGE measured text overlap or summary similarity for machine translation, summarization, and generation tasks [929, 930]. As a historical reference point, evaluation began with surface similarity and moved toward task completion. In the LLM era, MMLU measured broad knowledge and generalization with multi-subject multiple-choice questions [931]. GSM8K and MATH evaluated final-answer correctness in mathematical reasoning [402, 414]. BIG-Bench and HELM gave broader views of model behavior across many task types [932, 933]. As MMLU became saturated, MMLU-Pro added harder reasoning questions and more answer choices [934], while MMMU extended static evaluation to college-level multimodal understanding and reasoning across disciplines [935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941].

At the same time, empirical evaluation started to ask more than “is the answer correct?” IFEval tests whether a given model follows explicit, verifiable constraints such as specific format, length, and keyword requirements [942]. SimpleQA focuses on factuality in short-form question answering tasks [943]. MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena use LLM-as-a-judge frameworks and human preferences to evaluate subjective open-ended dialogue quality [944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949].

The data paradigm in the early SFT stage can therefore be summarized as knowledge corpora plus instruction-answer pairs. The corresponding evaluation paradigm was accuracy, preference, and instruction following on static inputs. This was enough to test whether a model could speak fluently, recall factual knowledge, and answer as requested. It was not enough to test whether it could keep working in a real production environment until the full job was done [950, 951, 952, 953, 954].

5.1.2 Thinking LLM Era: Chain-of-Thought and Process Reward Data (CoT / PRM)

The main change in Thinking LLMs is that training data no longer contain only a question and a final answer. They can also contain Chain-of-Thought traces, intermediate reasoning steps, revision traces, and verification signals. The long-CoT survey by Chen et al. frames this stage as a shift from answer-oriented reasoning to deep reasoning, reflection, and exploration over longer internal trajectories [453]. In data terms, the supervision object becomes a reasoning path: decompositions, calculations, hypotheses, checks, backtracks, and sometimes tool calls. Some traces are human-written; others are model-generated and then filtered, revised, distilled, or rewarded after generation. Few-shot CoT and zero-shot CoT first showed that asking models to write intermediate steps can unlock reasoning without changing model weights [15, 31]. Self-consistency then turned one prompt into multiple sampled paths and selected the answer supported by the most consistent ones, making sampling and aggregation part of the data pipeline [421]. Tree-of-Thoughts generalized this idea from a single chain to branching intermediate states, linking reasoning data with planning-style exploration [412]. STaR and Quiet-STaR pushed the same idea into self-training: models generate rationales, keep or improve those leading to correct answers, and learn internal reasoning before speaking [955, 956]. Self-Refine and Reflexion added feedback, reflection, and revision to the loop, showing that models can record failure information and use it in later attempts [32, 33, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961].

A second data route is domain-specific reasoning distillation, especially for mathematics and code. Instead of treating reasoning traces as generic explanations, these datasets synthesize or collect checkable problem–solution trajectories. MetaMath bootstraps new mathematical questions through question rewriting and answer-conditioned augmentation; WizardMath combines evolved mathematical instructions with reinforced fine-tuning; MAMmoTH mixes natural-language and program-of-thought rationales for math-generalist models; and ToRA integrates natural-language reasoning with executable tool use for mathematical problem solving [189, 962, 963, 964]. These works show why long-CoT data differ from ordinary SFT data: the target is not merely a helpful response, but a reusable search-and-verification trace for difficult mathematical or coding tasks [965, 966, 967, 968, 969].

Process supervision is one of the most important data changes in this stage. A traditional outcome reward model (ORM) typically scores the whole solution by final answer or output quality. That makes it hard to distinguish a mostly correct solution with a minor final arithmetic slip from a flawed reasoning chain that lands on the right answer. A process reward model (PRM) shifts supervision down to each individual reasoning step. It can judge whether a step is valid, whether it introduces an error, and whether it is worth continuing. Earlier verifier work ranked candidate math solutions, while process- and outcome-based feedback made the contrast between final-answer rewards and step-wise supervision explicit [414, 970]. PRM800K annotated step-level correctness in mathematical

reasoning and showed that process supervision can outperform final-answer supervision [34]. Math-Shepherd reduced human annotation dependence through automatically constructed step-level supervision [892]. Preference optimization also changed the role of data. PPO-based RLHF optimizes against a learned reward model, while DPO turns pairwise preference data directly into a policy objective without a separate reward model [382, 499]. For reasoning models, useful feedback is often a verifiable signal: a correct answer, a valid proof step, or generated code that passes tests. DeepSeekMath introduced GRPO, which estimates advantages from groups of sampled answers and removes the separate PPO critic, making large-scale RL on mathematical reasoning data more efficient [35]. DeepSeek-R1 further showed that RL on verifiable reasoning tasks can elicit long-chain reasoning, self-verification, and backtracking [16]. The data start to record how the model searches, fails, checks, and recovers, and the training signal moves from answer imitation to reward-guided exploration over reasoning traces [971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981].

The evaluation stack changed with it. GSM8K and MATH remained useful [402, 414], but they were no longer enough to separate stronger reasoning models. GPQA uses graduate-level science questions to test difficult knowledge-intensive reasoning [982]. AIME became a common measure for mathematical contest reasoning. Code-generation benchmarks add another axis: they typically report code-pass rate, often as Pass@1, to measure whether the first generated solution passes the hidden or public tests. LiveCodeBench uses time splits and real programming problems to reduce contamination [983]. FrontierMath and Humanity’s Last Exam target harder expert-level questions across a wider range of subjects [984, 985]. LiveBench and ARC-AGI-2 reflect two further pressures: benchmarks need to keep changing to limit contamination, and they need to test abstraction and out-of-distribution reasoning rather than memorized patterns [986, 987]. ProcessBench and PRMBench move evaluation inside the reasoning trace by testing whether models can identify faulty steps and whether process reward models are reliable [988, 989]. The object being evaluated is no longer just answer correctness. It is the reliability of the full reasoning path.

5.1.3 Agent & OpenClaw Era: State–Action–Observation Trajectories

Agent data move beyond reasoning traces into interactive environment logs. A tool-augmented task can usually be written as a sequence of states, actions, and observations: the model reads the current task and environment state, chooses a tool or UI action, receives a result, and plans the next move. These trajectories may include tool-call traces, multimodal UI-action traces, screenshots, DOM states, terminal output, file changes, error messages, and explicit feedback signals. Toolformer was an early attempt to let models learn API calls through self-supervision [17]. API-Bank, Gorilla/APIBench, ToolAlpaca, and ToolBench/ToolLLM then built data for tool selection, argument filling, multi-API composition, and tool-use trajectories [18, 730, 893, 990, 991]. The central question is no longer “what answer should the model write?” It becomes “which action should be taken in this state, and how should the model use the feedback to continue toward completion?”

In OpenClaw-style workspace intelligence, the execution trace becomes richer again. It is not only an API name, a JSON argument object, and a return value. It can include terminal errors, file-system snapshots, browser DOM changes, UI screenshots, background processes, strict permission boundaries, and task history. WebArena models interactive web pages through screenshots, HTML DOM, and accessibility trees [50]. OSWorld places agents inside a real operating system and covers various desktop applications, web applications, file I/O, and cross-application workflows [49]. ClawsBench uses high-fidelity simulated services such as Gmail, Slack, Calendar, Docs, and Drive, with state management and deterministic snapshot/restore for reproducible evaluation [895].

A second change is that reusable skill assets become part of the data. These may come from human experts or strong agents working inside a specific workspace: operation recordings, command sequences, checklists, recovery procedures, and written experience. Voyager stores and reuses complex behavior through a retrievable executable skill library [51]. Agent S reuses external knowledge and internal experience through experience-augmented hierarchical planning [992]. ClawsBench explicitly treats domain skills as an independent variable in agent scaffolding [895]. Put differently, OpenClaw data are not just about which tool was called. They also describe the worksite, the constraints, and the learned procedure used to finish the task. This is why Skill plus Workspace is a real transition: the upper bound of the system depends on the model, the environment structure, the accumulated skills, and the reuse of task experience.

Skill data should not be treated as one-off prompts. The OpenClaw skill format describes a skill as a structured directory asset containing `SKILL.md`, metadata, version information, runtime requirements, and dependencies. A modular skill that can be evaluated properly should specify its version, dependencies, trigger conditions, preconditions, postconditions, failure cases, rollback behavior, and safety permissions. Evaluating a skill is not only checking whether it succeeds once in isolation. It also means checking whether it remains stable when software versions, APIs, permissions, and inputs change. ClawKeeper brings skills, plugins, and watchers into the safety layer, which shows that the skill lifecycle is now part of OpenClaw system reliability [993].

Agent evaluation also moved from static questions to dynamic environments, but not along a single path. Several benchmark families converged. The first is tool use: API-Bank, Gorilla/APIBench, ToolBench, and ToolSandbox test tool selection, argument generation, stateful tool calls, and multi-turn feedback [18, 730, 893, 894]. The second is web agents: WebShop, Mind2Web, WebArena, BrowseComp, and ClawBench move from simulated shopping and offline traces toward sandboxed sites, long browsing tasks, cross-page information gathering, and production-site interaction [50, 994, 995, 996, 997]. The third is computer-use and workflow agents: SWE-bench uses real GitHub issues, code patches, and tests to verify software-engineering tasks [58]; OSWorld verifies desktop tasks through configured initial states and execution-based scripts [49]; Terminal-Bench, WorkArena, and τ -bench cover CLI work, enterprise software, and multi-turn user-tool interaction [48, 790, 998]. A fourth direction is OpenClaw-oriented vertical-domain sandboxes, where the benchmark fixes a realistic workspace for software engineering, office productivity, data analysis, scientific discovery, humanities research, or enterprise operations, then measures whether the agent can close the task under domain tools, data, and safety constraints. This matters because expert benchmarks already judge frontier models across scientific and broad disciplinary knowledge, not only coding or office work: GPQA targets graduate-level science, MMMU covers college-level multimodal disciplinary reasoning, and Humanity's Last Exam spans a wide expert range [935, 982, 985]. OpenClaw is not an isolated benchmark that appeared out of nowhere. It is where these lines meet at workspace-level intelligence, with the model, tools, skills, state, permissions, and safety policies all becoming part of the evaluation object [999, 1000, 1001, 1002, 1003, 1004].

Moving beyond single tool calls, OpenClaw concretizes this shift by asking how a model understands files, web pages, terminals, permissions, task history, and skill packages in constrained workspaces, and whether it can execute real workflows. ClawsBench evaluates task success and unsafe-action rates in simulated productivity services such as Gmail, Slack, and Drive, analyzing how domain skills and meta prompts affect OpenClaw agents [895]. ATBench-Claw extends evaluation to trajectory-level safety diagnosis across tools, skills, sessions, and external action chains [896]. ClawSafety, OpenClaw safety evaluation, and ClawKeeper point to the same issue: once an agent has file, shell, network, and third-party skill permissions, the risk exceeds wrong answers, including credential leakage, unauthorized action, malicious execution, or system-level damage [796, 897, 993].

Therefore, Agent/OpenClaw benchmarks need several concrete properties: reproducible initial states, executable tools or workspaces, full trajectory logs, final-state verification, cost and efficiency records, and safety checks. The core metrics also have to move beyond single-question accuracy or pass@1:

- **Task success rate:** whether the system moves the task from its initial state to a verifiable final deliverable, rather than only producing a plan or explanation. WebArena, OSWorld, and ClawsBench all use end-to-end task success to evaluate real interaction tasks [49, 50, 895].
- **State verifiability:** whether completion can be checked through external evidence such as tests, database diffs, file diffs, UI state, email state, calendar state, or document state, instead of relying on the model’s own claim. SWE-bench requires code changes to pass tests before an issue is counted as solved [58]. OSWorld includes initial-state configuration and custom execution-based evaluation scripts for each task [49].
- **Execution reliability:** whether the system can diagnose errors, recover, and stay consistent when APIs fail, pages change, networks lag, or files are modified. Voyager and Agent S both show that environment feedback, execution errors, and experience retrieval matter for reliability in long-horizon tasks [51, 992].
- **Efficiency:** the number of steps, tool calls, tokens, wall-clock time, and human interventions needed to finish the task. τ -bench, ToolSandbox, and ClawsBench include interaction rounds, tool calls, cost, or safety-success trade-offs in their analysis, rather than reporting only final success [894, 895, 998].
- **Reproducibility:** whether the environment supports fixed initial states, snapshot/restore, trajectory logs, replay, and final-state diffs. Without these controls, comparisons between agents are unreliable. ClawsBench was built partly to avoid irreversible actions on live services, using high-fidelity mock services with full state management and deterministic snapshot [895].
- **Trajectory-level safety:** whether unsafe behavior appears anywhere in the action chain, including unauthorized access, credential exposure, malicious skill execution, skipped confirmation, mistaken authorization, and irreversible damage. ATBench-Claw evaluates and diagnoses trajectory-level safety for OpenClaw tools, skills, sessions, and external action chains [896]. ClawSafety also argues that local high-privilege personal agents face prompt injection, malicious skills, email attacks, web content attacks, and other multi-channel threats, so safety evaluation must cover the model, the agent framework, and the execution stack [897].

The question that matters is no longer whether the model can produce a plausible answer. It is whether the system can take a task in a realistic or high-fidelity workspace and drive it to completion. Older benchmarks look like static snapshots: one question, one answer, one score. OpenClaw evaluation is closer to a recorded work session. The model has to perceive, decide, act, check, and repair while the environment changes around it. The low success rates reported by WebArena and OSWorld already show that real web and desktop environments are much harder than static question answering [49, 50]. ClawsBench adds another practical concern: evaluating productivity agents on live services can create irreversible side effects, so high-fidelity simulated services, state snapshots, and safety-critical scenarios are needed [895]. Running one such evaluation can take tens of minutes in a sandbox, consume many tokens, and produce a long execution trace. That cost is not an accident of implementation. It is evidence that the evaluation object has fundamentally changed.

Challenges

Data Scarcity, Expert Annotation, and Temporal Decay. This shift creates a harder data problem, as high-quality action trajectories cannot be passively scraped from the web. They are scarce because they require a real task, a realistic workspace, correct actions, and a verifiable final state. Benchmarks such as WebArena, OSWorld, and ClawsBench make this cost visible by requiring executable environments, configured initial states, and final-state checks rather than static labels [49, 50, 895]. Annotation is exceptionally expensive: experts must demonstrate workflows, label intermediate failures, check dynamic tool outputs, and verify the final workspace state. This overhead is compounded in scientific discovery and humanities research, where expert judgment is scarce, evidence may be incomplete or interpretive, and success is often not reducible to a unit test, UI diff, or single ground-truth answer; GPQA, MMMU, and Humanity’s Last Exam show this pressure even before tasks become interactive [935, 982, 985]. Furthermore, these trajectories age rapidly. UI layouts change, APIs return different errors, websites add controls, and enterprise tools revise permissions; a valid trajectory may drift out of date within months, making dynamic web and desktop benchmarks hard to reproduce and compare, demanding continuous maintenance [49, 50, 995].

Simulation Bottlenecks, Stateful Environments, and Generation Security. Simulators help mitigate these data collection challenges, but environmental realism becomes its own bottleneck. If a sandbox is too simple, agents learn brittle shortcuts; if too close to a live service, evaluation becomes costly, risky, and hard to reset, forcing a difficult trade-off between fidelity and safety. ToolSandbox and ClawsBench use controlled stateful environments and snapshot/restore mechanisms, but also show the infrastructure credible agent evaluation requires [894, 895]. Finally, scalable trajectory generation remains unresolved. Self-play, synthetic tasks, and agent demonstrations can increase data volume, but without strong state verification and safety filters, they risk amplifying incorrect habits, unsafe tool use, and spurious completion. Consequently, managing these risks is paramount; trajectory-level safety work on OpenClaw-style agents treats these action-chain failures as first-class evaluation targets to prevent out-of-distribution execution [896, 897, 993, 1005, 1006, 1007].

💡 Challenge: From Static Labels to Verifiable Trajectories

- For model training, agent and OpenClaw data must capture complete state–action–observation trajectories, including tool outputs, workspace changes, intermediate failures, and final-state evidence rather than relying solely on prompt–response pairs.
- Comprehensive evaluation therefore shifts from answer-level accuracy to task closure, reproducibility, efficiency, and trajectory-level safety, which makes the deployment of realistic sandboxes and scalable verification infrastructure increasingly essential.

5.2 Evaluation Paradigm Shift: From Output Scoring to Task-State Verification

From “Final-Answer Accuracy” to “Process Judgment” and “Task Closure”

As shown in Figure 10, evaluation evolves with the object being evaluated through three stages. First, static-input tasks are scored by final-output correctness metrics such as accuracy [1008, 1009, 1010, 1011, 1012]. Second, long reasoning traces are inspected by LLM-as-a-judge and process-level verifiers for coherence, faithfulness, and correctness [64, 1013, 1014, 1015]. Third, agentic systems are judged by task closure: whether tool use and environment changes leave the workspace in a state that satisfies the user’s intent. Table 7 summarizes this shift from final-answer evaluation to process judgment and workspace-level task-state verification [63, 1016, 1017, 1018, 1019].




Figure 10. Evaluation paradigm shift: evaluation moves from final-answer correctness to process judgment and task closure. The figure summarizes how next-generation systems must be assessed by reasoning validity, environment state changes, reliability, efficiency, reproducibility, and safety.

Table 7. Summary of the evaluation paradigm shift from final-answer scoring to process judgment and workspace-level task closure.

Stage	Evaluation Object	Core Metrics	Representative Bench-Mark	Main Limitation
Final-Output Evaluation	Static answers, labels, generated text, or executable final outputs	Accuracy, exact match, BLEU/ROUGE, preference win rate, and Pass@1	MMLU, GSM8K / MATH, GPQA / FrontierMath, BIG-Bench / HELM	Scores the endpoint but cannot reveal whether the model used a valid reasoning path or merely reached the right answer accidentally
Process-Level Evaluation	Reasoning traces, intermediate steps, critiques, and verification paths	Step correctness, judge preference, process-reward, consistency, and contamination resistance	Hard2Verify, DeltaBench, contam-Bench / PRMBench	/Improves trace inspection but Process-may rely on judge models, incomplete process labels, or reasoning that is not grounded in external state
Task-Closure Evaluation	Interactive trajectories and final workspace states after tool, web, file, or UI operations	Task success rate, final-state verification, efficiency, reliability, reproducibility, and trajectory-level safety	SWE-bench, WebArena, OSWorld, ToolSandbox / τ -bench	Requires executable environments, reproducible initial states, trajectory logs, replay mechanisms, and costly final-state checks
Workspace OpenClaw Evaluation	Persistent workspaces with skills, permissions, snapshots, external services, and auditable action chains	Closure rate, unsafe-action rate, rollback behavior, external stability, state diffs, ditability, and governance compliance	Claw-Eval, ClawBench, ClawsBench, ATBench-Claw, ClawSafety	Makes evaluation realistic but increases infrastructure cost, safety risk, simulator-design burden, and cross-run comparability challenges

5.2.1 Stage I: Final-Output Accuracy and Answer Correctness

The first evaluation stage treats the model primarily as a generator of final answers. The central object is a single output: whether it matches a reference answer, satisfies a label, or is preferred as a response. For classification, multiple-choice QA, and short-answer reasoning tasks, simple metrics such as accuracy directly measure final-answer correctness. MMLU evaluates multi-subject knowledge through multiple-choice accuracy, while GSM8K and MATH evaluate mathematical reasoning by final-answer correctness [402, 414, 931]. Earlier generation metrics such as BLEU and ROUGE compare final text with references through n-gram overlap or summary similarity [929, 930]. BIG-Bench and HELM broaden this paradigm across tasks and dimensions, but the evaluation unit remains the produced answer [932, 933, 1020, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024].

This initial stage is effective when the task has a clear label, executable answer, or reference output. It is also relatively easy to scale because outputs can be scored automatically. However, final-output accuracy has an important methodological limitation: it does not explain how the answer was obtained. A model may produce the correct answer for the wrong reason, or produce a wrong answer after an almost correct chain of reasoning. Therefore, as LLMs begin to solve harder problems through long reasoning traces, evaluation must move beyond Acc-style final-result scoring and ask whether the reasoning process itself is valid and reliable [1025, 1026, 1027, 1028, 1029]. Table 8 lists representative models and methods under this traditional final-output evaluation setting.

Table 8. Representative models and methods for Stage I final-output evaluation. Scores are reported under the original benchmark metrics; unavailable base models or unreported scores are denoted by “-”. Rows sharing FastMCTS or CodeI/O citation numbers are variants or baselines reported in the same source paper.

Model	Base Model	MMLU	MMLU-Pro	GSM8K	MATH	MATH-500	HumanEval
GPT-5.4 [577]	-	94.0	87.0	98.1	90.2	-	94.1
Claude Opus 4.6 [575]	-	92.1	82.5	97.8	91.5	-	92.4
Gemini 3.1 Pro [572]	-	92.6	91.2	94.2	85.3	-	87.6
DeepSeek-V4-Pro-Base [1030]	-	90.1	73.5	92.6	64.5	-	76.8
Qwen3.7 Max [1031]	-	-	89.6	-	94.6	-	92.4
GLM-5.1 [587]	-	89.0	86.0	95.3	83.4	-	88.6
SAGE-32B (Think) [1032]	Qwen2.5-32B [357]	90.2	79.3	96.7	-	91.8	-
Warmup K&K [1033]	Qwen2.5-14B [357]	-	62.7	-	-	77.4	-
AceMath-72B-Instruct [1034]	Qwen2.5-Math-72B-Instruct [1035]	-	-	96.4	86.1	-	-
PromptCoT-DS-7B [1036]	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B [468]	-	-	92.6	-	93.0	-
Nemotron-CrossThink-32B [1037]	Qwen2.5-32B [357]	83.6	69.4	-	-	84.0	-
Introspective X Training [1038]	-	50.9	27.9	59.5	46.5	-	54.9
CoT2-Meta [1039]	Claude Sonnet 4.5 [540]	-	88.4	98.6	92.8	-	72.8
Guideline Forest [1040]	GPT-4o-mini [333]	-	-	93.5	-	69.2	95.4
STOP-ECN [1041]	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B [468]	-	-	91.1	-	86.8	-
FastMCTS+Branch-DPO [1042]	FastMCTS-7B	-	-	89.9	75.4	-	-
FastMCTS [1042]	Qwen2.5-7B [357]	-	-	88.9	74.0	-	-
Rejection Sampling [1042]	Qwen2.5-7B [357]	-	-	87.1	70.0	-	-
SBS [512]	DeepSeek-Math-7B-Base [35]	-	-	84.1	66.3	-	-
MCTS [512]	DeepSeek-Math-7B-Base [35]	-	-	83.2	64.0	-	-
DeepSeekMath-7B-RL [35]	DeepSeekMath-7B [35]	-	-	88.2	51.7	-	-
SimPO [1043]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct [1035]	-	-	88.8	40.0	56.6	-
Self-Explore [979]	DeepSeek-Math-7B-Base [35]	-	-	78.6	37.7	-	-
DeepSeek-Coder-V2-Instruct [322]	-	-	-	94.9	75.7	-	90.2
OMI2 (Full) [1044]	Qwen2.5-Coder-7B [370]	-	-	88.5	73.2	-	-
CODEI/O [1044]	Qwen2.5-Coder-7B [370]	-	-	86.4	71.9	-	-
PyEdu [1044]	Qwen2.5-Coder-7B [370]	-	-	85.8	71.4	-	-
MathCoder-CL [1045]	Code-Llama-7B [187]	-	-	67.8	30.2	-	-

Table 9. Representative models and methods for Stage II process-level reasoning evaluation. Scores are reported in the original benchmark metrics; unavailable base models or unreported scores are denoted by “-”.

Model / Method	Base Model	Hard2Verify						DeltaBench				ProcessBench				PRMBench			
		Step A	Step F1	Resp. A	Resp. F1	ErrID A	ErrID F1	Avg.	HM	Corr.	Err.	GSM8K	MATH	Olympiad	Omni	Overall	Simp.	Sound.	Sens.
GPT-5 [532]	-	86.5	85.8	89.7	89.5	70.6	69.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gemini 2.5 Pro [563]	-	83.4	83.1	85.7	85.5	52.5	52.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Claude Sonnet 4 [519]	-	70.6	60.4	78.2	73.4	53.5	39.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DeepSeek-R1 [16]	-	68.9	62.3	74.0	72.8	54.2	45.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67.8	62.9	71.4	77.1	
Qwen3-235B-A22B [528]	-	72.5	64.0	79.4	77.9	60.9	50.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Qwen3-Next-80B-A3B [355]	-	67.9	54.7	75.1	68.3	58.3	43.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
GPT-4o [1046]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49.9	48.7	42.0	57.9	79.2	63.6	51.4	53.5	66.8	59.7	70.9	75.8
o1-mini [518]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93.2	88.9	87.2	82.4	68.8	64.6	72.1	75.5
Gemini-2.0-thinking-exp-1219 [527]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68.8	66.2	71.8	75.3	
QwQ-32B-Preview [522]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88.0	78.7	57.8	61.3	63.6	56.4	68.2	73.5
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct [295]	-	54.3	18.4	57.0	28.2	49.4	2.5	-	-	-	-	82.9	59.4	46.7	43.0	-	-	-	-
Qwen2.5-72B-Instruct [357]	-	56.0	26.4	61.1	46.9	26.5	16.4	-	-	-	-	76.2	61.8	54.6	52.2	-	-	-	-
Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct [357]	-	60.5	47.6	63.4	63.2	43.5	18.9	-	-	-	-	69.3	53.3	45.0	41.3	-	-	-	-
Qwen2.5-Math-72B-Instruct [1035]	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.8	52.1	32.5	31.7	57.4	55.1	61.1	67.1
Qwen2.5-Math-PRM-72B [1047]	Qwen2.5-Math-72B	55.8	35.5	66.8	64.9	41.8	37.3	-	-	-	-	87.3	80.6	74.3	71.1	68.2	54.6	73.9	77.0
Qwen2.5-Math-PRM-7B [1047]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B	57.6	42.4	63.1	57.6	35.0	32.5	-	-	-	-	82.4	77.6	67.5	66.3	65.5	52.1	71.0	75.5
UniversalPRM-7B [1048]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B-Instruct	64.2	60.3	54.7	41.5	26.1	26.0	-	-	-	-	85.8	77.7	67.6	66.4	-	-	-	-
ActPRM-X [1049]	Qwen2.5-Math-PRM-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	82.7	82.0	72.0	67.3	66.7	54.5	72.7	75.6
ActPRM [1049]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.6	79.8	71.4	67.0	65.5	53.6	71.3	75.2
RefCritic-R1-14B [1050]	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86.3	82.0	67.6	72.3	-	-	-	-
RefCritic-Qwen-14B [1050]	Qwen2.5-14B-Instruct	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.9	71.2	58.1	60.7	-	-	-	-
FlexiVe (Think@64) [1051]	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88.1	90.1	86.7	80.4	-	-	-	-
FlexiVe (Flex@128) [1051]	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-14B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	83.0	85.0	80.0	75.2	-	-	-	-
GenPRM-32B (Maj@8) [1052]	Qwen2.5-32B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.1	86.3	78.9	80.1	-	-	-	-
GenPRM-7B (Maj@8) [1052]	Qwen2.5-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81.0	85.7	78.4	76.8	-	-	-	-
SPC (Round 2) [1053]	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.5	59.5	68.2	52.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPC (Round 1) [1053]	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.8	57.3	68.4	49.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SPC (Round 0) [1053]	Qwen2.5-7B-Instruct	-	-	-	-	-	-	54.9	53.5	45.9	64.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Qwen2.5-Math-7B-PRM800K [988]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.5	41.3	90.1	26.8	68.2	62.6	50.7	44.3	-	-	-	-
Pure-PRM-7B [1054]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69.0	66.5	48.4	45.9	65.3	52.2	70.2	75.8
Skywork-PRM-7B [1055]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B	38.5	34.1	56.8	29.8	11.6	8.4	-	-	-	-	70.8	53.6	22.9	21.0	65.1	59.6	68.5	73.3
Math-Shepherd-PRM-7B [892]	Mistral-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	53.3	14.3	7.7	98.8	47.9	29.5	24.8	23.8	47.0	47.1	45.7	60.7
RLHFlow-PRM-Mistral-8B [1056]	Llama-3.1-8B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50.4	33.4	13.8	15.8	54.4	46.7	57.5	68.5
ReasonEval-34B [1057]	CodeLlama-34B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	60.5	51.5	63.0	73.1
ReasonFlux-PRM-7B [1058]	DeepSeek-R1-Distill-Qwen-7B	53.1	22.4	55.9	53.8	42.5	28.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
uPRM [1059]	Qwen2.5-Math-7B	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.3	52.6	42.7	39.8	-	-	-	-

Notes. Hard2Verify reports Balanced Accuracy (A) and Balanced F1 for Step-Level, Response-Level, and ErrorID tasks. DeltaBench reports Average, harmonic mean (HM), correct-step recall, and error-step recall; the listed DeltaBench scores follow the comparison protocol in Chen et al. [1053]. ProcessBench columns report F1 on GSM8K/MATH/OlympiadBench/OmniMATH. PRMBench reports the overall PRMScore and category-average PRMScores for Simplicity, Soundness, and Sensitivity. Scores are taken from the corresponding benchmark papers or official benchmark result tables, while rows cite the model or method itself unless the method is a benchmark-trained baseline.

5.2.2 Stage II: LLM-as-Judge for Long-Chain Reasoning and Process Verification

The second stage emerges when the model’s output is no longer just an answer but a long reasoning chain. For Thinking LLMs, the evaluation target expands from “is the final answer correct?” to “is the reasoning trajectory correct, coherent, and verifiable?” Mathematical and scientific benchmarks such as AIME, GPQA, FrontierMath, Humanity’s Last Exam, MMLU-Pro, and MMMU increase problem difficulty and make shallow answer matching less reliable [934, 935, 982, 984, 985]. Code benchmarks provide process-sensitive verification: generated programs can be executed, and metrics such as Pass@1 test whether the first solution passes unit tests [192, 983, 1060, 1061, 1062, 1063, 1064].

In this stage, LLM-as-a-judge becomes essential as intermediate chains lack simple reference labels. Extending the pairwise preferences of MT-Bench and Chatbot Arena [944], judge models can inspect reasoning traces for step-by-step logic, hidden assumptions, and final support. ProcessBench and PRMBench make this process-level evaluation explicit by testing if models can identify incorrect intermediate steps [988, 989]. Meanwhile, LiveBench and ARC-AGI-2 emphasize dynamic, abstraction-oriented evaluations to reduce contamination [986, 987]. Thus, evaluation shifts from scoring only endpoints to judging the long-chain reasoning process itself [1065, 1066, 1067, 1068, 1069, 1070]. Table 9 summarizes these representative methods and scores.

Table 10. Representative models and methods for Stage III task-closure evaluation. Scores are original task success or pass rates; unavailable base models or unreported scores are denoted by “-”.

Model / Method	Base Model	SWE-V	Terminal 2.0	OSWorld-V	WebArena-V	BrowseComp	MCP-Atlas
GPT-5.4 xHigh [577]	-	-	75.1	75.0	67.3	82.7	67.2
Claude Opus 4.6 Max [575]	-	80.8	65.4	-	-	83.7	73.8
Gemini 3.1 Pro High [572]	-	80.6	68.5	-	-	85.9	69.2
DeepSeek-V4-Pro Max [1030]	-	80.6	67.9	-	-	83.4	73.6
Kimi-K2.6 Thinking [585]	-	80.2	66.7	-	-	83.2	66.6
GLM-5.1 Thinking [587]	-	-	63.5	-	-	79.3	71.8
UI-TARS-2 [1071]	UI-TARS-2	68.7	45.3*	-	-	29.6*	-
OpenCUA-72B [1072]	Qwen2.5-VL-72B	-	-	45.0	-	-	-
SWE-Exp [1073]	Claude 4 Sonnet	73.0	-	-	-	-	-
Kimi-Dev [1074]	Qwen2.5-72B-Base	60.4	-	-	-	-	-
SWE-Master-32B-RL [1075]	Qwen2.5-Coder-32B	61.4	-	-	-	-	-
PDR+RTV [1076]	Gemini 3.1 Pro [572]	76.6	64.8	-	-	-	-
TACT-GATE [1077]	Qwen3.5-27B	73.3	36.0	-	-	-	-
IHR+NLAH [1078]	GPT-5.4-mini	73.0	53.9	-	-	-	-
Polar RL (Pi) [1079]	Qwen3.5-4B	40.4	-	-	-	-	-
SA-SWE-32B [1080]	Qwen3-32B [145]	39.4	16.3	-	-	19.4 (+)	-
CODESKILL [1081]	Qwen3.5-35B-A3B	66.0	34.1	-	-	-	-
CodeScout-14B [1082]	Qwen3-Coder-30B-A3B	46.0	-	-	-	-	-
TACO [1083]	MiniMax-M2.5 [576]	-	44.2	-	-	-	-
ComputerRL [1084]	GLM-4.1V-9B-Thinking	-	-	48.0	-	-	-
UltraCUA-32B-RL [1085]	UltraCUA-32B	-	-	43.7	-	-	-
OS-Symphony [1086]	GPT-5	-	-	65.8	-	-	-

Notes. SWE-V denotes SWE-bench Verified. OSWorld-V denotes OSWorld-Verified. WebArena-V denotes WebArena-Verified. Terminal 2.0 denotes Terminal-Bench v2.0. Retained columns were selected using Semantic Scholar citation-overlap among representative Stage III benchmark families and pruning redundant or less representative columns. Static frontier rows use one model source per row; Terminal 2.0, BrowseComp, and MCP-Atlas scores follow the DeepSeek-V4-Pro comparative report [1030] unless an official row source reports the metric directly. Rows discovered through benchmark-overlap are included only when the source reports an end-to-end task-closure metric on a retained column. UI-TARS-2 scores marked with “use the paper’s extended GUI-SDK setting; its BrowseComp is BrowseComp-en. SA-SWE-32B reports BrowseComp-Plus, marked with(+)”.

5.2.3 Stage III: Agent & OpenClaw Era: Task Closure Rate

The third stage appears when LLMs become agents that operate tools, call APIs, browse websites, write files, and modify external environments. At this point, neither final-answer accuracy nor process judgment is sufficient. A reasoning trace may look valid, but the task is still incomplete if the code does not pass tests, the web order is not submitted, the document is not updated, or the calendar event is created with the wrong constraints. The evaluation target therefore becomes task closure: whether the system can transform an initial environment state into the intended final state. SWE-bench evaluates software-engineering agents by whether real GitHub issues are resolved through patches that pass tests, while WebShop and WebArena evaluate whether agents can complete interactive web tasks rather than merely describe how to do them [50, 58, 994]. Mind2Web, OSWorld, WorkArena, ToolSandbox, and τ -bench broaden this closure-based perspective to offline web traces, desktop operating systems, enterprise workflows, stateful tool use, and multi-turn user-tool interaction [48, 49, 894, 995, 998, 1087, 1088, 1089, 1090, 1091]. Table 10 compares representative task-closure evaluation results for agentic systems.

Table 11. Representative models and methods for Stage IV workspace and OpenClaw evaluation. Scores are reported under the original benchmark metrics; lower ClawSafety ASR is better.

Model / Method	Setting	Claw-Eval	ClawBench	ClawsBench	ATBench-Claw	ClawSafety
		Gen. Multi	SR	TSR UAR SCR	Acc. F1 Rec.	ASR ↓
Claude Opus 4.6 [575]	OpenClaw on/on	70.8 68.4	-	63.0 23.0 50.0	- - -	-
Claude Sonnet 4.6 [1092]	OpenClaw / ClawSafety	68.3 65.8	33.3	56.0 13.0 48.0	- - -	40.0
MiMo-V2.5-Pro [584]	Claw-Eval	64.0 63.2	-	- - -	- - -	-
GLM-5.1 [587]	Claw-Eval	62.7 60.5	-	- - -	- - -	-
Muse Spark [1093]	Claw-Eval	62.7 68.4	-	- - -	- - -	-
Kimi K2.6 [585]	Claw-Eval	61.5 65.8	-	- - -	- - -	-
GPT-5.4 [577]	OpenClaw on/on	60.2 60.5	6.5	53.0 7.0 41.0	- - -	-
DeepSeek V4 Pro [1030]	Claw-Eval	58.4 65.8	-	- - -	- - -	-
Qwen3.6 Plus [1094]	Claw-Eval	57.1 65.8	-	- - -	- - -	-
Qwen3.5-397B-A17B [571]	AgentDoG prompt	57.8 52.6	-	- - -	83.8 86.5 87.5	-
GLM-5 [1095]	OpenClaw text-only / on/on	- -	24.2	60.0 23.0 48.0	- - -	-
Gemini 3 Flash [559]	ClawBench	- -	19.0	- - -	- - -	-
Claude Haiku 4.5 [543]	ClawBench	- -	18.3	- - -	- - -	-
Gemini 3.1 Flash-Lite [1096]	OpenClaw on/on	- -	3.3	39.0 23.0 26.0	- - -	-
Kimi K2.5 [569]	OpenClaw / ClawSafety	52.8 50.0	0.7	- - -	- - -	60.8
Gemini 3.1 Pro [572]	OpenClaw on/on	55.9 65.8	-	58.0 10.0 48.0	- - -	-
Qwen3Guard-Gen-8B [1097]	Guard model	- -	-	- - -	52.1 36.3 23.1	-
Llama-Guard-4-12B [1098]	Guard model	- -	-	- - -	74.4 73.4 60.0	-
ShieldAgent [1099]	Guard model	- -	-	- - -	68.1 60.1 43.3	-
Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct [1100]	AgentDoG prompt	- -	-	- - -	80.6 82.3 76.4	-
AgentDoG-Qwen3-4B [1101]	AgentDoG	- -	-	- - -	87.2 89.6 92.9	-
Gemini 2.5 Pro [563]	OpenClaw	- -	-	- - -	- - -	55.0
DeepSeek V3 [143]	OpenClaw	- -	-	- - -	- - -	67.5
GPT-5.1 [549]	OpenClaw	- -	-	- - -	- - -	75.0
Claude Sonnet 4.6 + Nanobot [1102]	Nanobot scaffold	- -	-	- - -	- - -	48.6
Claude Sonnet 4.6 + NemoClaw [1103]	NemoClaw scaffold	- -	-	- - -	- - -	45.8

Notes. Claw-Eval reports general and multi-turn PassAll³ from the public leaderboard [1104]. ClawBench reports live-web task success rate [997]. ClawsBench reports Task Success Rate (TSR), Unsafe Action Rate (UAR), and Safe Completion Rate (SCR) for OpenClaw on/on unless otherwise noted [895]; on/on means domain skills on and meta prompt on. ATBench-Claw reports trajectory-safety Acc./F1/Recall, converted to percentages [896]. ClawSafety reports overall attack success rate (ASR), where lower is better [897].

5.2.4 Stage IV: Workspace/OpenClaw Capability and Safety

OpenClaw-oriented benchmarks make the task-closure view more explicit. ClawBench evaluates everyday online task completion, while ClawsBench evaluates productivity agents in simulated workspaces with services such as Gmail, Slack, Calendar, Docs, and Drive, combining capability and safety measurements under reproducible state management [895, 997]. The metric stack, therefore changes again. Success rate measures whether the end-to-end task is completed. Reliability measures whether completion remains stable across long horizons, noisy observations, web layout changes, API failures, and partial mistakes. The efficiency measures tool calls, turns, tokens, wall-clock time, and human interventions. Reproducibility requires fixed initial states, state snapshots, trajectory logs, replayable actions, and final-state diffs. Without these controls, apparent success may be impossible to audit or compare [1105, 1106, 1107, 1108, 1109].

Safety and guardrails also become first-class evaluation targets in the task-closure stage. In a chatbot setting, an unsafe answer is usually a textual failure; in an agentic workspace, an unsafe action can leak private data, modify files, trigger external side effects, or execute an untrusted skill. ATBench-Claw evaluates trajectory-level safety diagnosis for OpenClaw-style agents, while ClawSafety, systematic

OpenClaw security evaluation, and ClawKeeper highlight risks from prompt injection, unintended operations, malicious skills, privacy leakage, and weak runtime protection [796, 896, 897, 993]. The evaluation paradigm, therefore, moves through three increasingly demanding objects: the final answer, the reasoning process, and finally the closed task state. Table 11 summarizes representative workspace/OpenClaw evaluation results across capability, reliability, and safety metrics.

🔍 Key Difference: Evaluation Object

- **Trend:** Evaluation is shifting from judging isolated final answers to inspecting reasoning trajectories and ultimately verifying whether the intended environment state has been achieved, *thereby ensuring robust alignment with complex human objectives.*
- **Challenge:** Task-closure evaluation requires reproducible initial states, trajectory logs, replayable actions, and final-state diffs; otherwise, agent success is difficult to audit or compare *systematically across different models and complex environments.*

6 Open Challenges and Future Directions

From Model-Centric Capability to Ecosystem-Level Reliability

The preceding sections have traced a clear trajectory from language generation to reasoning, tool use, and workspace-level task execution. This progression marks a shift from AI systems that primarily answer questions to AI systems acting within digital environments. However, greater autonomy also changes the nature of failure: errors are no longer limited to incorrect text, but may involve unsafe tool calls, corrupted workspace states, incomplete task closure, or untraceable long-horizon behavior.

This final section therefore focuses on the central challenge facing next-generation generative AI systems: how to make autonomy reliable in practice. We first summarize the open problems that prevent current agents from evolving into dependable digital colleagues. We then outline future directions toward self-evolving AI ecosystems, where models, contexts, tools, skills, workspaces, and governance mechanisms are engineered as an integrated whole.

6.1 Open Challenges: Making Autonomy Reliable

From Impressive Demonstrations to Dependable Digital Work

As shown in Figure 11, despite significant recent progress, current LLM-based agents remain far from trustworthy digital workers. Their capabilities may appear impressive in isolated demonstrations, but real-world production deployment requires stable performance across long horizons, safe operation under strict permission constraints, persistent memory resisting collapse under growing context, and careful management of social and organizational consequences. The key challenge is not merely to make agents more capable, but to ensure that their autonomous behavior remains auditable, recoverable, controllable, and closely aligned with human values, ethical principles, and boundaries.

6.1.1 Long-Horizon Reliability and Task Closure

From Demonstrated Capability to Stable Completion

The evaluation shift toward task closure reveals a major reliability bottleneck: an agent must not only reason correctly at individual steps, but also maintain progress until the intended environment

Open Challenges in Making AI Autonomy Reliable




Figure 11. Open challenges for reliable autonomy: as agents move from answering to acting in workspaces, failures become longer-horizon, stateful, and harder to reverse. The figure summarizes key bottlenecks around task closure, safety and governance, memory, context management, and persistent workspace state.

state is achieved. Long-horizon tasks introduce several sources of instability. Errors can propagate across tool calls, partial failures can leave the workspace in inconsistent states, and early planning mistakes may only become visible after many irreversible actions.

Skill encapsulation partially mitigates this problem by turning common procedures into reusable units. However, composing skills into longer workflows introduces new interface-level failure modes. A skill may generate an output that is syntactically valid but semantically unsuitable for the next skill, while another may silently fail while leaving misleading traces. Therefore, reliable autonomy requires explicit mechanisms for progress monitoring, intermediate verification, self-healing, and recovery. Future systems need to detect when a trajectory is drifting away from the user’s intent, repair local failures, and, when necessary, roll back to a safe checkpoint instead of continuing blindly.

6.1.2 Safety, Governance, and Permission Boundaries

From Textual Guardrails to Operational Control

As agents gain access to files, browsers, APIs, terminals, databases, and enterprise applications, safety must move beyond response filtering. In a chatbot setting, unsafe behavior often appears as harmful text; in an agentic workspace, unsafe behavior may leak private data, overwrite files, trigger external side effects, execute untrusted skills, or make unauthorized decisions. The safety problem therefore becomes operational rather than purely linguistic.

Reliable deployment of autonomous systems requires fine-grained permission isolation, risk-aware action validation, audit trails, and rollback mechanisms. Autonomous agents should operate within boundaries defining resource access, approval requirements, and logging or sandboxing. Human oversight must balance autonomy against operational risk. A central research challenge is building governance that preserves usefulness while keeping high-impact actions inspectable and controllable.

6.1.3 Human–AI Collaboration Ethics and Data Boundaries

From Technical Reliability to Socio-Technical Accountability

Reliable autonomy is fundamentally a complex socio-technical problem. As agents become digital colleagues, they reshape who can participate in professional work and how that work is organized. On one hand, workspace agents may lower barriers to entry by giving novices access to procedural guidance, code editing, data analysis, document production, and domain-specific workflows. On the other hand, they may compress apprenticeship pathways, accelerate expected work rhythms, blur responsibility for errors, and shift human labor from direct creation toward the cognitively demanding roles of supervision, correction, and accountability.

Intellectual creativity is affected in both directions: agents can expand exploration by making rapid prototyping and recombination cheaper, but they can also homogenize outputs when reusable skills and standardized templates become dominant defaults. Future systems should therefore preserve meaningful human agency, attribution, contestability, and escalation paths rather than treating human operators as passive, uncritical approvers of work.

Data sovereignty, privacy, and clear enterprise asset boundaries become equally central. Workspace agents often observe sensitive code repositories, internal documents, chats, credentials, databases, logs, and intermediate task traces. These traces may later become memories, skills, evaluation examples, or training data, making the boundary between user data, protected enterprise assets, third-party information, and public system experience difficult to maintain. Reliable deployment therefore requires strict tenant isolation, data minimization, purpose limitation, detailed provenance metadata, retention controls, policy-aware retrieval, and explicit rules for whether task trajectories can be stored, reused, or shared. Enterprise workflows, custom prompts, proprietary code patches, and learned skills may encode organizational know-how; they should be governed as organizational assets rather than casually exported across projects, customers, or model providers. From this perspective, privacy and data governance are not merely external compliance obligations, but core architectural and design requirements for trustworthy digital colleagues [65, 66, 800].

6.1.4 Memory, Context, and Persistent State

From Short Interactions to Persistent Collaboration

Long-running autonomous agents operating in complex and dynamic environments cannot rely solely on ephemeral, short-term context windows to maintain operational coherence. As tasks span multiple distinct sessions, tools, files, and users, systems must persistently remember goals, constraints, decisions, failures, and environmental changes over extended periods. While ultra-long contexts offer a promising direction, million-token context windows remain computationally expensive, difficult to search with high precision, and highly unstable when distracted by irrelevant historical data.

Recent work on agent memory argues that the conventional short-term/long-term distinction is too coarse for modern AI agents, and that memory should instead be analyzed along three distinct axes: forms, functions, and dynamics [1110]. From the perspective of **forms**, memory may appear as token-level context that can be directly inserted into the model’s prompt, parametric memory internalized in model weights or fine-tuned components, latent memory represented in hidden or vector spaces, and external workspace memory stored in files, databases, logs, vector indexes, or skill repositories. These forms differ in editability, auditability, retrieval cost, privacy exposure, and the degree to which humans can inspect or correct them.

From the perspective of **functions**, memory supports different roles in agent work. Working memory maintains the current trajectory state, intermediate observations, assumptions, and plans; factual memory stores relatively stable user, project, domain, or world facts; experiential memory records previous interactions, successes, failures, and repair attempts; and procedural memory is often externalized as reusable skills, checklists, scripts, or workflows. From a dynamic systems perspective, reliable memory is not merely stored but continuously formed, evolved, and retrieved: task traces must be converted into candidate memories, noisy or obsolete memories must be summarized, merged, forgotten, or corrected, and retrieval must surface the right information at the right decision point without overwhelming the model. Without robust memory lifecycle management, agents cannot develop the continuity required for colleague-like collaboration; with poorly governed memory, they may instead accumulate stale assumptions, privacy risks, and misleading procedural habits.

💡 Core Challenge: Reliable Autonomy

- **Challenge:** As AI systems transition from generating answers to modifying environments, failures become harder to detect, more consequential, more difficult to reverse, and more entangled with human responsibility, organizational routines, and sensitive data flows.
- **Need:** To deploy agents in production, achieving reliable autonomy requires long-horizon verification, permission boundaries, automated rollback mechanisms, persistent memory, human-centered oversight, data-sovereignty controls, and multi-tiered governance tools that remain effective across complex, dynamic workflows.

6.2 Future Directions: Toward Self-Evolving AI Ecosystems

From Larger Models to Integrated Learning Ecosystems

As shown in Figure 12, the next stage of agentic AI will likely be defined not only by larger foundation models, but by the ecosystems built around them. The recent trajectory of LLM development already suggests this shift. Pretraining provides broad linguistic and world knowledge; instruction tuning and RLHF align models with human interaction; reasoning-oriented training and verifiable rewards push models toward longer deliberation and outcome-grounded problem solving [16, 446]. Yet as soon as models are placed inside tools, browsers, repositories, terminals, memories, and workspaces, capability is no longer stored only in neural weights. It is distributed across an execution ecosystem.

This fundamentally changes the meaning of progress. Sutton’s influential “bitter lesson” argues that general methods capable of leveraging computation tend to outperform hand-engineered knowledge in the long run [1111]. The agent era does not contradict this lesson; it reframes it. The important question is not whether humans should manually encode brittle rules, but whether AI systems can use scalable computation to generate, test, revise, and maintain their own external structures: prompts, contexts, tools, skills, tests, memories, workflows, and governance policies. In this view, self-evolution is not a mystical property of a single model. It is an engineered feedback loop in which operational experience is continuously converted into validated system assets.

This subsection therefore views future AI systems as self-evolving ecosystems. The model remains the cognitive core, but the surrounding layers determine whether its experience can accumulate. A task trajectory may become a memory; a repeated workflow may evolve into a skill; a failure may become a regression test; a tool error may trigger a wrapper update; a safety incident may become a new permission rule. The central research problem is to make this transformation reliable: how to let systems improve from experience while keeping changes observable, testable, and governed.




Figure 12. Future directions toward self-evolving AI ecosystems: next-generation systems will combine models, contexts, tools, skills, workspaces, memories, evaluators, and governance mechanisms into an integrated learning loop. The figure illustrates the path from reactive chatbots to governed digital colleagues that accumulate experience and improve their operating environments.

6.2.1 From Prompt Engineering to Harness Engineering

From Asking Better Questions to Building Better Execution Substrates

The first visible interface for interacting with large language models (LLMs) was the prompt. Early prompt engineering treated natural language as a control surface: by changing instructions, examples, roles, formats, and reasoning scaffolds, users could elicit different behaviors from the same underlying model. This was powerful because it made programming partially linguistic. Andrej Karpathy’s influential characterization of the emerging AI era as a new software paradigm captures this intuition: natural language is increasingly becoming the primary interface for specifying computation, while the model performs much of the translation from human intent to computational behavior [1112]. However, the rise of prompt engineering exposes the architectural limitations of language-only control. A prompt can ask an agent to be careful, but it cannot by itself enforce strict safety permissions, preserve state, replay actions, verify side effects, or safely roll back a corrupted workspace.

The second layer is context engineering. As LLM applications become more complex, performance depends less on a single clever instruction and more on what information is assembled around the model at inference time. Context now includes system messages, task descriptions, retrieved documents, tool schemas, intermediate observations, execution logs, user preferences, memory summaries, and workspace state. This makes context engineering closer to attention management than prompt writing. The system must determine what information the model should retain, what it can ignore, what should be compressed, and what must be preserved with high fidelity. Long-context models reduce some bottlenecks, but they do not remove the need for curation. A larger context window can also become a larger noise channel if irrelevant history buries the decision-critical state.

The third layer is harness engineering. Harnesses bind models to tools, APIs, file systems, browsers, repositories, sandboxes, memories, and human approval workflows. ReAct made the Thought–Action–Observation loop a canonical abstraction for tool-using agents [7], while Toolformer integrated tool-use into model learning [17]. More recent software agents further demonstrate that the agent-computer interface is not incidental but decisive for capability: repository navigation, edit mechanisms, tests, execution feedback, and environment management all shape what an agent can reliably do [46, 47]. Future harnesses will therefore be judged not only by whether they connect models to more tools, but also by whether they make actions inspectable, constrained, replayable, and learnable.

The deeper point is that prompts, context, and harnesses form a stack. Prompt engineering specifies intent; context engineering provides task-relevant state; harness engineering defines the operational world in which actions have consequences. Self-evolving ecosystems require all three, but the frontier is increasingly shifting downward into the harness. A system cannot reliably learn from experience unless that experience is captured as structured traces, associated with outcomes, tested against future cases, and governed by explicit update policies. Thus, future progress may depend as much on better execution substrates as on better model checkpoints themselves.

6.2.2 AI-Native Workspaces as Digital Embodiment

From Disembodied Intelligence to Stateful Operation

A language model without a workspace is disembodied: it can reason about actions, but does not inhabit a persistent state. Once connected to files, browsers, terminals, APIs, calendars, documents, repositories, and databases, an agent obtains a digital body. This body determines what the agent can sense and change, what consequences persist, and what evidence remains after a task is completed. The workspace is not a user interface; it is the environment in which cognition becomes action.

This explains why agent evaluation moved from answer correctness to task closure. In a workspace, success is not the plausibility of a response but the correctness of a state transition. Did the repository patch pass all tests? Did the document change as intended? Was the email sent to the right recipient? Were permissions respected? Benchmarks such as SWE-bench, OSWorld, WorkArena, SWE-agent, and OpenHands reflect this workspace turn by evaluating agents through realistic environments, execution feedback, and final-state verification [46, 47, 48, 49, 58]. Future AI-native workspaces will make state transitions first-class entities rather than hidden side effects.

An AI-native workspace should therefore provide primitives that traditional user interfaces did not need to expose explicitly: state snapshots, action logs, replay, rollback, permission scopes, provenance, resource isolation, final-state diffs, and evaluator hooks. These are not merely safety features. They are also learning features. A system cannot improve from a failure it cannot reconstruct; it cannot abstract a skill from a success it cannot replay; it cannot determine whether an update is beneficial without a stable evaluation substrate. Recent OpenClaw-oriented work on harness engineering and programmable agent infrastructure points in this direction by treating the runtime, tool interface, and workspace substrate as central design objects [781, 782].

Digital embodiment also clarifies the distinction between a chatbot and a digital colleague. A chatbot produces messages; a digital colleague participates in a shared workspace. It remembers which files matter, which conventions the project follows, which tools are trusted, which tasks are unfinished, and which changes were previously reverted. In human organizations, much expertise is embedded not in individual memory but in workflows, checklists, dashboards, tests, version control, and institutional routines. AI-native workspaces may play the same role for agents: they externalize cognition into a persistent environment where experience can be accumulated, audited, and reused.

6.2.3 Beyond-Gradient Learning and Continual System Maintenance

From Updating Weights to Updating Executable Systems

The dominant modern learning paradigm updates neural weights through large-scale optimization. This paradigm remains indispensable: pretraining, instruction tuning, RLHF, RLVR, and reasoning-oriented reinforcement learning have dramatically expanded what models can represent and solve [16, 446]. But agentic systems introduce a second improvement channel. Once models can read logs, edit code, create tests, revise workflows, and update memory stores, learning can occur outside the neural parameters. A system can improve because its executable environment changes.

This is the core insight behind beyond-gradient learning. As Weng systematically argues, stronger autonomous coding agents make it increasingly plausible for systems to improve by repeatedly analyzing failures, modifying programs, adding tests, watching replays, and maintaining heuristic or procedural structures without retraining the underlying model [1113]. The traditional version of heuristics was brittle because humans had to maintain them manually. The new possibility is different: if agents can continuously generate, test, and reliably repair those structures, then rules, workflows, wrappers, and skills can become scalable objects of learning rather than one-off patches.

For self-evolving AI ecosystems, the update target is broader than weights. A failed tool call can lead to a more robust API wrapper. A recurring user correction can update a preference memory. A successful debugging trajectory can be distilled into a reusable skill. A benchmark failure can become a regression test. A dangerous action can become a permission rule. This does not replace gradient-based learning; it complements it. The model supplies general reasoning, while the ecosystem stores local, operational, verifiable improvements that would be inefficient to encode into parameters.

Beyond-gradient learning presents a distinct maintenance challenge: while neural networks fear catastrophic forgetting, system maintenance must prevent ecosystem corruption from false memories, overfitted skills, and broken permissions. As skills and memories accumulate, systems must manage their provenance, compatibility, and lifecycle. Memory is therefore not mere storage, but a selection, compression, and governance challenge [9, 679, 705, 707, 708]. The ultimate goal is to evolve this ecosystem without letting it decay into stale data and brittle procedures.

The research agenda is clear: experience must be transformed into reusable assets that are small enough to retrieve, structured enough to test, general enough to reuse, and safe enough to deploy. Self-evolving systems require curation as well as learning. They must decide what to remember, what to forget, what to merge, what to quarantine, what to verify, and what should require human approval. The deepest shift is from continual model learning to continual system stewardship.

6.2.4 Composable Skill and Multi-Agent Ecosystems

From Isolated Tools to Collaborative Capability Networks

Tools are atomic affordances; skills are reusable procedures. The distinction matters. A tool exposes an operation, but a skill encodes when and how to use operations to accomplish a goal under constraints. Voyager demonstrated that an agent can build and reuse an executable skill library from environment feedback [51]. Recent production-oriented skill systems further formalize skills as packages containing instructions, scripts, resources, dependencies, and usage conditions [783, 784, 788]. This suggests a future in which agent capability grows less like a flat tool list and more like a software ecosystem.

A mature skill ecosystem will need the same disciplines that made software ecosystems reliable: interfaces, versioning, dependency management, tests, documentation, security review, and deprecation.

A skill should define its input and output schema, preconditions, side effects, required permissions, failure modes, validation criteria, and compatibility assumptions. Without these contracts, skill composition becomes fragile: one skill may silently change state in a way another skill does not expect, or a workflow may succeed syntactically while violating the user's intent. With contracts, skills can become inspectable building blocks that agents compose, adapt, and improve.

The supply-chain analogy is important. If skills become shareable assets, they also become potential attack surfaces. Malicious or over-permissive skills may exfiltrate data, trigger unintended side effects, or hide unsafe instructions. Formal analysis and supply-chain security for agentic skills are therefore not peripheral concerns but prerequisites for scalable skill markets [789]. A self-evolving ecosystem must not only learn new skills; it must certify, sandbox, monitor, and retire them.

Multi-agent systems extend this idea from composable procedures to composable roles. AutoGen and MetaGPT show how multiple agents can coordinate through conversation, role specialization, and structured workflows [19, 20]. In future AI-native workspaces, one agent may plan, another may execute, another may verify, another may curate memory, another may maintain skills, and another may monitor safety. This division of labor can improve robustness because agents can cross-check one another, but it can also multiply failure modes if state, authority, and accountability are unclear.

A central future direction is therefore **multi-agent orchestration and governance**. Orchestration concerns the runtime problem of deciding which agents should participate, which roles they occupy, how tasks are decomposed, how messages and artifacts are routed, when agents synchronize, and how conflicts or deadlocks are resolved. Governance is the complementary control problem: each agent should have explicit authority scopes, resource permissions, ownership of workspace regions, audit obligations, escalation rules, and accountability for the state changes it proposes or executes. Without such controls, adding agents may increase parallel activity without increasing task closure.

The challenge is not merely enabling communication, but ensuring a shared workspace under coordination rules. Multi-agent ecosystems require resources (e.g., role contracts, permission boundaries) and governance mechanisms to prevent responsibility diffusion, hidden mutations, and unsafe delegation [65, 66, 800]. Without these safeguards, collaboration risks degenerating into parallel hallucination. The long-term vision is a collaborative network of modular, testable, and governable skills and agents, where orchestration allocates work and the workspace anchors coordination.

6.2.5 Self-Evolving Systems: From Chatbot to Digital Colleague

From Reactive Assistance to Governed Self-Improvement

The endpoint of this trajectory is the transition from chatbot-like interaction to digital-colleague collaboration. A chatbot is primarily reactive. It responds to the current prompt and often loses continuity once the session ends. A digital colleague accumulates project-specific memory, learns local conventions, identifies recurring failures, proposes improvements, maintains shared tools, and adapts its behavior based on experience. The colleague metaphor is not about anthropomorphism; rather, it emphasizes persistence, responsibility, and participation in a shared workflow.

Self-evolution can enable this transition, but only if governed. This self-evolving loop comprises: observe operational traces, diagnose success and failure, abstract reusable patterns, propose updates to memory or skills, validate updates in sandboxes or tests, version accepted changes, deploy under permission constraints, monitor effects, and roll back if behavior degrades. This loop turns evaluation from a passive scoreboard into active feedback. Verifiers, final-state diffs, replay logs, and task-closure metrics become evidence for system learning [793, 794].

The most important word is governed. Uncontrolled self-modification can entrench mistakes, amplify unsafe shortcuts, or pollute memory with false assumptions. Governed self-evolution treats every durable update as an auditable change. Memories should carry provenance; skills should be accompanied by tests; workflows should maintain version history; high-risk actions should require approval; and degraded updates should be reversible. The research challenge is not merely to build agents that can change themselves, but to build ecosystems that know which changes deserve to survive.

This perspective also reconciles two seemingly opposite trends in AI. On one side, the field continues to scale general-purpose models and verifiable reinforcement learning. On the other side, practical agent systems increasingly rely on external scaffolds: context pipelines, tools, workspaces, skills, memory stores, and runtime policies. The future self-evolving ecosystem combines both. General models provide flexible reasoning; external assets preserve operational experience; harnesses make action safe and measurable; and governance decides how experience updates the system. The result is not a single omniscient model, but an adaptive digital organization.

The path from chatbot to digital colleague therefore requires a new engineering principle: every important action should be capable of becoming evidence, and every useful piece of evidence should be capable of becoming a governed improvement over time. If operational experience can be transformed into validated memories, skills, workflows, tests, and policies, AI systems can move beyond one-off assistance toward sustained participation in collective problem solving.

💡 Future Vision: Self-Evolving AI Ecosystems

- **Trend:** The frontier is shifting from scaling isolated models to scaling ecosystems in which models act: prompts become contexts, contexts become harnesses, and harnesses connect agents to workspaces, memories, tools, skills, evaluators, and governance mechanisms.
- **Mechanism:** Self-evolution emerges when operational execution traces are converted into durable and adaptive system assets: successful trajectories become reusable skills, unexpected failures become automated regression tests, user corrections become memories, tool errors become wrappers, and safety incidents become robust guardrail policies.
- **Principle:** Every consequential action should be treated as evidence, and every useful piece of evidence should become a governed update: validated, versioned, auditable, reversible, and deployed under explicit permission boundaries.
- **Vision:** Under this framework, AI systems can move beyond reactive chatbots toward adaptive digital colleagues that participate in workflows, accumulate experience, and improve the environments they inhabit.

7 Related Work

As LLMs shift from instruction-following to long-horizon deliberation, self-verification, and test-time computation, existing surveys have focused on pretraining, alignment, and factual reliability limits [59, 60, 76, 1114]. Early prompting strategies like Chain-of-Thought and its variants (Tree/Graph-of-Thought) demonstrated that intermediate reasoning improves multi-step problem solving [15, 31, 412, 421, 464]. Recent works explore inference-time scaling, process supervision, and reinforcement-learning-driven reasoning [16, 30, 166, 453, 493], alongside self-improvement and reflection feedback loops [32, 33]. However, while most literature treats reasoning as an internal, text-centered capability, we focus on how it becomes fully operational when integrated with tools, persistent states, and verifiable workspace changes [1115, 1116, 1117, 1118, 1119].

While Wang et al. [4] and Xi et al. [5] overview broad agent architectures, specialized surveys highlight the planning, memory, and reliability safeguards required for long-horizon tasks [9, 766, 1120]. Cognitive frameworks analyze how memory and planning sustain this long-term behavior [8, 637]. To execute actions, Yao et al. [7] integrate reasoning with external steps, while Schick et al. [17], Qin et al. [18], Shen et al. [648], and Patil et al. [730] investigate API invocation, task routing, and tool utilization. Additionally, Wang et al. [51] demonstrates open-ended skill accumulation. Together, these foundational works establish the traditional "observe-plan-act" loop. In contrast, we highlight a transition: agents are evolving from simple tool callers into operators of durable workspaces containing files, sessions, and permissions [1121, 1122, 1123].

Further, interactive benchmarks are essential for evaluating whether agents can complete tasks in realistic environments. Liu et al. [57] and Mialon et al. [618] evaluate general agent abilities and assistant-style problem solving. Earlier browser-assisted systems like WebGPT connected language models with web navigation and human feedback [912]. Web-based environments such as WebShop, Mind2Web, and WebArena then test agents through interactive shopping, website navigation, and realistic web tasks [50, 994, 995]. OSWorld and WorkArena extend this direction to desktop operating systems and enterprise workflows [48, 49]. In software engineering, SWE-bench, SWE-agent, and OpenHands emphasize repositories, tests, execution feedback, and agent-computer interfaces for development tasks [46, 47, 58]. Tool-learning benchmarks and datasets such as APIBank, ToolAlpaca, ToolLLM, ToolSandbox, and -bench further stress API selection, argument generation, stateful tool use, and multi-turn user-tool interaction [18, 893, 894, 990, 998]. Together, these benchmarks motivate task-closure evaluation, where success depends on whether the environment reaches the intended final state rather than whether the model produces a plausible text answer alone.

Despite extensive studies on general LLMs, reasoning models, hallucination, autonomous agents, planning, memory, tool learning, and interactive benchmarks, there is still limited discussion of the boundary between the Agent Era and the OpenClaw Era [621, 622, 623, 624]. Existing work provides many necessary ingredients, including external action loops, web and desktop environments, software repositories, stateful tools, execution feedback, memory mechanisms, reflection loops, and task-level verification [1120, 1124, 1125, 1126, 1127, 1128, 1129]. However, these ingredients are often treated separately; in this paper, we re-examine them under a workspace-centered perspective [46, 48, 642, 1127, 1129]. Specifically, we argue that files, terminals, browser sessions, logs, permissions, snapshots, and skill assets jointly define what an agent can perceive, modify, verify, and recover [1124, 1125, 1126, 1128]. This perspective clarifies why reliability, provenance, rollback, permissions, and governance become core architectural issues once agents operate over durable workspaces [66, 1109].

8 Conclusion

In conclusion, we frame the shift from Chatbot to Digital Colleague as the transition from conversational answers to persistent work. Cognitively, LLMs advance from next-token "fast thinking" to Thinking LLMs leveraging inference-time computation. Executionally, they progress from ad hoc tool-calling to workstation systems (OpenClaw) with persistent workspaces, skills, and governance. The "Workspace + Skill" paradigm drives this transition through state persistence, reusable procedures, and task closure. Data and evaluation shift from instruction-response pairs and static benchmarks toward State-Action-Observation trajectories and auditable, self-evolving ecosystems. Ultimately, reliable digital colleagues require persistent environments, reusable skills, and safety governance.

References

- [1] Rishi Bommasani, Drew A Hudson, Ehsan Adeli, Russ Altman, Simran Arora, Sydney von Arx, Michael S Bernstein, Jeannette Bohg, Antoine Bosselut, Emma Brunskill, et al. On the opportunities and risks of foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258*, 2021.
- [2] Bonan Min, Hayley Ross, Elinor Sulem, Amir Pouran Ben Veyseh, Thien Huu Nguyen, Oscar Sainz, Eneko Agirre, Ilana Heintz, and Dan Roth. Recent advances in natural language processing via large pre-trained language models: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(2): 1–40, 2023.
- [3] Humza Naveed, Asad Ullah Khan, Shi Qiu, Muhammad Saqib, Saeed Anwar, Muhammad Usman, Naveed Akhtar, Nick Barnes, and Ajmal Mian. A comprehensive overview of large language models. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 16(5):1–72, 2025.
- [4] Lei Wang, Chen Ma, Xueyang Feng, Zeyu Zhang, Hao Yang, Jingsen Zhang, Zhiyuan Chen, Jiakai Tang, Xu Chen, Yankai Lin, et al. A survey on large language model based autonomous agents. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 18(6), 2024.
- [5] Zhiheng Xi, Wenxiang Chen, Xin Guo, Wei He, Yiwen Ding, Boyang Hong, Ming Zhang, Junzhe Wang, Senjie Jin, Enyu Zhou, et al. The rise and potential of large language model based agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864*, 2023.
- [6] Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Xiachong Feng, Yang Wu, Yongheng Zhang, Yinghui Li, Min Li, Wanxiang Che, and Philip S. Yu. Large language models meet nlp: A survey, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.12819>.
- [7] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03629*, 2022.
- [8] Joon Sung Park, Joseph O’Brien, Carrie Jun Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*, pages 1–22, 2023.
- [9] Zeyu Zhang, Quanyu Dai, Xiaohe Bo, Chen Ma, Rui Li, Xu Chen, Jieming Zhu, Zhenhua Dong, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey on the memory mechanism of large language model-based agents. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 43(6):1–47, 2025.
- [10] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [11] Tom B Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:1877–1901, 2020.
- [12] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.08361*, 2020.

- [13] Jordan Hoffmann, Sebastian Borgeaud, Arthur Mensch, Elena Buchatskaya, Trevor Cai, Eliza Rutherford, Diego de Las Casas, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Johannes Welbl, Aidan Clark, et al. Training compute-optimal large language models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.15556>.
- [14] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023.
- [15] Jason Wei, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Maarten Bosma, Fei Xia, Ed Chi, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, et al. Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:24824–24837, 2022.
- [16] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, Xiaokang Zhang, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, Z. F. Wu, Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Zhuoshu Li, Ziyi Gao, Aixin Liu, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Bei Feng, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Hanwei Xu, Honghui Ding, Huazuo Gao, Hui Qu, Hui Li, Jianzhong Guo, Jiashi Li, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Jinhao Tu, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, J. L. Cai, Jiaqi Ni, Jian Liang, Jin Chen, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaichao You, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingxu Zhou, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruyi Chen, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shengfeng Ye, Shiyu Wang, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, S. S. Li, Shuang Zhou, Shaoqing Wu, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, T. Wang, Wangding Zeng, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, W. L. Xiao, Wei An, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xianzu Wang, Xinxia Shan, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yuan Ou, Yuduan Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yunfan Xiong, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Y. X. Zhu, Yanping Huang, Yaohui Li, Yi Zheng, Yuchen Zhu, Yunxian Ma, Ying Tang, Yukun Zha, Yuting Yan, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhiyu Wu, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Zizheng Pan, Zhen Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, and Zhen Zhang. Deepseek-r1 incentivizes reasoning in llms through reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 645(8081):633–638, 2025. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/s41586-025-09422-z. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41586-025-09422-z>.
- [17] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2023.

- [18] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, et al. ToolLLM: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world APIs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.16789*, 2023.
- [19] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, et al. AutoGen: Enabling next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.
- [20] Sirui Hong, Xiawu Zheng, Jonathan Chen, Yuheng Cheng, Jinlin Wang, Ceyao Zhang, Zili Wang, Steven Ka Shing Yau, Zijuan Lin, Liyang Zhou, et al. MetaGPT: Meta programming for multi-agent collaborative framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.00352*, 2023.
- [21] OpenAI. Introducing ChatGPT. <https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt>, 2022.
- [22] Teven Le Scao, Angela Fan, Christopher Akiki, Ellie Pavlick, Suzana Ilić, Daniel Hesslow, Roman Castagné, Alexandra Sasha Luccioni, François Yvon, Matthias Gallé, et al. BLOOM: A 176b-parameter open-access multilingual language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.05100*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.05100>.
- [23] Gemma Team, Morgane Riviere, Shreya Pathak, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Cassidy Hardin, Surya Bhupatiraju, Léonard Hussenot, Thomas Mesnard, Bobak Shahriari, Alexandre Ramé, et al. Gemma 2: Improving open language models at a practical size, 2024.
- [24] Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de Las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, et al. Mistral 7b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06825*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06825>.
- [25] Xi Chen, Josip Djolonga, Piotr Padlewski, Basil Mustafa, Soravit Changpinyo, Jialin Wu, Carlos Riquelme Ruiz, Sebastian Goodman, Xiao Wang, Yi Tay, et al. Pali-x: On scaling up a multilingual vision and language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.18565*, 2023.
- [26] Fabio Petroni, Tim Rocktäschel, Sebastian Riedel, Patrick Lewis, Anton Bakhtin, Yuxiang Wu, and Alexander Miller. Language models as knowledge bases? 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 2463–2473, 2019.
- [27] Jie Huang and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. Towards reasoning in large language models: A survey. In *Findings of the association for computational linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 1049–1065, 2023.
- [28] Nouha Dziri, Ximing Lu, Melanie Sclar, Xiang Lorraine Li, Liwei Jiang, Bill Yuchen Lin, Sean Welleck, Peter West, Chandra Bhagavatula, Ronan Le Bras, et al. Faith and fate: Limits of transformers on compositionality. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36: 70293–70332, 2023.
- [29] Karthik Valmeekam, Alberto Olmo, Sarath Sreedharan, and Subbarao Kambhampati. Large language models still can’t plan (a benchmark for llms on planning and reasoning about change). In *NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*, 2022.
- [30] Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. Scaling LLM test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling model parameters, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.03314>.

- [31] Takeshi Kojima, Shixiang Shane Gu, Machel Reid, Yutaka Matsuo, and Yusuke Iwasawa. Large language models are zero-shot reasoners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22199–22213, 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/8bb0d291acd4acf06ef112099c16f326-Abstract-Conference.html.
- [32] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and Peter Clark. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:46534–46594, 2023. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/91edff07232fb1b55a505a9e9f6c0ff3-Abstract-Conference.html.
- [33] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:8634–8652, 2023.
- [34] Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yuri Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 39578–39601, 2024.
- [35] Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, R. Xu, Jun-Mei Song, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Yu Wu, and Daya Guo. Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.03300, 2024.
- [36] Johannes Schneider. Generative to agentic ai: Survey, conceptualization, and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.18875*, 2025.
- [37] Tianxin Wei, Ting-Wei Li, Zhining Liu, Xuying Ning, Ze Yang, Jiaru Zou, Zhichen Zeng, Ruizhong Qiu, Xiao Lin, Dongqi Fu, et al. Agentic reasoning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.12538*, 2026.
- [38] Avinash Patil and Aryan Jadon. Advancing reasoning in large language models: Promising methods and approaches. In *International Conference on Computational Intelligence and Soft Computing*, pages 284–298. Springer, 2025.
- [39] Changyuan Zhao, Guangyuan Liu, Ruichen Zhang, Yinqiu Liu, Jiacheng Wang, Jiawen Kang, Dusit Niyato, Zan Li, Xuemin Shen, Zhu Han, et al. Edge general intelligence through world models, large language models, and agentic ai: Fundamentals, solutions, and challenges. *IEEE Transactions on Cognitive Communications and Networking*, 2026.
- [40] Sihao Hu, Tiansheng Huang, Gaowen Liu, Ramana Rao Kompella, Fatih Ilhan, Selim Furkan Tekin, Yichang Xu, Zachary Yahn, and Ling Liu. A survey on large language model-based game agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02039*, 2024.
- [41] Fengli Xu, Qian Yue Hao, Chenyang Shao, Zefang Zong, Yu Li, Jingwei Wang, Yunke Zhang, Jingyi Wang, Xiaochong Lan, Jiahui Gong, et al. Toward large reasoning models: A survey of reinforced reasoning with large language models. *Patterns*, 6(10), 2025.

- [42] Taicheng Guo, Xiuying Chen, Yaqi Wang, Ruidi Chang, Shichao Pei, Nitesh V Chawla, Olaf Wiest, and Xiangliang Zhang. Large language model based multi-agents: A survey of progress and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01680*, 2024.
- [43] Yiming Lei, Jiawei Xu, Chia Xin Liang, Ziqian Bi, Xiaoming Li, Danyang Zhang, Junhao Song, and Zhenyu Yu. Large language model agents: A comprehensive survey on architectures, capabilities, and applications. 2025.
- [44] Jiankai Sun, Chuanyang Zheng, Enze Xie, Zhengying Liu, Ruihang Chu, Jianing Qiu, Jiaqi Xu, Mingyu Ding, Hongyang Li, Mengzhe Geng, et al. A survey of reasoning with foundation models: Concepts, methodologies, and outlook. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(11):1–43, 2025.
- [45] Aske Plaat, Max van Duijn, Niki Van Stein, Mike Preuss, Peter van der Putten, and Kees Joost Batenburg. Agentic large language models, a survey. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 84, 2025.
- [46] Xingyao Wang, Boxuan Li, Yufan Song, Frank F Xu, Xiangru Tang, Mingchen Zhuge, Jiayi Pan, Yueqi Song, Bowen Li, Jaskirat Singh, et al. Openhands: An open platform for ai software developers as generalist agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 65882–65919, 2025.
- [47] John Yang, Carlos E Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. SWE-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mXpq6ut8J3>.
- [48] Alexandre Drouin, Maxime Gasse, Massimo Caccia, Issam H Laradji, Manuel Del Verme, Tom Marty, Léo Boisvert, Megh Thakkar, Quentin Cappart, David Vazquez, et al. Workarena: How capable are web agents at solving common knowledge work tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07718*, 2024.
- [49] Tianbao Xie, Danyang Zhang, Jixuan Chen, Xiaochuan Li, Siheng Zhao, Ruisheng Cao, Toh Jing Hua, Zhoujun Cheng, Dongchan Shin, Fangyu Lei, Yitao Liu, Yiheng Xu, Shuyan Zhou, Silvio Savarese, Caiming Xiong, Victor Zhong, and Tao Yu. OSWorld: Benchmarking multimodal agents for open-ended tasks in real computer environments. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=tN61DTr4Ed>.
- [50] 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. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=oKn9c6ytLx>.
- [51] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ehfRiF0R3a>.

- [52] Junyu Luo, Weizhi Zhang, Ye Yuan, Yusheng Zhao, Junwei Yang, Yiyang Gu, Bohan Wu, Binqi Chen, Ziyue Qiao, Qingqing Long, et al. Large language model agent: A survey on methodology, applications and challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.21460*, 2025.
- [53] María Miró Maestre, Iván Martínez-Murillo, Tania J Martin, Borja Navarro-Colorado, Antonio Ferrández, Armando Suárez Cueto, and Elena Lloret. Beyond generative artificial intelligence: Roadmap for natural language generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10554*, 2024.
- [54] Shangheng Du, Jiabao Zhao, Jinxin Shi, Zhentao Xie, Xin Jiang, Yanhong Bai, and Liang He. A survey on the optimization of large language model-based agents. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 58(9):1–37, 2026.
- [55] Saikat Barua. Exploring autonomous agents through the lens of large language models: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04442*, 2024.
- [56] Huanjin Yao, Ruifei Zhang, Jiaxing Huang, Jingyi Zhang, Yibo Wang, Bo Fang, Ruolin Zhu, Yongcheng Jing, Shunyu Liu, Guanbin Li, et al. A survey on agentic multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10991*, 2025.
- [57] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, et al. AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03688*, 2023.
- [58] Carlos E. Jimenez et al. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06770*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2310.06770. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06770>.
- [59] Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, et al. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05232*, 2023.
- [60] Ziwei Ji, Nayeon Lee, Rita Frieske, Tiezheng Yu, Dan Su, Yan Xu, Etsuko Ishii, Ye Jin Bang, Andrea Madotto, and Pascale Fung. Survey of hallucination in natural language generation. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 55(12):1–38, 2023.
- [61] Charles Packer, Vivian Fang, Shishir_G Patil, Kevin Lin, Sarah Wooders, and Joseph_E Gonzalez. Memgpt: towards llms as operating systems. 2023.
- [62] Yangjun Ruan, Honghua Dong, Andrew Wang, Silviu Pitis, Yongchao Zhou, Jimmy Ba, Yann Dubois, Chris Maddison, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Identifying the risks of lm agents with an lm-emulated sandbox. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 27031–27098, 2024.
- [63] Edoardo DeBenedetti, Jie Zhang, Mislav Balunovic, Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Florian Tramèr. Agentdojo: A dynamic environment to evaluate prompt injection attacks and defenses for llm agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:82895–82920, 2024.
- [64] Qiusi Zhan, Zhixiang Liang, Zifan Ying, and Daniel Kang. Injecagent: Benchmarking indirect prompt injections in tool-integrated large language model agents. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 10471–10506, 2024.

- [65] Frank Li. Openclaw prism: A zero-fork, defense-in-depth runtime security layer for tool-augmented llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.11853*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.11853>.
- [66] Wei Zhao, Zhe Li, Peixin Zhang, and Jun Sun. Clawguard: A runtime security framework for tool-augmented llm agents against indirect prompt injection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.11790*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.11790>.
- [67] Pan Lu, Baolin Peng, Hao Cheng, Michel Galley, Kai-Wei Chang, Ying Nian Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. Chameleon: Plug-and-play compositional reasoning with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:43447–43478, 2023.
- [68] Qwen Team. Qwen3.6-27B non-thinking, April 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.6-27b>.
- [69] Ahmed Salem, Andrew Paverd, and Sahar Abdelnabi. Stateless yet not forgetful: Implicit memory as a hidden channel in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.08563*, 2026.
- [70] Hao Ding, Ziwei Fan, Ingo Guehring, Gaurav Gupta, Wooseok Ha, Jun Huan, Linbo Liu, Behrooz Omidvar-Tehrani, Shiqi Wang, and Hao Zhou. Reasoning and planning with large language models in code development. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 6480–6490, 2024.
- [71] Jia Li, Ge Li, Yongmin Li, and Zhi Jin. Structured chain-of-thought prompting for code generation. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 34(2):1–23, 2025.
- [72] Chunfang Ou, Lijuan Fan, Guobin Fu, Renzheng Liu, and Zhongzhi Li. A survey on large reasoning models with self-play deep reinforcement learning and chain-of-thought. In *Proceedings of the 2025 2nd Symposium on Big Data, Neural Networks, and Deep Learning*, pages 186–190, 2025.
- [73] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, Hai Zhao, George Karypis, and Alex Smola. Multimodal chain-of-thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.00923*, 2023.
- [74] Xiaoshuai Song, Yanan Wu, Weixun Wang, Jiaheng Liu, Wenbo Su, and Bo Zheng. Progco: Program helps self-correction of large language models. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pages 944–959, 2025.
- [75] Daniel Kahneman. Thinking, fast and slow. *Farrar, Straus and Giroux*, 2011.
- [76] Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xia Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, et al. A survey of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223*, 2023.
- [77] Fengqing Jiang, Zhangchen Xu, Yuetai Li, Luyao Niu, Zhen Xiang, Bo Li, Bill Yuchen Lin, and Radha Poovendran. Safechain: Safety of language models with long chain-of-thought reasoning capabilities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 23303–23320, 2025.

- [78] Yancheng He, Shilong Li, Jiaheng Liu, Weixun Wang, Xingyuan Bu, Ge Zhang, Zy Peng, Zhaoxiang Zhang, Zhicheng Zheng, Wenbo Su, et al. Can large language models detect errors in long chain-of-thought reasoning? In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 18468–18489, 2025.
- [79] Rock Yuren Pang, KJ Kevin Feng, Shangbin Feng, Chu Li, Weijia Shi, Yulia Tsvetkov, Jeffrey Heer, and Katharina Reinecke. Interactive reasoning: Visualizing and controlling chain-of-thought reasoning in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*, pages 852–867, 2026.
- [80] Dawei Zhu, Xiyu Wei, Guangxiang Zhao, Wenhao Wu, Haosheng Zou, Junfeng Ran, Xun Wang, Lin Sun, Xiangzheng Zhang, and Sujian Li. Chain-of-thought matters: improving long-context language models with reasoning path supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.20790*, 2025.
- [81] Leonardo Ranaldi and Andre Freitas. Aligning large and small language models via chain-of-thought reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1812–1827, 2024.
- [82] Mengxue Qu, Yibo Hu, Kunyang Han, Yunchao Wei, and Yao Zhao. Recot: Reflective self-correction training for mitigating confirmation bias in large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9147–9157, 2025.
- [83] Juyong Jiang, Jiasi Shen, Sunghun Kim, Kang Min Yoo, Jeonghoon Kim, and Sungju Kim. Reflexicoder: Teaching large language models to self-reflect on generated code and self-correct it via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.05863*, 2026.
- [84] Yi Ding and Ruqi Zhang. Sherlock: Self-correcting reasoning in vision-language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:101638–101672, 2026.
- [85] Mariana Costa, Alberlucia Rafael Soares, Daniel Kim, and Camila Ferreira. Enhancing self-correction in large language models through multi-perspective reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.07780*, 2026.
- [86] Zaifu Zhan, Mengyuan Cui, and Rui Zhang. Can large language models self-correct in medical question answering? an exploratory study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.00261*, 2026.
- [87] Yongheng Zhang, Qiguang Chen, Min Li, Wanxiang Che, and Libo Qin. AutoCAP: Towards automatic cross-lingual alignment planning for zero-shot chain-of-thought. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 9191–9200, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.546. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.546/>.
- [88] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. Technical report, OpenAI, 2018.
- [89] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019.

- [90] Xinyu Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Zhihao Lv, Yingqian Min, Wayne Xin Zhao, Binbin Hu, Ziqi Liu, and Zhiqiang Zhang. Unlocking general long chain-of-thought reasoning capabilities of large language models via representation engineering. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6832–6849, 2025.
- [91] Shizhe Diao, Pengcheng Wang, Yong Lin, Rui Pan, Xiang Liu, and Tong Zhang. Active prompting with chain-of-thought for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1330–1350, 2024.
- [92] Yinghui Li, Haojing Huang, Shirong Ma, Yong Jiang, Yangning Li, Feng Zhou, Hai-Tao Zheng, and Qingyu Zhou. On the (in) effectiveness of large language models for chinese text correction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09007*, 2023.
- [93] Zhuosheng Zhang, Aston Zhang, Mu Li, and Alex Smola. Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*, 2022.
- [94] Shuaitong Liu, Renjue Li, Lijia Yu, Lijun Zhang, Zhiming Liu, and Gaojie Jin. Badthink: Triggered overthinking attacks on chain-of-thought reasoning in large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 32141–32149, 2026.
- [95] Lei Wang, Wanyu Xu, Yihuai Lan, Zhiqiang Hu, Yunshi Lan, Roy Ka-Wei Lee, and Ee-Peng Lim. Plan-and-solve prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models. In *Proceedings of the 61st annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: long papers)*, pages 2609–2634, 2023.
- [96] Jiaqi Li, Xinyi Dong, Yang Liu, Zhizhuo Yang, Quansen Wang, Xiaobo Wang, Song-Chun Zhu, Zixia Jia, and Zilong Zheng. Reflectevo: Improving meta introspection of small llms by learning self-reflection. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 16948–16966, 2025.
- [97] Hanqi Yan, Qinglin Zhu, Xinyu Wang, Lin Gui, and Yulan He. Mirror: Multiple-perspective self-reflection method for knowledge-rich reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7086–7103, 2024.
- [98] Ashim Dhor. Reflexion: Language models that think twice for internalized self-correction.
- [99] Ling Yang, Zhaochen Yu, Tianjun Zhang, Minkai Xu, Joseph E Gonzalez, Bin Cui, and Shuicheng Yan. Supercorrect: Supervising and correcting language models with error-driven insights. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09008*, 9, 2024.
- [100] Haotian Zhu. Closed-loop multi-round planning for large language model agents via self-reflection and error correction. *Journal of Computer Technology and Software*, 3(9), 2024.
- [101] Yinghui Li, Jiayi Kuang, Peng Xing, Daixian Liu, Yongheng Zhang, Junnan Dong, Shu-Yu Guo, Yangning Li, Qingyu Zhou, Wenhao Jiang, Hai-Tao Zheng, Ying Shen, Liang Lin, and Philip S. Yu. Cognitive mismatch in multimodal large language models for discrete symbol understanding, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.18472>.

- [102] Zhipeng Xu, Zhenghao Liu, Yukun Yan, Shuo Wang, Shi Yu, Zheni Zeng, Chaojun Xiao, Zhiyuan Liu, Ge Yu, and Chenyan Xiong. ThinkNote: Enhancing knowledge integration and utilization of large language models via constructivist cognition modeling. In Vera Demberg, Kentaro Inui, and Lluís Marquez, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2026*, pages 211–229, Rabat, Morocco, March 2026. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-386-9. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-eacl.12. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-eacl.12/>.
- [103] Yao Yao, Zuchao Li, and Hai Zhao. Beyond chain-of-thought, effective graph-of-thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16582*, 2023.
- [104] Shulin Huang, Shirong Ma, Yinghui Li, Mengzuo Huang, Wuhe Zou, Weidong Zhang, and Haitao Zheng. Lateval: An interactive llms evaluation benchmark with incomplete information from lateral thinking puzzles. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 10186–10197, 2024.
- [105] Yinghui Li, Qingyu Zhou, Yuanzhen Luo, Shirong Ma, Yangning Li, Hai-Tao Zheng, Xuming Hu, and Philip S Yu. When llms meet cunning texts: A fallacy understanding benchmark for large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:112433–112458, 2024.
- [106] Yinghui Li, Shang Qin, Jingheng Ye, Haojing Huang, Yangning Li, Shu-Yu Guo, Libo Qin, Xuming Hu, Wenhao Jiang, Hai-Tao Zheng, et al. Rethinking the roles of large language models in chinese grammatical error correction. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, pages 553–567, 2025.
- [107] Tianyu Yu, Chengyue Jiang, Chao Lou, Shen Huang, Xiaobin Wang, Wei Liu, Jiong Cai, Yangning Li, Yinghui Li, Kewei Tu, et al. Seqgpt: An out-of-the-box large language model for open domain sequence understanding. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19458–19467, 2024.
- [108] Bin Yu, Hang Yuan, Haotian Li, Xueyin Xu, Yuliang Wei, Bailing Wang, Weizhen Qi, and Kai Chen. Long-short chain-of-thought mixture supervised fine-tuning eliciting efficient reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.03469*, 2025.
- [109] Jialiang Zhang, Junlong Tong, Junyan Lin, Hao Wu, Yirong Sun, Yunpu Ma, and Xiaoyu Shen. Think-as-you-see: Streaming chain-of-thought reasoning for large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11998–12008, 2026.
- [110] Jingjing Jiang, Chao Ma, Xurui Song, Hanwang Zhang, and Jun Luo. Corvid: Improving multimodal large language models towards chain-of-thought reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3034–3046, 2025.
- [111] Xufeng Zhao, Mengdi Li, Wenhao Lu, Cornelius Weber, Jae-Hee Lee, Kun Chu, and Stefan Wermter. Enhancing zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning in large language models through logic. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 6144–6166, 2024.

- [112] Lili Zhao, Yang Wang, Qi Liu, Mengyun Wang, Wei Chen, Zhichao Sheng, and Shijin Wang. Evaluating large language models through role-guide and self-reflection: A comparative study. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [113] Hanbin Wang, Jingwei Song, Jinpeng Li, Qi Zhu, Fei Mi, Ganqu Cui, Yasheng Wang, and Lifeng Shang. Teaching large reasoning models effective reflection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.12720*, 2026.
- [114] Yunxiang Zhang, Muhammad Khalifa, Lajanugen Logeswaran, Jaekyeom Kim, Moontae Lee, Honglak Lee, and Lu Wang. Small language models need strong verifiers to self-correct reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 15637–15653, 2024.
- [115] Liangming Pan, Michael Saxon, Wenda Xu, Deepak Nathani, Xinyi Wang, and William Yang Wang. Automatically correcting large language models: Surveying the landscape of diverse self-correction strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03188*, 2023.
- [116] Fei Ding, Baiqiao Wang, Zijian Zeng, and Youwei Wang. Multi-layer grpo: Enhancing reasoning and self-correction in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.04746*, 2025.
- [117] Jack W Rae, Sebastian Borgeaud, Trevor Cai, Katie Millican, Jordan Hoffmann, Francis Song, John Aslanides, Sarah Henderson, Roman Ring, Susannah Young, et al. Scaling language models: Methods, analysis & insights from training gopher. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11446*, 2021.
- [118] Ge Zheng, Bin Yang, Jiajin Tang, Hong-Yu Zhou, and Sibe Yang. Ddcot: Duty-distinct chain-of-thought prompting for multimodal reasoning in language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:5168–5191, 2023.
- [119] Qiguang Chen, Hanjing Li, Libo Qin, Dengyun Peng, Jinhao Liu, Jiangyi Wang, Chengyue Wu, Xie Chen, Yantao Du, and Wanxiang Che. Beyond surface reasoning: Unveiling the true long chain-of-thought capacity of diffusion large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.09544*, 2025.
- [120] Xumeng Wen, Zihan Liu, Shun Zheng, Shengyu Ye, Zhirong Wu, Yang Wang, Zhijian Xu, Xiao Liang, Junjie Li, Ziming Miao, et al. Reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards implicitly incentivizes correct reasoning in base llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.14245*, 2025.
- [121] Yiping Wang, Qing Yang, Zhiyuan Zeng, Liliang Ren, Liyuan Liu, Baolin Peng, Hao Cheng, Xuehai He, Kuan Wang, Jianfeng Gao, et al. Reinforcement learning for reasoning in large language models with one training example. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:122721–122764, 2026.
- [122] Yunhao Tang, Sid Wang, Lovish Madaan, and Rémi Munos. Beyond verifiable rewards: Scaling reinforcement learning in language models to unverifiable data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:74421–74448, 2026.
- [123] Xuan Feng, Shuai Zhao, Luwei Xiao, Tianlong Gu, and Bo An. Self-debias: Self-correcting for debiasing large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.08243*, 2026.
- [124] Nishanth Upadhyaya and Raghavendra Sridharamurthy. Internalized self-correction for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16653*, 2024.

- [125] Yifei Wang, Yuyang Wu, Zeming Wei, Stefanie Jegelka, and Yisen Wang. A theoretical understanding of self-correction through in-context alignment. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:89869–89912, 2024.
- [126] Lihui Liu. Monte carlo tree search for graph reasoning in large language model agents. In *Proceedings of the 34th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pages 4966–4970, 2025.
- [127] Zitian Gao, Boye Niu, Xuzheng He, Haotian Xu, Hongzhang Liu, Aiwei Liu, Xuming Hu, and Lijie Wen. Interpretable contrastive monte carlo tree search reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01707*, 2024.
- [128] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, et al. PaLM: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.02311*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.02311>.
- [129] Susan Zhang, Stephen Roller, Naman Goyal, Mikel Artetxe, Moya Chen, Shuohui Chen, Christopher Dewan, Mona Diab, Xian Li, Xi Victoria Lin, et al. Opt: Open pre-trained transformer language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.01068*, 2022.
- [130] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023.
- [131] Zirui Song, Guangxian Ouyang, Mingzhe Li, Yuheng Ji, Chenxi Wang, Zixiang Xu, Zeyu Zhang, Xiaoqing Zhang, Qian Jiang, Fengxian Ji, et al. ManipLm-r1: Reinforcement learning for reasoning in embodied manipulation with large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 18558–18566, 2026.
- [132] Xiaoyuan Liu, Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Jiahao Xu, Wenxuan Wang, Pinjia He, Zhaopeng Tu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. Trust, but verify: A self-verification approach to reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38: 130475–130501, 2026.
- [133] Kaiyan Zhang, Yuxin Zuo, Bingxiang He, Youbang Sun, Runze Liu, Che Jiang, Yuchen Fan, Kai Tian, Guoli Jia, Pengfei Li, et al. A survey of reinforcement learning for large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.08827*, 2025.
- [134] Qiyuan Liu, Hao Xu, Xuhong Chen, Wei Chen, Yee Whye Teh, and Ning Miao. Enhancing large language model reasoning with reward models: An analytical survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.01925*, 2025.
- [135] Zafir Stojanovski, Oliver Stanley, Joe Sharratt, Richard Jones, Abdulkhakeem Adefioye, Jean Kaddour, and Andreas Köpf. Reasoning gym: Reasoning environments for reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [136] Yuhang Han, Yuyang Wu, Zhengbo Jiao, Yiyu Wang, Xuyang Liu, Shaobo Wang, Hanlin Xu, Xuming Hu, and Linfeng Zhang. Bridging visual representation and reinforcement learning from verifiable rewards in large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.27375*, 2026.

- [137] Mingjie Liu, Shizhe Diao, Ximing Lu, Jian Hu, Xin Dong, Yejin Choi, Jan Kautz, and Yi Dong. Prorl: Prolonged reinforcement learning expands reasoning boundaries in large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:17998–18031, 2026.
- [138] Alessandro Berti, Xiaoting Wang, Humam Kourani, and Wil MP Van der Aalst. Specializing large language models for process modeling via reinforcement learning with verifiable and universal rewards. *Process Science*, 2(1):26, 2025.
- [139] Alex Havrilla, Yuqing Du, Sharath Chandra Raparthy, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Maksym Zhuravinskyi, Eric Hambro, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, and Roberta Raileanu. Teaching large language models to reason with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04642*, 2024.
- [140] Pei-Chi Pan, Yingbin Liang, and Sen Lin. Reward modeling for reinforcement learning-based llm reasoning: Design, challenges, and evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.09305*, 2026.
- [141] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088*, 2024.
- [142] DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bin Wang, Bingxuan Wang, Bo Liu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Hanwei Xu, Hao Yang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jin Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruizhe Pan, Runxin Xu, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Size Zheng, T. Wang, Tian Pei, Tian Yuan, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xuan Lu, Xuecheng Su, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yiliang Xiong, Yilong Zhao, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yixin Dong, Yixuan Tan, Yiyuan Liu, Yongji Wang, Yongqiang Guo, Yuchen Zhu, Yudian Wang, Yuheng Zou, Yukun Zha, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhewen Hao, Zhihong Shao, Zhiniu Wen, Zhipeng Xu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihan Wang, Zihui Gu, Zilin Li, and Ziwei Xie. Deepseek-v2: A strong, economical, and efficient mixture-of-experts language model, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.04434>.
- [143] DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong

- Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jin Chen, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojun Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangyan Zhou, Shanhuang Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, T. Wang, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wanjia Zhao, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaokang Zhang, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinxia Shan, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yu Wu, Yuan Ou, Yuchen Zhu, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yukun Zha, Yunfan Xiong, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Z. F. Wu, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhibin Gou, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhihong Shao, Zhipeng Xu, Zhiyu Wu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Ziyi Gao, and Zizheng Pan. Deepseek-v3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.19437>.
- [144] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024.
- [145] Qwen Team. Qwen3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.09388>.
- [146] MiniMax, Aonian Li, Bangwei Gong, Bo Yang, Boji Shan, Chang Liu, Cheng Zhu, Chunhao Zhang, Congchao Guo, Da Chen, Dong Li, Enwei Jiao, Gengxin Li, Guojun Zhang, Haohai Sun, Houze Dong, Jiadai Zhu, Jiaqi Zhuang, Jiayuan Song, Jin Zhu, Jingtao Han, Jingyang Li, Junbin Xie, Junhao Xu, Junjie Yan, Kaishun Zhang, Kecheng Xiao, Kexi Kang, Le Han, Leyang Wang, Lianfei Yu, Liheng Feng, Lin Zheng, Linbo Chai, Long Xing, Meizhi Ju, Mingyuan Chi, Mozhi Zhang, Peikai Huang, Pengcheng Niu, Pengfei Li, Pengyu Zhao, Qi Yang, Qidi Xu, Qiexiang Wang, Qin Wang, Qiuhui Li, Ruitao Leng, Shengmin Shi, Shuqi Yu, Sichen Li, Songquan Zhu, Tao Huang, Tianrun Liang, Weigao Sun, Weixuan Sun, Weiyu Cheng, Wenkai Li, Xiangjun Song, Xiao Su, Xiaodong Han, Xinjie Zhang, Xinzhu Hou, Xu Min, Xun Zou, Xuyang Shen, Yan Gong, Yingjie Zhu, Yipeng Zhou, Yiran Zhong, Yongyi Hu, Yuanxiang Fan, Yue Yu, Yufeng Yang, Yuhao Li, Yunan Huang, Yunji Li, Yunpeng Huang, Yunzhi Xu, Yuxin Mao, Zehan Li, Zekang Li, Zewei Tao, Zewen Ying, Zhaoyang Cong, Zhen Qin, Zhenhua Fan, Zhihang Yu, Zhuo Jiang, and Zijia Wu. Minimax-01: Scaling foundation models with lightning attention, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.08313>.
- [147] OpenAI. Gpt-4.5 system card, 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-5/>.
- [148] xAI. Grok 4 fast non-reasoning model card, 2025.

- [149] Saksham Sahai Srivastava and Vaneet Aggarwal. A technical survey of reinforcement learning techniques for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.04136*, 2025.
- [150] Shaoshen Chen, Yangning Li, Zishan Xu, Yongqin Zeng, Shunlong Wu, Xinshuo Hu, Zifei Shan, Xin Su, Jiwei Tang, Yinghui Li, et al. Dast: Context-aware compression in llms via dynamic allocation of soft tokens. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 20544–20552, 2025.
- [151] Akifumi Wachi, Hirota Kinoshita, Shokichi Takakura, Rei Higuchi, and Taiji Suzuki. A relative-budget theory for reinforcement learning with verifiable rewards in large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.01523*, 2026.
- [152] Yangning Li, Shaoshen Chen, Yinghui Li, Yankai Chen, Hai-Tao Zheng, Hui Wang, Wenhao Jiang, and Philip S Yu. Admtree: Compressing lengthy context with adaptive semantic trees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:40389–40415, 2026.
- [153] Zhiqi Chen, Rui Lu, Andrew Zhao, Zhaokai Wang, Yang Yue, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Does reinforcement learning really incentivize reasoning capacity in llms beyond the base model? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:57654–57689, 2026.
- [154] Haitao Hong, Yuchen Yan, Xingyu Wu, Guiyang Hou, Wenqi Zhang, Weiming Lu, Yongliang Shen, and Jun Xiao. Cooper: Co-optimizing policy and reward models in reinforcement learning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.05613*, 2025.
- [155] Yuxin Jiang, Yufei Wang, Qiyuan Zhang, Xingshan Zeng, Liangyou Li, Jierun Chen, Chaofan Tao, Haoli Bai, and Lifeng Shang. From verifiable dot to reward chain: Harnessing verifiable reference-based rewards for reinforcement learning of open-ended generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.18533*, 2026.
- [156] Kevin Meng, David Bau, Alex Andonian, and Yonatan Belinkov. Locating and editing factual associations in gpt. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:17359–17372, 2022.
- [157] Damai Dai, Li Dong, Yaru Hao, Zhifang Sui, Baobao Chang, and Furu Wei. Knowledge neurons in pretrained transformers. In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8493–8502, 2022.
- [158] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9459–9474, 2020.
- [159] Anisha Gunjal, Anthony Wang, Elaine Lau, Vaskar Nath, Yunzhong He, Bing Liu, and Sean Hendryx. Rubrics as rewards: Reinforcement learning beyond verifiable domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.17746*, 2025.
- [160] Qiyuan Zhang, Fuyuan Lyu, Zexu Sun, Lei Wang, Weixu Zhang, Wenyue Hua, Haolun Wu, Zhihan Guo, Yufei Wang, Niklas Muennighoff, et al. A survey on test-time scaling in large language models: What, how, where, and how well? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.24235*, 2025.
- [161] Hao Mark Chen, Zhiwen Mo, Guanxi Lu, Shuang Liang, Lingxiao Ma, Wayne Luk, and Hongxiang Fan. Fasttts: Accelerating test-time scaling for edge llm reasoning. In *Proceedings*

- of the 31st ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 2, pages 732–748, 2026.
- [162] Charlie Snell, Jaehoon Lee, Kelvin Xu, and Aviral Kumar. Scaling llm test-time compute optimally can be more effective than scaling parameters for reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 10131–10165, 2025.
- [163] Aradhye Agarwal, Ayan Sengupta, and Tanmoy Chakraborty. The art of scaling test-time compute for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02008*, 2025.
- [164] Jason Wei, Yi Tay, Rishi Bommasani, Colin Raffel, Barret Zoph, Sebastian Borgeaud, Dani Yogatama, Maarten Bosma, Denny Zhou, Donald Metzler, et al. Emergent abilities of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.07682*, 2022.
- [165] Rylan Schaeffer, Brando Miranda, and Sanmi Koyejo. Are emergent abilities of large language models a mirage? *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:55565–55581, 2023.
- [166] Zhong-Zhi Li, Duzhen Zhang, Ming-Liang Zhang, Jiabin Zhang, Zengyan Liu, Yuxuan Yao, Haotian Xu, Junhao Zheng, Pei-Jie Wang, Xiuyi Chen, Yingying Zhang, Fei Yin, Jiahua Dong, Zhiwei Li, Bao-Long Bi, Ling-Rui Mei, Junfeng Fang, Xiao Liang, Zhijiang Guo, Le Song, and Cheng-Lin Liu. From system 1 to system 2: A survey of reasoning large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.17419>.
- [167] Fali Wang, Hui Liu, Zhenwei Dai, Jingying Zeng, Zhiwei Zhang, Zongyu Wu, Chen Luo, Zhen Li, Xianfeng Tang, Qi He, et al. Agenttts: Large language model agent for test-time compute-optimal scaling strategy in complex tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:98396–98433, 2026.
- [168] Yixin Ji, Juntao Li, Yang Xiang, Hai Ye, Kaixin Wu, Kai Yao, Jia Xu, Linjian Mo, and Min Zhang. A survey of test-time compute: From intuitive inference to deliberate reasoning. *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–51, 2026.
- [169] Xiaoke Huang, Juncheng Wu, Hui Liu, Xianfeng Tang, and Yuyin Zhou. m1: Unleash the potential of test-time scaling for medical reasoning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.00869*, 2025.
- [170] Wenkai Yang, Shuming Ma, Yankai Lin, and Furu Wei. Towards thinking-optimal scaling of test-time compute for llm reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38: 43605–43631, 2026.
- [171] Junlin Wang, Shang Zhu, Jon Saad-Falcon, Ben Athiwaratkun, Qingyang Wu, Jue Wang, Shuaiwen Leon Song, Ce Zhang, Bhuwan Dhingra, and James Zou. Think deep, think fast: Investigating efficiency of verifier-free inference-time-scaling methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14047*, 2025.
- [172] Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ganesh Jawahar, Sahaj Agarwal, Hamid Palangi, and Ahmed Awadallah. Orca: Progressive learning from complex explanation traces of gpt-4, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02707>.
- [173] OpenAI. Gpt-2: 1.5b release. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-2-1-5b-release/>, 2019.

- [174] Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Kevin Stone, Peter Albert, Amjad Almahairi, Yasmine Babaei, Nikolay Bashlykov, Soumya Batra, Prajjwal Bhargava, Shruti Bhosale, et al. Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.09288>.
- [175] Siqi Bao, Huang He, Fan Wang, Hua Wu, and Haifeng Wang. Plato: Pre-trained dialogue generation model with discrete latent variable. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 85–96, 2020.
- [176] InternLM Team. InternLM: A multilingual language model with progressively enhanced capabilities. <https://github.com/InternLM/InternLM-techreport>, 2023.
- [177] Colin Raffel, Noam Shazeer, Adam Roberts, Katherine Lee, Sharan Narang, Michael Matena, Yanqi Zhou, Wei Li, and Peter J Liu. Exploring the limits of transfer learning with a unified text-to-text transformer. *Journal of machine learning research*, 21(140):1–67, 2020.
- [178] Anthropic. Introducing the next generation of claude. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-2>, 2023.
- [179] Yizhe Zhang, Siqi Sun, Michel Galley, Yen-Chun Chen, Chris Brockett, Xiang Gao, Jianfeng Gao, Jingjing Liu, and William B Dolan. Dialogpt: Large-scale generative pre-training for conversational response generation. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: system demonstrations*, pages 270–278, 2020.
- [180] Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Kai Zheng, Xiubo Geng, Pu Zhao, Jiazhan Feng, Chongyang Tao, and Daxin Jiang. Wizardlm: Empowering large language models to follow complex instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12244*, 2023.
- [181] Daniel Adiwardana, Minh-Thang Luong, David R So, Jamie Hall, Noah Fiedel, Romal Thoppilan, Zi Yang, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Gaurav Nemade, Yifeng Lu, et al. Towards a human-like open-domain chatbot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09977*, 2020.
- [182] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.16609>.
- [183] Stephen Roller, Emily Dinan, Naman Goyal, Da Ju, Mary Williamson, Yinhan Liu, Jing Xu, Myle Ott, Eric Michael Smith, Y-Lan Boureau, et al. Recipes for building an open-domain chatbot. In *Proceedings of the 16th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Main Volume*, pages 300–325, 2021.
- [184] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-VL: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12966>.
- [185] Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Josh Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Gadre, Shiori Sagawa, et al. OpenFlamingo: An open-source framework for training large autoregressive vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01390*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.01390>.

- [186] Siqi Bao, Huang He, Fan Wang, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, Wenquan Wu, Zhen Guo, Zhibin Liu, and Xinchao Xu. Plato-2: Towards building an open-domain chatbot via curriculum learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL-IJCNLP 2021*, pages 2513–2525, 2021.
- [187] Baptiste Roziere, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, et al. Code Llama: Open foundation models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12950*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.12950>.
- [188] ParlAI. BlenderBot 2.0: An open source chatbot that builds long-term memory and searches the internet. <https://parl.ai/projects/blenderbot2/>, July 2021.
- [189] Haipeng Luo, Qingfeng Sun, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Jianguang Lou, Chongyang Tao, Xiubo Geng, Qingwei Lin, Shifeng Chen, and Dongmei Zhang. Wizardmath: Empowering mathematical reasoning for large language models via reinforced evol-instruct, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.09583>.
- [190] Opher Lieber, Or Sharir, Barak Lenz, and Yoav Shoham. Jurassic-1: Technical details and evaluation. <https://www.ai21.com/blog/research/jurassic-1-technical-details-evaluation/>, 2021.
- [191] Ziyang Luo, Can Xu, Pu Zhao, Qingfeng Sun, Xiubo Geng, Wenxiang Hu, Chongyang Tao, Jing Ma, Qingwei Lin, and Daxin Jiang. WizardCoder: Empowering code large language models with evol-instruct. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 27168–27188, 2024.
- [192] Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde De Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*, 2021.
- [193] Hugo Laurençon, Lucile Saulnier, Léo Tronchon, Stas Bekman, Amanpreet Singh, Anton Lozhkov, Thomas Wang, Siddharth Karamcheti, Alexander Rush, Douwe Kiela, et al. Obelics: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:71683–71702, 2023.
- [194] Boseop Kim, Hyoungho Kim, Sang-Woo Lee, Gichang Lee, Donghyun Kwak, Dong Hyeon Jeon, Sunghyun Park, Sungju Kim, Seonhoon Kim, Dongpil Seo, et al. What changes can large-scale language models bring? intensive study on HyperCLOVA. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04650*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.04650>.
- [195] Yuanzhi Li, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Allie Del Giorno, Suriya Gunasekar, and Yin Tat Lee. Textbooks are all you need II: phi-1.5 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05463*, 2023.
- [196] Siqi Bao, Huang He, Fan Wang, Hua Wu, Haifeng Wang, Wenquan Wu, Zhihua Wu, Zhen Guo, Hua Lu, Xinxian Huang, et al. Plato-xl: Exploring the large-scale pre-training of dialogue generation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: AACL-IJCNLP 2022*, pages 107–118, 2022.
- [197] Aiyuan Yang, Bin Xiao, Bingning Wang, Borong Zhang, Ce Bian, Chao Yin, Chenxu Lv, Da Pan, Dian Wang, Dong Yan, et al. Baichuan 2: Open large-scale language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.10305*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10305>.

- [198] OpenAI. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4v-system-card/>, 2023.
- [199] Shuohuan Wang, Yu Sun, Yang Xiang, Zhihua Wu, Siyu Ding, Weibao Gong, Shikun Feng, Junyuan Shang, Yanbin Zhao, Chao Pang, et al. ERNIE 3.0 titan: Exploring larger-scale knowledge enhanced pre-training for language understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.12731*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.12731>.
- [200] Nan Du, Yanping Huang, Andrew M Dai, Simon Tong, Dmitry Lepikhin, Yuanzhong Xu, Maxim Krikun, Yanqi Zhou, Adams Wei Yu, Orhan Firat, et al. Glam: Efficient scaling of language models with mixture-of-experts. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5547–5569. PMLR, 2022.
- [201] Romal Thoppilan, Daniel De Freitas, Jamie Hall, Noam Shazeer, Apoorv Kulshreshtha, Heng-Tze Cheng, Alicia Jin, Taylor Bos, Leslie Baker, Yu Du, et al. Lamda: Language models for dialog applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.08239*, 2022.
- [202] Moonshot AI. Kimi / Moonshot AI product documentation. <https://platform.kimi.ai/docs>, 2024.
- [203] Yujia Li, David Choi, Junyoung Chung, Nate Kushman, Julian Schrittwieser, Rémi Leblond, Tom Eccles, James Keeling, Felix Gimeno, Agustin Dal Lago, et al. Competition-level code generation with alphacode. *Science*, 378(6624):1092–1097, 2022.
- [204] Baidu. ERNIE 4.0 product information. <https://yiyuan.baidu.com/>, 2023.
- [205] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:27730–27744, 2022.
- [206] Adept AI. Fuyu-8b: A multimodal architecture for AI agents. <https://www.adept.ai/blog/fuyu-8b>, 2023.
- [207] Lewis Tunstall, Edward Beeching, Nathan Lambert, Nazneen Rajani, Kashif Rasul, Younes Belkada, Shengyi Huang, Leandro von Werra, Clémentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Nathan Sarrazin, Omar Sanseviero, Alexander M. Rush, and Thomas Wolf. Zephyr: Direct distillation of LM alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16944*, 2023.
- [208] Erik Nijkamp, Bo Pang, Hiroaki Hayashi, Lifu Tu, Huan Wang, Yingbo Zhou, Silvio Savarese, and Caiming Xiong. A conversational paradigm for program synthesis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13474*, 30, 2022.
- [209] THUDM. Chatglm3-6b repository and model card. <https://github.com/zai-org/ChatGLM3>, 2023.
- [210] Tianwen Wei, Liang Zhao, Lichang Zhang, Bo Zhu, Lijie Wang, Haihua Yang, Biye Li, Cheng Cheng, Weiwei Lü, Rui Hu, et al. Skywork: A more open bilingual foundation model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19341*, 2023.
- [211] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katie Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza

- Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andrew Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karen Simonyan. Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.14198>.
- [212] OpenAI. New models and developer products announced at devday. <https://openai.com/index/new-models-and-developer-products-announced-at-devday/>, 2023.
- [213] OpenAI. Gpt-4 turbo model documentation. <https://platform.openai.com/docs/models/gpt-4-turbo>, 2024.
- [214] xAI. Grok-1 open release. <https://x.ai/news/grok-os>, 2024.
- [215] Baolin Peng, Michel Galley, Pengcheng He, Chris Brockett, Lars Liden, Elnaz Nouri, Zhou Yu, Bill Dolan, and Jianfeng Gao. Godel: Large-scale pre-training for goal-directed dialog. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.11309*, 2022.
- [216] Alex Young, Bei Chen, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Ge Zhang, Guanwei Zhang, Heng Li, Jiangcheng Zhu, Jianqun Chen, Jing Chang, et al. Yi: Open foundation models by 01.AI. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.04652*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.04652>.
- [217] Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Wenmeng Yu, Wenyi Hong, Ji Qi, Yan Wang, Junhui Ji, Zhuoyi Yang, Lei Zhao, Xixuan Song, et al. CogVLM: Visual expert for pretrained language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03079*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03079>.
- [218] Kurt Shuster, Jing Xu, Mojtaba Komeili, Da Ju, Eric Michael Smith, Stephen Roller, Megan Ung, Moya Chen, Kushal Arora, Joshua Lane, et al. Blenderbot 3: a deployed conversational agent that continually learns to responsibly engage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.03188*, 2022.
- [219] Anthropic. Introducing claude 2.1. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-2-1>, November 2023.
- [220] Xi Chen, Xiao Wang, Soravit Changpinyo, AJ Piergiovanni, Piotr Padlewski, Daniel Salz, Sebastian Goodman, Adam Grycner, Basil Mustafa, Lucas Beyer, et al. PaLI: A jointly-scaled multilingual language-image model. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.06794>.
- [221] Inflection AI. Inflection-2: The next step up. <https://inflection.ai/blog/inflection-2>, November 2023.
- [222] Amelia Glaese, Nat McAleese, Maja Trębacz, John Aslanides, Vlad Firoiu, Timo Ewalds, Mari-beth Rauh, Laura Weidinger, Martin Chadwick, Phoebe Thacker, et al. Improving alignment of dialogue agents via targeted human judgements. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14375*, 2022.
- [223] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek Coder: Let the code write itself. <https://github.com/deepseek-ai/deepseek-coder>, November 2023.
- [224] Qinkai Zheng, Xiao Xia, Xu Zou, Yuxiao Dong, Shan Wang, Yufei Xue, Lei Shen, Zihan Wang, Andi Wang, Yang Li, et al. Codegeex: A pre-trained model for code generation with multilingual benchmarking on humaneval-x. In *Proceedings of the 29th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 5673–5684, 2023.

- [225] Guan Wang, Sijie Cheng, Xianyuan Zhan, Xiangang Li, Sen Song, and Yang Liu. Openchat: Advancing open-source language models with mixed-quality data. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 57021–57040, 2024.
- [226] Aohan Zeng, Xiao Liu, Zhengxiao Du, Zihan Wang, Hanyu Lai, Ming Ding, Zhuoyi Yang, Yifan Xu, Wendi Zheng, Xiao Xia, et al. GLM-130B: An open bilingual pre-trained model. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.02414>.
- [227] Xiao Bi, Deli Chen, Guanting Chen, Shanhuang Chen, Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Honghui Ding, Kai Dong, Qiushi Du, Zhe Fu, et al. Deepseek llm: Scaling open-source language models with longtermism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02954*, 2024.
- [228] Ross Taylor, Marcin Kardas, Guillem Cucurull, Thomas Scialom, Anthony Hartshorn, Elvis Saravia, Andrew Poulton, Viktor Kerkez, and Robert Stojnic. Galactica: A large language model for science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09085*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09085>.
- [229] Arindam Mitra, Luciano Del Corro, Shweti Mahajan, Andres Coda, Clarisse Simoes, Sahaj Agarwal, Xuxi Chen, Anastasia Razdaibiedina, Erik Jones, Kriti Aggarwal, et al. Orca 2: Teaching small language models how to reason. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11045*, 2023.
- [230] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [231] Microsoft. Phi-2: The surprising power of small language models. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/phi-2-the-surprising-power-of-small-language-models/>, 2023.
- [232] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Alpaca: A strong, replicable instruction-following model. <https://crfm.stanford.edu/2023/03/13/alpaca.html>, mar 2023. Blog post.
- [233] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M. Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, David Silver, Melvin Johnson, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Amelia Glaese, Jilin Chen, Emily Pitler, Timothy Lillicrap, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, James Molloy, Michael Isard, Paul R. Barham, Tom Hennigan, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, Ryan Doherty, Eli Collins, Clemens Meyer, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, Jack Krawczyk, Cosmo Du, Ed Chi, Heng-Tze Cheng, Eric Ni, Purvi Shah, Patrick Kane, Betty Chan, Manaal Faruqui, Aliaksei Severyn, Hanzhao Lin, YaGuang Li, Yong Cheng, Abe Ittycheriah, Mahdis Mahdieh, Mia Chen, Pei Sun, Dustin Tran, Sumit Bagri, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Jeremiah Liu, Andras Orban, Fabian Gra, Hao Zhou, Xinying Song, Aurelien Boffy, Harish Ganapathy, Steven Zheng, HyunJeong Choe, goston Weisz, Tao Zhu, Yifeng Lu, Siddharth Gopal, Jarrod Kahn, Maciej Kula, Jeff Pitman, Rushin Shah, Emanuel Taropa, Majd Al Merey, Martin Baeuml, Zhifeng Chen, Laurent El Shafey, Yujing Zhang, Olcan Sercinoglu, George Tucker, Enrique Piqueras, Maxim Krikun, Iain Barr, Nikolay Savinov, Ivo Danihelka, Becca Roelofs, Anas White, Anders Andreassen, Tamara von Glehn, Lakshman Yagati, Mehran Kazemi, Lucas Gonzalez, Misha Khalman, Jakub Sygnowski, Alexandre

- Frechette, Charlotte Smith, Laura Culp, Lev Proleev, Yi Luan, Xi Chen, James Lottes, Nathan Schucher, Federico Lebron, Alban Rrustemi, Natalie Clay, Phil Crone, Tomas Kocisky, Jeffrey Zhao, Bartek Perz, Dian Yu, Heidi Howard, Adam Bloniarz, Jack W. Rae, Han Lu, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023.
- [234] Anthropic. Introducing claude. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/introducing-claude>, 2023.
- [235] Yuntao Bai, Saurav Kadavath, Sandipan Kundu, Amanda Askell, Jackson Kernion, Andy Jones, Anna Chen, Anna Goldie, Azalia Mirhoseini, Cameron McKinnon, et al. Constitutional ai: Harmlessness from ai feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*, 2022.
- [236] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. InternVL: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.14238>.
- [237] Xiaozhe Ren, Pingyi Zhou, Xinfan Meng, Xinjing Huang, Yadao Wang, Weichao Wang, Pengfei Li, Xiaoda Zhang, Alexander Podolskiy, Grigory Arshinov, et al. Pangu- Σ : Towards trillion parameter language model with sparse heterogeneous computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10845*, 2023.
- [238] Sanghoon Kim, Dahyun Kim, Chanjun Park, Wonsung Lee, Wonho Song, Yunsu Kim, Hyeonwoo Kim, Yungi Kim, Hyeonju Lee, Jihoo Kim, et al. Solar 10.7 b: Scaling large language models with simple yet effective depth up-scaling. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, pages 23–35, 2024.
- [239] Shijie Wu, Ozan Irsoy, Steven Lu, Vadim Dabravolski, Mark Dredze, Sebastian Gehrmann, Prabhanjan Kambadur, David Rosenberg, and Gideon Mann. BloombergGPT: A large language model for finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17564*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.17564>.
- [240] Zhipu AI. GLM-4 product and model documentation. <https://open.bigmodel.cn/dev/howuse/model>, 2024.
- [241] THUDM. Chatglm-6b repository and model card. <https://github.com/THUDM/ChatGLM-6B>, 2023.
- [242] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. LLaVA-NeXT: Improved reasoning, OCR, and world knowledge. <https://llava-vl.github.io/blog/2024-01-30-llava-next/>, 2024.
- [243] Danny Driess, Fei Xia, Mehdi S. M. Sajjadi, Corey Lynch, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Brian Ichter, Ayzaan Wahid, Jonathan Tompson, Quan Vuong, Tianhe Yu, Wenlong Huang, Yevgen Chebotar, Pierre Sermanet, Daniel Duckworth, Sergey Levine, Vincent Vanhoucke, Karol Hausman, Marc Toussaint, Klaus Greff, Andy Zeng, Igor Mordatch, and Pete Florence. Palm-e: An embodied multimodal language model, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.03378>.

- [244] Marco Bellagente, Jonathan Tow, Dakota Mahan, Duy Phung, Maksym Zhuravinskiy, Reshinth Adithyan, James Baicoianu, Ben Brooks, Nathan Cooper, Ashish Datta, et al. Stable lm 2 1.6 b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.17834*, 2024.
- [245] Wei-Lin Chiang, Zhuohan Li, Zi Lin, Ying Sheng, Zhanghao Wu, Hao Zhang, Lianmin Zheng, Siyuan Zhuang, Yonghao Zhuang, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Ion Stoica, and Eric P. Xing. Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing GPT-4 with 90%* ChatGPT quality. <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/>, mar 2023. Blog post.
- [246] OpenAI. Introducing apis for GPT-3.5 Turbo and whisper. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-chatgpt-and-whisper-apis/>, 2023.
- [247] Mistral AI. Mistral large. <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-large>, 2024.
- [248] Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Quentin Gregory Anthony, Herbie Bradley, Kyle O’Brien, Eric Hallahan, Mohammad Aflah Khan, Shivanshu Purohit, USVSN Sai Prashanth, Edward Raff, et al. Pythia: A suite for analyzing large language models across training and scaling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.01373>.
- [249] Qwen Team. Qwen1.5-moe: Matching 7b model performance with 1/3 activated parameters. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen-moe/>, 2024.
- [250] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.08485>.
- [251] Gemini Team, Petko Georgiev, Ving Ian Lei, Ryan Burnell, Libin Bai, Anmol Gulati, Garrett Tanzer, Damien Vincent, Zhufeng Pan, Shibo Wang, Soroosh Mariooryad, Yifan Ding, Xinyang Geng, Fred Alcober, Roy Frostig, Mark Omernick, Lexi Walker, Cosmin Paduraru, Christina Sorokin, Andrea Tacchetti, Colin Gaffney, Samira Daruki, Olcan Sercinoglu, Zach Gleicher, Juliette Love, Paul Voigtlaender, Rohan Jain, Gabriela Surita, Kareem Mohamed, Rory Blevins, Junwhan Ahn, Tao Zhu, Kornraphop Kawintiranon, Orhan Firat, Yiming Gu, Yujing Zhang, Matthew Rahtz, Manaal Faruqui, Natalie Clay, Justin Gilmer, JD Co-Reyes, Ivo Penchev, Rui Zhu, Nobuyuki Morioka, Kevin Hui, Krishna Haridasan, Victor Campos, Mahdis Mahdieh, Mandy Guo, Samer Hassan, Kevin Kilgour, Arpi Vezar, Heng-Tze Cheng, Raoul de Liedekerke, Siddharth Goyal, Paul Barham, DJ Strouse, Seb Noury, Jonas Adler, Mukund Sundararajan, Sharad Vikram, Dmitry Lepikhin, Michela Paganini, Xavier Garcia, Fan Yang, Dasha Valter, Maja Trebacz, Kiran Vodrahalli, Chulayuth Asawaroengchai, Roman Ring, Norbert Kalb, Livio Baldini Soares, Siddhartha Brahma, David Steiner, Tianhe Yu, Fabian Mentzer, Antoine He, Lucas Gonzalez, Bibo Xu, Raphael Lopez Kaufman, Laurent El Shafey, Junhyuk Oh, Tom Hennigan, George van den Driessche, Seth Odoom, Mario Lucic, Becca Roelofs, Sid Lall, Amit Marathe, Betty Chan, Santiago Ontanon, Luheng He, Denis Teplyashin, Jonathan Lai, Phil Crone, Bogdan Damoc, Lewis Ho, Sebastian Riedel, Karel Lenc, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Aakanksha Chowdhery, et al. Gemini 1.5: Unlocking multimodal understanding across millions of tokens of context. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.05530*, 2024.
- [252] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.10592>.

- [253] Dirk Groeneveld, Iz Beltagy, Evan Walsh, Akshita Bhagia, Rodney Kinney, Oyvind Tafjord, Ananya Jha, Hamish Ivison, Ian Magnusson, Yizhong Wang, et al. Olmo: Accelerating the science of language models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 15789–15809, 2024.
- [254] Databricks. Free dolly: Introducing the world’s first truly open instruction-tuned llm. <https://www.databricks.com/blog/2023/04/12/dolly-first-open-commercially-viable-instruction-tuned-llm>, apr 2023. Blog post and dataset release.
- [255] Anton Lozhkov, Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Federico Cassano, Joel Lamy-Poirier, Nouamane Tazi, Ao Tang, Dmytro Pykhtar, Jiawei Liu, Yuxiang Wei, et al. Starcoder 2 and the stack v2: The next generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.19173*, 2024.
- [256] Stability AI. Stable LM, April 2023. URL <https://github.com/stability-AI/stableLM/>.
- [257] Reka AI. Reka Flash, February 2024. URL <https://reka.ai/news/reka-flash-efficient-and-capable-multimodal-language-models>.
- [258] Ebtesam Almazrouei, Hamza Alobeidli, Abdulaziz Alshamsi, Alessandro Cappelli, Ruxandra Cojocaru, M erouane Debbah,  tienne Goffinet, Daniel Hesslow, Julien Launay, Quentin Malartic, et al. The falcon series of open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16867*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16867>.
- [259] Guilherme Penedo, Quentin Malartic, Daniel Hesslow, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Alessandro Cappelli, Hamza Alobeidli, Baptiste Pannier, Ebtesam Almazrouei, and Julien Launay. The Refined-Web dataset for falcon LLM: Outperforming curated corpora with web data, and web data only. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.01116*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.01116>.
- [260] Gemma Team, Thomas Mesnard, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, Surya Bhupatiraju, Shreya Pathak, Laurent Sifre, Morgane Riviere, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Juliette Love, et al. Gemma: Open models based on gemini research and technology. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.08295*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08295>.
- [261] MosaicML. Introducing mpt-7b: A new standard for open-source, commercially usable LLMs. <https://www.databricks.com/blog/mpt-7b>, 2023.
- [262] MosaicML. Mpt-30b: Raising the bar for open-source foundation models. <https://www.databricks.com/blog/mpt-30b>, 2023.
- [263] Raymond Li, Loubna Ben Allal, Yangtian Zi, Niklas Muennighoff, Denis Kocetkov, Chenghao Mou, Marc Marone, Christopher Akiki, Jia Li, Jenny Chim, et al. Starcoder: May the source be with you! *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06161*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06161>.
- [264] Databricks. Introducing DBRX: A new state-of-the-art open LLM. <https://www.databricks.com/blog/introducing-dbrx-new-state-art-open-llm>, 2024.
- [265] Together AI. Redpajama-INCITE model family. <https://www.together.ai/blog/redpajama-models-v1>, 2023.

- [266] Opher Lieber, Barak Lenz, Hofit Bata, Gal Cohen, Jhonathan Osin, Itay Dalmedigos, Erez Safahi, Shaked Meir, Yonatan Belinkov, Shai Shalev-Shwartz, et al. Jamba: A hybrid transformer-mamba language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.19887*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.19887>.
- [267] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. InstructBLIP: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.06500>.
- [268] Anthropic. The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>, 2024.
- [269] Rohan Anil, Andrew M Dai, Orhan Firat, Melvin Johnson, Dmitry Lepikhin, Alexandre Passos, Siamak Shakeri, Emanuel Taropa, Paige Bailey, Zhifeng Chen, et al. Palm 2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10403*, 2023.
- [270] Cohere. Command r: Retrieval-augmented generation at production scale. <https://cohere.com/blog/command-r>, March 2024.
- [271] Yue Wang, Hung Le, Akhilesh Gotmare, Nghi Bui, Junnan Li, and Steven Hoi. Codet5+: Open code large language models for code understanding and generation. In *Proceedings of the 2023 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1069–1088, 2023.
- [272] Inflection AI. Inflection-2.5: Meet the world’s best personal AI. <https://inflection.ai/blog/inflection-2-5>, March 2024.
- [273] Inflection AI. Inflection-1: Pi’s best-in-class LLM. <https://inflection.ai/blog/inflection-1>, June 2023.
- [274] Haoyu Lu, Wen Liu, Bo Zhang, Bingxuan Wang, Kai Dong, Bo Liu, Jingxiang Sun, Tongzheng Ren, Zhuoshu Li, Hao Yang, Yaofeng Sun, Chengqi Deng, Hanwei Xu, Zhenda Xie, and Chong Ruan. Deepseek-vl: Towards real-world vision-language understanding, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.05525>.
- [275] Suriya Gunasekar, Yi Zhang, Jyoti Aneja, Caio César Teodoro Mendes, Allie Del Giorno, Sivakanth Gopi, Mojan Javaheripi, Piero Kauffmann, Gustavo de Rosa, Olli Saarikivi, Adil Salim, Shital Shah, Harkirat Singh Behl, Xin Wang, Sébastien Bubeck, Ronen Eldan, Adam Tauman Kalai, Yin Tat Lee, and Yuanzhi Li. Textbooks are all you need. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11644*, 2023.
- [276] xAI. Grok-1.5, March 2024. URL <https://x.ai/news/grok-1.5>.
- [277] BAAI. Aquila language model series. <https://github.com/FlagAI-Open/FlagAI/tree/master/examples/Aquila>, 2023.
- [278] Brandon McKinzie, Zhe Gan, Jean-Philippe Fauconnier, Sam Dodge, Bowen Zhang, Philipp Dufter, Dhruvi Shah, Xianzhi Du, Futang Peng, Anton Belyi, et al. Mm1: methods, analysis and insights from multimodal llm pre-training. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 304–323. Springer, 2024.

- [279] THUDM. Chatglm2-6b repository and model card. <https://github.com/zai-org/ChatGLM2-6B>, 2023.
- [280] Baichuan Inc. Baichuan-7B. <https://github.com/baichuan-inc/baichuan-7B>, 2023.
- [281] Baichuan Inc. Baichuan-13B. <https://github.com/baichuan-inc/baichuan-13B>, 2023.
- [282] Marah Abdin, Sam Ade Jacobs, Ammar Ahmad Awan, Jyoti Aneja, Ahmed Awadallah, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Amit Bahree, Arash Bakhtiari, Harkirat Behl, et al. Phi-3 technical report: A highly capable language model locally on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14219*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.14219>.
- [283] Erik Nijkamp, Tian Xie, Hiroaki Hayashi, Bo Pang, Congying Xia, Chen Xing, Jesse Vig, Semih Yavuz, Philippe Laban, Ben Krause, et al. Xgen-7b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03450*, 2023.
- [284] Mistral AI. Cheaper, better, faster, stronger. <https://mistral.ai/news/mixtral-8x22b>, 2024.
- [285] Meta. Introducing meta llama 3. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/meta-llama-3/>, 2024.
- [286] Xingwu Sun, Yanfeng Chen, Yiqing Huang, Ruobing Xie, Jiaqi Zhu, Kai Zhang, Shuaipeng Li, Zhen Yang, Jonny Han, Xiaobo Shu, et al. Hunyuan-large: An open-source moe model with 52 billion activated parameters by tencent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.02265*, 2024.
- [287] Cohere. Introducing command r+: A scalable LLM built for business. <https://cohere.com/blog/command-r-plus-microsoft-azure>, 2024.
- [288] Team OLMO, Pete Walsh, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Yuling Gu, Shengyi Huang, Matt Jordan, et al. 2 olmo 2 furious. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.00656*, 2024.
- [289] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Hao Tian, Shenglong Ye, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Wenwen Tong, Kongzhi Hu, Jiapeng Luo, Zheng Ma, et al. How far are we to gpt-4v? closing the gap to commercial multimodal models with open-source suites. *Science China Information Sciences*, 67(12):220101, 2024.
- [290] Mistral AI. Pixtral Large, November 2024. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/pixtral-large/>.
- [291] Reka AI. Reka Core, April 2024. URL <https://reka.ai/news/reka-core-our-frontier-class-multimodal-language-model>.
- [292] Andrés Marafioti, Orr Zohar, Miquel Farré, Merve Noyan, Elie Bakouch, Pedro Cuenca, Cyril Zakka, Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Nouamane Tazi, et al. Smolvlm: Redefining small and efficient multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.05299*, 2025.
- [293] Qwen Team. CodeQwen1.5, April 2024. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=codeqwen1.5>.

- [294] Hugo Laurençon, Léo Tronchon, Matthieu Cord, and Victor Sanh. What matters when building vision-language models? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 87874–87907, 2024.
- [295] AI at Meta. Llama 3.3 70b: A highly capable open model. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3-3/>, 2024.
- [296] Sachin Mehta, Mohammad Hossein Sekhavat, Qingqing Cao, Maxwell Horton, Yanzi Jin, Chenfan Sun, Iman Mirzadeh, Mahyar Najibi, Dmitry Belenko, Peter Zatloukal, et al. Openelm: An efficient language model family with open training and inference framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.14619*, 2024.
- [297] Andreas Steiner, André Susano Pinto, Michael Tschannen, Daniel Keysers, Xiao Wang, Yonatan Bitton, Alexey Gritsenko, Matthias Minderer, Anthony Sherbondy, Shangbang Long, et al. Paligemma 2: A family of versatile vlms for transfer, 2024.
- [298] Snowflake. Snowflake Arctic, April 2024. URL <https://www.snowflake.com/en/blog/arctic-open-efficient-foundation-language-models-snowflake/>.
- [299] Zhiyu Wu, Xiaokang Chen, Zizheng Pan, Xingchao Liu, Wen Liu, Damai Dai, Huazuo Gao, Yiyang Ma, Chengyue Wu, Bingxuan Wang, et al. Deepseek-vl2: Mixture-of-experts vision-language models for advanced multimodal understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.10302*, 2024.
- [300] Volcengine / ByteDance. Doubao large model service documentation. <https://www.volcengine.com/product/doubao>, 2024.
- [301] Falcon-LLM Team. The falcon 3 family of open models, December 2024. URL <https://huggingface.co/blog/falcon3>.
- [302] IBM Granite Team. Granite 3.1, December 2024. URL <https://github.com/ibm-granite/granite-3.1-language-models>.
- [303] Zhe Chen, Weiyun Wang, Yue Cao, Yangzhou Liu, Zhangwei Gao, Erfei Cui, Jinguo Zhu, Shenglong Ye, Hao Tian, Zhaoyang Liu, et al. Expanding performance boundaries of open-source multimodal models with model, data, and test-time scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05271*, 2024.
- [304] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Jiazheng Xu, Wenmeng Yu, Junhui Ji, Yan Wang, Zihan Wang, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, and Jie Tang. CogVLM2: Visual language models for image and video understanding. <https://github.com/THUDM/CogVLM2>, 2024.
- [305] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, Qianyu Chen, Huarong Zhou, Zhensheng Zou, Haoye Zhang, Shengding Hu, Zhi Zheng, Jie Zhou, Jie Cai, Xu Han, Guoyang Zeng, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.01800>.
- [306] Mistral AI. Codestral. <https://mistral.ai/news/codestral/>, May 2024.
- [307] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5-Max: Exploring the intelligence of large-scale moe model. <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen2.5-max>, January 2025.

- [308] Quentin Malartic, Nilabhra Roy Chowdhury, Ruxandra Cojocaru, Mugariya Farooq, Giulia Campesan, Yasser Abdelaziz Dahou Djilali, Sanath Narayan, Ankit Singh, Maksim Velikanov, Basma El Amel Boussaha, et al. Falcon2-11b technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14885*, 2024.
- [309] OpenBMB. MiniCPM-o 2.6: A gpt-4o level MLLM for vision, speech and multimodal live streaming on your phone. [OpenBMB release note](#), January 2025.
- [310] Lucas Beyer, Andreas Steiner, André Susano Pinto, Alexander Kolesnikov, Xiao Wang, Daniel Salz, Maxim Neumann, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Michael Tschannen, Emanuele Bugliarello, et al. Paligemma: A versatile 3b vlm for transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07726*, 2024.
- [311] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv e-prints*, pages arXiv-2502, 2025.
- [312] Viraat Aryabumi, John Dang, Dwarak Talupuru, Saurabh Dash, David Cairuz, Hangyu Lin, Bharat Venkitesh, Madeline Smith, Jon Ander Campos, Yi Chern Tan, et al. Aya 23: Open weight releases to further multilingual progress. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15032*, 2024.
- [313] Xiaokang Chen, Zhiyu Wu, Xingchao Liu, Zizheng Pan, Wen Liu, Zhenda Xie, Xingkai Yu, and Chong Ruan. Janus-pro: Unified multimodal understanding and generation with data and model scaling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17811*, 2025.
- [314] Mayank Mishra, Matt Stallone, Gaoyuan Zhang, Yikang Shen, Aditya Prasad, Adriana Meza Soria, Michele Merler, Parameswaran Selvam, Saptha Surendran, Shivdeep Singh, et al. Granite code models: A family of open foundation models for code intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.04324*, 2024.
- [315] Mistral AI. Mistral Small 3, January 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-small-3/>.
- [316] An Yang, Baosong Yang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chang Zhou, Chengpeng Li, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.10671*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.10671>.
- [317] GLM Team. GLM-4-9B / GLM-4 technical materials. <https://huggingface.co/THUDM/glm-4-9b>, 2024.
- [318] Abdelrahman Abouelenin, Atabak Ashfaq, Adam Atkinson, Hany Awadalla, Nguyen Bach, Jianmin Bao, Alon Benhaim, Martin Cai, Vishrav Chaudhary, Congcong Chen, et al. Phi-4-mini technical report: Compact yet powerful multimodal language models via mixture-of-LoRAs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.01743*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.01743>.
- [319] Anthropic. Claude 3.5 sonnet. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-5-sonnet>, 2024.
- [320] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai Charitha Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, et al. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16860*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.16860>.

- [321] Cohere. Introducing command a: Max performance, minimal compute. <https://cohere.com/blog/command-a>, March 2025.
- [322] DeepSeek-AI, Qihao Zhu, Daya Guo, Zhihong Shao, Dejian Yang, Peiyi Wang, Runxin Xu, Y. Wu, Yukun Li, Huazuo Gao, Shirong Ma, Wangding Zeng, Xiao Bi, Zihui Gu, Hanwei Xu, Damai Dai, Kai Dong, Liyue Zhang, Y. Piao, Zhibin Gou, Zhenda Xie, Zhewen Hao, Bing-Li Wang, Jun-Mei Song, Deli Chen, Xin Xie, Kang Guan, Yu mei You, A. Liu, Qiushi Du, Wenjun Gao, Xuan Lu, Qinyu Chen, Yaohui Wang, C. Deng, Jiashi Li, Chenggang Zhao, C. Ruan, Fuli Luo, and W. Liang. Deepseek-coder-v2: Breaking the barrier of closed-source models in code intelligence. *ArXiv*, abs/2406.11931, 2024.
- [323] Mistral AI. Mistral small 3.1: A versatile multimodal model for edge and enterprise. <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-small-3-1/>, 2025.
- [324] Bo Adler, Niket Agarwal, Ashwath Aithal, Dong H. Anh, Pallab Bhattacharya, Annika Brundyn, Jared Casper, Bryan Catanzaro, Sharon Clay, Jonathan Cohen, Sirshak Das, Ayush Dattagupta, Olivier Delalleau, Leon Derczynski, Yi Dong, Daniel Egert, Ellie Evans, Aleksander Ficek, Denys Fridman, Shaona Ghosh, Boris Ginsburg, Igor Gitman, Tomasz Grzegorzec, Robert Hero, Jining Huang, Vibhu Jawa, Joseph Jennings, Aastha Jhunjunwala, John Kamalu, Sadaf Khan, Oleksii Kuchaiev, Patrick LeGresley, Hui Li, Jiwei Liu, Zihan Liu, Eileen Long, Ameya Sunil Mahabaleshwarkar, Somshubra Majumdar, James Maki, Miguel Martinez, Maer Rodrigues de Melo, Ivan Moshkov, Deepak Narayanan, Sean Narenthiran, Jesus Navarro, Phong Nguyen, Osvald Nitski, Vahid Noroozi, Guruprasad Nutheti, Christopher Parisien, Jupinder Parmar, Mostofa Patwary, Krzysztof Pawelec, Wei Ping, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Rajarshi Roy, Trisha Saar, Vasanth Rao Naik Sabavat, Sanjeev Satheesh, Jane Polak Scowcroft, Jason Sewall, Pavel Shamis, Gerald Shen, Mohammad Shoeybi, Dave Sizer, Misha Smelyanskiy, Felipe Soares, Makesh Narsimhan Sreedhar, Dan Su, Sandeep Subramanian, Shengyang Sun, Shubham Toshniwal, Hao Wang, Zhilin Wang, Jiaxuan You, Jiaqi Zeng, Jimmy Zhang, Jing Zhang, Vivienne Zhang, Yian Zhang, and Chen Zhu. Nemotron-4 340B technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11704*, 2024.
- [325] Saurabh Dash, Yiyang Nan, John Dang, Arash Ahmadian, Shivalika Singh, Madeline Smith, Bharat Venkitesh, Vlad Shmyhlo, Viraat Aryabumi, Walter Beller-Morales, et al. Aya vision: Advancing the frontier of multilingual multimodality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08751*, 2025.
- [326] Qwen Team. Qwen2.5-VL-32B, March 2025. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen2.5-vl-32b>.
- [327] Tianwen Wei, Bo Zhu, Liang Zhao, Cheng Cheng, Biye Li, Weiwei Lü, Peng Cheng, Jianhao Zhang, Xiaoyu Zhang, Liang Zeng, et al. Skywork-moe: A deep dive into training techniques for mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06563*, 2024.
- [328] Allen Institute for AI. OLMo 2 32B, March 2025. URL <https://allenai.org/blog/olmo2-32B>.
- [329] InternVL Team. InternVL2 release documentation. <https://internvl.github.io/blog/2024-07-02-InternVL-2.0/>, 2024.
- [330] OpenAI. Introducing the gpt-4.1 family with enhanced performance and long-context support, 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4-1/>.

- [331] Aaron Grattafiori, Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Alex Vaughan, et al. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.21783>.
- [332] InternLM Team. InternLM2.5 release and documentation. <https://github.com/InternLM/InternLM>, 2024.
- [333] OpenAI. GPT-4o mini: Advancing cost-efficient intelligence. <https://openai.com/index/gpt-4o-mini-advancing-cost-efficient-intelligence/>, jul 2024. Blog post.
- [334] IBM Granite Team. Granite 3.3, April 2025. URL <https://huggingface.co/collections/ibm-granite/granite-33>.
- [335] Mistral AI. Codestral mamba. <https://mistral.ai/news/codestral-mamba/>, July 2024.
- [336] Kimi Team. Kimi-VL technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.07491>.
- [337] Mistral AI. Mistral nemo. <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-nemo/>, July 2024.
- [338] Charith Peris and Charith Peris. Amazon nova premier: Technical report and model card. *Amazon Technical Reports*, 2025. URL <https://www.amazon.science/publications/amazon-nova-premier-technical-report-and-model-card>.
- [339] Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Elie Bakouch, Leandro von Werra, and Thomas Wolf. Smollm-blazingly fast and remarkably powerful. *Hugging Face Blog*, 16, 2024.
- [340] Mistral AI. Mistral Medium 3, May 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-medium-3/>.
- [341] Mistral AI. Mistral Large 2, July 2024. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-large-2407/>.
- [342] Mistral AI and All Hands AI. Devstral, May 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/devstral>.
- [343] LLaVA Team. LLaVA-OneVision release documentation. https://github.com/LLaVA-VL/LLaVA-NeXT/blob/main/docs/LLaVA_OneVision.md, 2024.
- [344] Baidu. ERNIE 4.5 technical report. https://ernie.baidu.com/blog/publication/ERNIE_Technical_Report.pdf, June 2025.
- [345] xAI. Grok-2. <https://x.ai/blog/grok-2>, aug 2024. Blog post.
- [346] xAI. Grok-1.5V. <https://x.ai/news/grok-1.5v>, August 2024.
- [347] Kimi Team. Kimi K2: Open agentic intelligence, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.20534>.
- [348] Qwen Team. Qwen3-Coder: Agentic coding in the world, July 2025. URL <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwen3-coder/>.

- [349] Pavan Kumar Anasosalu Vasu, Fartash Faghri, Chun-Liang Li, Cem Koc, Nate True, Albert Antony, Gokula Santhanam, James Gabriel, Peter Grasch, Oncel Tuzel, et al. Fastvlm: Efficient vision encoding for vision language models. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 19769–19780, 2025.
- [350] Jamba Team, Barak Lenz, Alan Arazi, Amir Bergman, Avshalom Manevich, Barak Peleg, Ben Aviram, Chen Almagor, Clara Fridman, Dan Padnos, et al. Jamba-1.5: Hybrid transformer-mamba models at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.12570*, 2024.
- [351] Alexander Amini, Anna Banaszak, Harold Benoit, Arthur Böök, Tarek Dakhran, Song Duong, Alfred Eng, Fernando Fernandes, Marc Härkönen, Anne Harrington, et al. Lfm2 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.23404*, 2025.
- [352] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-VL: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.12191>.
- [353] Meituan LongCat Team, Bei Li, Bingye Lei, Bo Wang, Bolin Rong, Chao Wang, Chao Zhang, Chen Gao, Chen Zhang, Cheng Sun, et al. LongCat-Flash technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.01322*, 2025.
- [354] Meta. Llama 3.2: Revolutionizing edge ai and vision with open, customizable models. <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-3-2-connect-2024-vision-edge-mobile-devices/>, 2024.
- [355] Qwen Team. Qwen3-Next-80B-A3B-Instruct. <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen3-Next-80B-A3B-Instruct>, September 2025.
- [356] Shuai Bai, Yuxuan Cai, Ruizhe Chen, Keqin Chen, Xionghui Chen, Zesen Cheng, Lianghao Deng, Wei Ding, Chang Gao, Chunjiang Ge, et al. Qwen3-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.21631*, 2025.
- [357] Qwen, :, An Yang, Baosong Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bo Zheng, Bowen Yu, Chengyuan Li, Dayiheng Liu, Fei Huang, Haoran Wei, Huan Lin, Jian Yang, Jianhong Tu, Jianwei Zhang, Jianxin Yang, Jiayi Yang, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Kai Dang, Keming Lu, Keqin Bao, Kexin Yang, Le Yu, Mei Li, Mingfeng Xue, Pei Zhang, Qin Zhu, Rui Men, Runji Lin, Tianhao Li, Tianyi Tang, Tingyu Xia, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Yang Fan, Yang Su, Yichang Zhang, Yu Wan, Yuqiong Liu, Zeyu Cui, Zhenru Zhang, and Zihan Qiu. Qwen2.5 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.15115>.
- [358] Mistral AI. Mistral Large 3, December 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-3/>.
- [359] Pravesh Agrawal, Szymon Antoniak, Emma Bou Hanna, Baptiste Bout, Devendra Chaplot, Jessica Chudnovsky, Diogo Costa, Baudouin De Monicault, Saurabh Garg, Theophile Gervet, et al. Pixtral 12b. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07073*, 2024.
- [360] Niklas Muennighoff, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Jacob Morrison, Sewon Min, Weijia Shi, Pete Walsh, Oyvind Tafjord, Nathan Lambert, et al. Olmoe: Open mixture-of-experts language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 62061–62121, 2025.

- [361] Mistral AI. Introducing Devstral 2 and Mistral Vibe CLI, December 2025. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/devstral-2-vibe-cli>.
- [362] Anthropic. Introducing computer use, a new Claude 3.5 Sonnet, and Claude 3.5 Haiku. <https://www.anthropic.com/news/3-5-models-and-computer-use>, oct 2024. Blog post, covers Claude 3.5 Haiku.
- [363] Junru Lu, Jiarui Qin, Lingfeng Qiao, Yinghui Li, Xinyi Dai, Bo Ke, Jianfeng He, Ruizhi Qiao, Di Yin, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, Yinsong Liu, Shuangyin Liu, Mingkong Tang, Haodong Lin, Jiayi Kuang, Fanxu Meng, Xiaojuan Tang, Yunjia Xi, Junjie Huang, Haotong Yang, Zhenyi Shen, Yangning Li, Qianwen Zhang, Yifei Yu, Siyu An, Junnan Dong, Qiufeng Wang, Jie Wang, Keyu Chen, Wei Wen, Taian Guo, Zhifeng Shen, Daohai Yu, Jiahao Li, Ke Li, Zongyi Li, and Xiaoyu Tan. Youtu-llm: Unlocking the native agentic potential for lightweight large language models, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.24618>.
- [364] John Dang, Shivalika Singh, Daniel D’souza, Arash Ahmadian, Alejandro Salamanca, Madeline Smith, Aidan Peppin, Sungjin Hong, Manoj Govindassamy, Terrence Zhao, et al. Aya expand: Combining research breakthroughs for a new multilingual frontier. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04261*, 2024.
- [365] Zhixiang Wei, Yi Li, Zhehan Kan, Xinghua Jiang, Zuwei Long, Shifeng Liu, Hongze Shen, Wei Liu, Xiaoyu Tan, Haojia Lin, Yubo Zhu, Qianyu Li, Di Yin, Haoyu Cao, Weibo Gu, Xin Li, Yinsong Liu, Deqiang Jiang, Xing Sun, Yunsheng Wu, Mingkong Tang, Shuangyin Liu, Lexiang Tang, Haodong Lin, Junru Lu, Jiarui Qin, Lingfeng Qiao, Ruizhi Qiao, Bo Ke, Jianfeng He, Ke Li, Yangning Li, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, Peixian Chen, Kun Yin, Bing Liu, Yunfei Wu, Huang Chen, Zhongpeng Cai, and Xiaotian Li. Youtu-vl: Unleashing visual potential via unified vision-language supervision, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.19798>.
- [366] I Granite Team. Granite 3.0 language models. URL: <https://github.com/ibm-granite/granite-3.0-language-models>, 2024.
- [367] Ruisheng Cao, Mouxiang Chen, Jiawei Chen, Zeyu Cui, Yunlong Feng, Binyuan Hui, Yuheng Jing, Kaixin Li, Mingze Li, Junyang Lin, et al. Qwen3-coder-next technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.00729*, 2026.
- [368] Alan Wake, Bei Chen, CX Lv, Chao Li, Chengen Huang, Chenglin Cai, Chujie Zheng, Daniel Cooper, Fan Zhou, Feng Hu, et al. Yi-Lightning technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.01253*, 2024.
- [369] Hong Liu, Jiaqi Zhang, Chao Wang, Xing Hu, Linkun Lyu, Jiaqi Sun, Xurui Yang, Bo Wang, Fengcun Li, Yulei Qian, et al. Scaling embeddings outperforms scaling experts in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.21204*, 2026.
- [370] Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiayi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, K. Dang, An Yang, Rui Men, Fei Huang, Shanghaoran Quan, Xingzhang Ren, Xuancheng Ren, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Qwen2.5-coder technical report. *ArXiv*, abs/2409.12186, 2024.
- [371] Mistral AI. Mistral Small 4-instruct, March 2026. URL <https://mistral.ai/news/mistral-small-4/>.

- [372] Zhilin Wang, Alexander Bukharin, Olivier Delalleau, Daniel Egert, Gerald Shen, Jiaqi Zeng, Oleksii Kuchaiev, and Yi Dong. Helpsteer2-preference: Complementing ratings with preferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01257*, 2024.
- [373] Meituan LongCat Team, Bin Xiao, Chao Wang, Chengjiang Li, Chi Zhang, Chong Peng, Hang Yu, Hao Yang, Haonan Yan, Haoze Sun, et al. LongCat-Next: Lexicalizing modalities as discrete tokens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.27538*, 2026.
- [374] Jason Wei, Maarten Bosma, Vincent Y Zhao, Kelvin Guu, Adams Wei Yu, Brian Lester, Nan Du, Andrew M Dai, and Quoc V Le. Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [375] Jiin Kim, Byeongjun Shin, Jinha Chung, and Minsoo Rhu. The cost of dynamic reasoning: Demystifying ai agents and test-time scaling from an ai infrastructure perspective. In *2026 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 1–16. IEEE, 2026.
- [376] Yangzhen Wu, Zhiqing Sun, Shanda Li, Sean Welleck, and Yiming Yang. Inference scaling laws: An empirical analysis of compute-optimal inference for problem-solving with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00724*, 2024.
- [377] Zhikun Xu, Yinghui Li, Ruixue Ding, Xinyu Wang, Boli Chen, Yong Jiang, Haitao Zheng, Wenlian Lu, Pengjun Xie, and Fei Huang. Let llms take on the latest challenges! a chinese dynamic question answering benchmark. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, pages 10435–10448, 2025.
- [378] Junhong Lin, Xinyue Zeng, Jie Zhu, Song Wang, Julian Shun, Jun Wu, and Dawei Zhou. Plan and budget: Effective and efficient test-time scaling on large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16122*, 2025.
- [379] Qianjun Pan, Wenkai Ji, Yuyang Ding, Junsong Li, Shilian Chen, Junyi Wang, Jie Zhou, Qin Chen, Min Zhang, Yulan Wu, et al. A survey of slow thinking-based reasoning llms using reinforced learning and inference-time scaling law. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02665*, 2025.
- [380] Yunho Jin, Gu-Yeon Wei, and David Brooks. The energy cost of reasoning: Analyzing energy usage in llms with test-time compute. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14733*, 2025.
- [381] Yuntao Bai, Andy Jones, Kamal Ndousse, Amanda Askell, Anna Chen, Nova DasSarma, Dawn Drain, Stanislav Fort, Deep Ganguli, Tom Henighan, et al. Training a helpful and harmless assistant with reinforcement learning from human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05862*, 2022.
- [382] Rafael Rafailov, Archit Sharma, Eric Mitchell, Christopher D Manning, Stefano Ermon, and Chelsea Finn. Direct preference optimization: Your language model is secretly a reward model. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:53728–53741, 2023.
- [383] Junlin Wang, Shang Zhu, Jon Saad-Falcon, Ben Athiwaratkun, Qingyang Wu, Jue Wang, Shuaiwen Leon Song, Ce Zhang, Bhuwan Dhingra, and James Zou. Think deep, think fast: Investigating efficiency of verifier-free inference-time-scaling methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14047*, 2025.
- [384] Muhammad Khalifa. *Reasoning Under Inference-Time Compute*. PhD thesis, 2026.

- [385] Zihao Li, Shaoxiong Ji, and Jörg Tiedemann. Test-time scaling of reasoning models for machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 19th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2902–2917, 2026.
- [386] Yue Liu, Jiaying Wu, Yufei He, Ruihan Gong, Jun Xia, Liang Li, Hongcheng Gao, Hongyu Chen, Baolong Bi, Jiaheng Zhang, et al. Efficient inference for large reasoning models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23077*, 2025.
- [387] Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Fuxuan Wei, Shijue Huang, and Wanxiang Che. Cross-lingual prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning across languages. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 2695–2709, Singapore, December 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.163. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.163/>.
- [388] Jiangshu Du, Yibo Wang, Wenting Zhao, Zhongfen Deng, Shuaiqi Liu, Renze Lou, Henry Peng Zou, Pranav Narayanan Venkit, Nan Zhang, Mukund Srinath, et al. Llms assist nlp researchers: Critique paper (meta-) reviewing. In *Proceedings of the 2024 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 5081–5099, 2024.
- [389] Jiayi Kuang, Ying Shen, Jingyou Xie, Haohao Luo, Zhe Xu, Ronghao Li, Yinghui Li, Xianfeng Cheng, Xika Lin, and Yu Han. Natural language understanding and inference with mllm in visual question answering: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 57(8):1–36, 2025.
- [390] Yinghui Li, Zishan Xu, Shaoshen Chen, Haojing Huang, Yangning Li, Shirong Ma, Yong Jiang, Zhongli Li, Qingyu Zhou, Hai-Tao Zheng, et al. Towards real-world writing assistance: A chinese character checking benchmark with faked and misspelled characters. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8656–8668, 2024.
- [391] Jiayi Kuang, Yinghui Li, Chen Wang, Haohao Luo, Ying Shen, and Wenhao Jiang. Express what you see: Can multimodal llms decode visual ciphers with intuitive semiosis comprehension? In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 12743–12774, 2025.
- [392] Daixian Liu, Jiayi Kuang, Yinghui Li, Yangning Li, Di Yin, Haoyu Cao, Xing Sun, Ying Shen, Hai-Tao Zheng, Liang Lin, et al. Tangrampuzzle: Evaluating multimodal large language models with compositional spatial reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.16520*, 2026.
- [393] Team Wan, Ang Wang, Baole Ai, Bin Wen, Chaojie Mao, Chen-Wei Xie, Di Chen, Feiwu Yu, Haiming Zhao, Jianxiao Yang, Jianyuan Zeng, Jiayu Wang, Jingfeng Zhang, Jingren Zhou, Jinkai Wang, Jixuan Chen, Kai Zhu, Kang Zhao, Keyu Yan, Lianghua Huang, Mengyang Feng, Ningyi Zhang, Pandeng Li, Pingyu Wu, Ruihang Chu, Ruili Feng, Shiwei Zhang, Siyang Sun, Tao Fang, Tianxing Wang, Tianyi Gui, Tingyu Weng, Tong Shen, Wei Lin, Wei Wang, Wei Wang, Wenmeng Zhou, Wenten Wang, Wenting Shen, Wenyuan Yu, Xianzhong Shi, Xiaoming Huang, Xin Xu, Yan Kou, Yangyu Lv, Yifei Li, Yijing Liu, Yiming Wang, Yingya Zhang, Yitong Huang, Yong Li, You Wu, Yu Liu, Yulin Pan, Yun Zheng, Yuntao Hong, Yupeng Shi, Yutong Feng, Zeyinzi Jiang, Zhen Han, Zhi-Fan Wu, and Ziyu Liu. Wan: Open and advanced large-scale video generative models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.20314>.

- [394] Junnan Dong, Qinggang Zhang, Huachi Zhou, Daochen Zha, Pai Zheng, and Xiao Huang. Modality-aware integration with large language models for knowledge-based visual question answering. In *ACL*, pages 2417–2429, 2024.
- [395] Chengwu Liu, Ye Yuan, Yichun Yin, Yan Xu, Xin Xu, Zaoyu Chen, Yasheng Wang, Lifeng Shang, Qun Liu, and Ming Zhang. Safe: Enhancing mathematical reasoning in large language models via retrospective step-aware formal verification. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 12171–12186, 2025.
- [396] Liangchen Luo, Yinxiao Liu, Rosanne Liu, Samrat Phatale, Meiqi Guo, Harsh Lara, Yunxuan Li, Lei Shu, Yun Zhu, Lei Meng, et al. Improve mathematical reasoning in language models by automated process supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.06592*, 2024.
- [397] Peng-Yuan Wang, Tian-Shuo Liu, Chenyang Wang, Ziniu Li, Yidi Wang, Shu Yan, Chengxing Jia, Xu-Hui Liu, Xinwei Chen, Jiacheng Xu, et al. A survey on large language models for mathematical reasoning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 58(8):1–35, 2026.
- [398] Zhenru Zhang, Chujie Zheng, Yangzhen Wu, Beichen Zhang, Runji Lin, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. The lessons of developing process reward models in mathematical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 10495–10516, 2025.
- [399] Ruilin Luo, Zhuofan Zheng, Lei Wang, Yifan Wang, Xinzhe Ni, Zicheng Lin, Songtao Jiang, Yiyao Yu, Chufan Shi, Ruihang Chu, et al. Unlocking multimodal mathematical reasoning via process reward model. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:49851–49899, 2026.
- [400] Shuang Zeng, Dekang Qi, Xinyuan Chang, Feng Xiong, Shichao Xie, Xiaolong Wu, Shiyi Liang, Mu Xu, and Xing Wei. Janusvln: Decoupling semantics and spatiality with dual implicit memory for vision-language navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22548*, 2025.
- [401] Gemma Team, Aishwarya Kamath, Johan Ferret, Shreya Pathak, Nino Vieillard, Ramona Merhej, Sarah Perrin, Tatiana Matejovicova, Alexandre Ramé, Morgane Rivière, Louis Rouillard, Thomas Mesnard, Geoffrey Cideron, Jean bastien Grill, Sabela Ramos, Edouard Yvinec, Michelle Casbon, Etienne Pot, Ivo Penchev, Gaël Liu, Francesco Visin, Kathleen Kenealy, Lucas Beyer, Xiaohai Zhai, Anton Tsitsulin, Robert Busa-Fekete, Alex Feng, Noveen Sachdeva, Benjamin Coleman, Yi Gao, Basil Mustafa, Iain Barr, Emilio Parisotto, David Tian, Matan Eyal, Colin Cherry, Jan-Thorsten Peter, Danila Sinopalnikov, Surya Bhupatiraju, Rishabh Agarwal, Mehran Kazemi, Dan Malkin, Ravin Kumar, David Vilar, Idan Brusilovsky, Jiaming Luo, Andreas Steiner, Abe Friesen, Abhanshu Sharma, Abheesht Sharma, Adi Mayrav Gilady, Adrian Goedeckemeyer, Alaa Saade, Alex Feng, Alexander Kolesnikov, Alexei Bendebury, Alvin Abdagic, Amit Vadi, András György, André Susano Pinto, Anil Das, Ankur Bapna, Antoine Miech, Antoine Yang, Antonia Paterson, Ashish Shenoy, Ayan Chakrabarti, Bilal Piot, Bo Wu, Bobak Shahriari, Bryce Petriani, Charlie Chen, Charline Le Lan, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, CJ Carey, Cormac Brick, Daniel Deutsch, Danielle Eisenbud, Dee Cattle, Derek Cheng, Dimitris Paparas, Divyashree Shivakumar Sreepathihalli, Doug Reid, Dustin Tran, Dustin Zelle, Eric Noland, Erwin Huizenga, Eugene Kharitonov, Frederick Liu, Gagik Amirkhanyan, Glenn Cameron, Hadi Hashemi, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, Harman Singh, Harsh Mehta, Harshal Tushar Lehri, Hussein Hazimeh, Ian Ballantyne, Idan Szpektor, Ivan

- Nardini, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Jetha Chan, Joe Stanton, John Wieting, Jonathan Lai, Jordi Orbay, Joseph Fernandez, Josh Newlan, Ju yeong Ji, Jyotinder Singh, Kat Black, Kathy Yu, Kevin Hui, Kiran Vodrahalli, Klaus Greff, Linhai Qiu, Marcella Valentine, Marina Coelho, Marvin Ritter, Matt Hoffman, Matthew Watson, Mayank Chaturvedi, Michael Moynihan, Min Ma, Nabila Babar, Natasha Noy, Nathan Byrd, Nick Roy, Nikola Momchev, Nilay Chauhan, Noveen Sachdeva, Oskar Bunyan, Pankil Botarda, Paul Caron, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Phil Culliton, Philipp Schmid, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Pingmei Xu, Piotr Stanczyk, Pouya Tafti, Rakesh Shivanna, Renjie Wu, Renke Pan, Reza Rokni, Rob Willoughby, Rohith Vallu, Ryan Mullins, Sammy Jerome, Sara Smoot, Sertan Girgin, Shariq Iqbal, Shashir Reddy, Shruti Sheth, Siim Pöder, Sijal Bhatnagar, Sindhu Raghuram Panyam, Sivan Eiger, Susan Zhang, Tianqi Liu, Trevor Yacovone, Tyler Liechty, Uday Kalra, Utku Evci, Vedant Misra, Vincent Roseberry, Vlad Feinberg, Vlad Kolesnikov, Woohyun Han, Woosuk Kwon, Xi Chen, Yinlam Chow, Yuvein Zhu, Zichuan Wei, Zoltan Egyed, Victor Cotruta, Minh Giang, Phoebe Kirk, Anand Rao, Kat Black, Nabila Babar, Jessica Lo, Erica Moreira, Luiz Gustavo Martins, Omar Sanseviero, Lucas Gonzalez, Zach Gleicher, Tris Warkentin, Vahab Mirrokni, Evan Senter, Eli Collins, Joelle Barral, Zoubin Ghahramani, Raia Hadsell, Yossi Matias, D. Sculley, Slav Petrov, Noah Fiedel, Noam Shazeer, Oriol Vinyals, Jeff Dean, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Clement Farabet, Elena Buchatskaya, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Rohan Anil, Dmitry Lepikhin, Sebastian Borgeaud, Olivier Bachem, Armand Joulin, Alek Andreev, Cassidy Hardin, Robert Dadashi, and Léonard Hussenot. Gemma 3 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.19786>.
- [402] Dan Hendrycks et al. Measuring mathematical problem solving with the math dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.03874*, 2021. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2103.03874. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.03874>.
- [403] Shuang Zeng, Xinyuan Chang, Xinran Liu, Yujian Yuan, Shiyi Liang, Zheng Pan, Mu Xu, and Xing Wei. Priordrive: Enhancing online hd mapping with unified vector priors. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 12313–12321, 2026.
- [404] Congming Zheng, Jiachen Zhu, Zhuoying Ou, Yuxiang Chen, Kangning Zhang, Rong Shan, Zeyu Zheng, Mengyue Yang, Jianghao Lin, Yong Yu, et al. A survey of process reward models: From outcome signals to process supervisions for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.08049*, 2025.
- [405] Huaiyuan Ying, Shuo Zhang, Linyang Li, Zhejian Zhou, Yunfan Shao, Zhaoye Fei, Yichuan Ma, Jiawei Hong, Kuikun Liu, Ziyi Wang, et al. Internlm-math: Open math large language models toward verifiable reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06332*, 2024.
- [406] Shimao Zhang, Xiao Liu, Xin Zhang, Junxiao Liu, Zheheng Luo, Shujian Huang, and Yeyun Gong. Process-based self-rewarding language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 18097–18110, 2025.
- [407] Amrith Setlur, Chirag Nagpal, Adam Fisch, Xinyang Geng, Jacob Eisenstein, Rishabh Agarwal, Alekh Agarwal, Jonathan Berant, and Aviral Kumar. Rewarding progress: Scaling automated process verifiers for llm reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 60808–60838, 2025.
- [408] Zhaohui Yang, Chenghua He, Xiaowen Shi, Linjing Li, Qiyue Yin, Shihong Deng, and Daxin Jiang. Beyond the first error: Process reward models for reflective mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.14391*, 2025.

- [409] Junnan Dong, Qinggang Zhang, Chuang Zhou, Hao Chen, Daochen Zha, and Xiao Huang. Cost-efficient knowledge-based question answering with large language models. *NeurIPS*, 37:115261–115281, 2024.
- [410] Yue Zhang, Yafu Li, Leyang Cui, Deng Cai, Lemao Liu, Tingchen Fu, Xinting Huang, Enbo Zhao, Yu Zhang, Yulong Chen, et al. Siren’s song in the ai ocean: A survey on hallucination in large language models. *Computational Linguistics*, 51(4):1373–1418, 2025.
- [411] Stephanie Lin, Jacob Hilton, and Owain Evans. Truthfulqa: Measuring how models mimic human falsehoods. In *Proceedings of the 60th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics (volume 1: long papers)*, pages 3214–3252, 2022.
- [412] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:11809–11822, 2023.
- [413] Yann LeCun et al. A path towards autonomous machine intelligence version 0.9. 2, 2022-06-27. *Open Review*, 62(1):1–62, 2022.
- [414] Karl Cobbe et al. Training verifiers to solve math word problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14168*, 2021. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2110.14168. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.14168>.
- [415] Jie Huang, Xinyun Chen, Swaroop Mishra, Huaixiu Steven Zheng, Adams Yu, Xinying Song, and Denny Zhou. Large language models cannot self-correct reasoning yet. In *International conference on learning representations*, volume 2024, pages 32808–32824, 2024.
- [416] Massimiliano Pronesti, Anya Belz, and Yufang Hou. Beyond outcome verification: Verifiable process reward models for structured reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.17223*, 2026.
- [417] Wei Xiong, Hanning Zhang, Chenlu Ye, Lichang Chen, Nan Jiang, and Tong Zhang. Self-rewarding correction for mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.19613*, 2025.
- [418] Jiachen Zhu, Congmin Zheng, Jianghao Lin, Kounianhua Du, Ying Wen, Yong Yu, Jun Wang, and Weinan Zhang. Retrieval-augmented process reward model for generalizable mathematical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 8453–8468, 2025.
- [419] Wei Sun, Qianlong Du, Fuwei Cui, and Jiajun Zhang. An efficient and precise training data construction framework for process-supervised reward model in mathematical reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 4292–4305, 2025.
- [420] Azim Ospanov, Zijin Feng, Jiacheng Sun, Haoli Bai, Xin Shen, and Farzan Farnia. Hermes: Towards efficient and verifiable mathematical reasoning in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.18760*, 2025.
- [421] Xuezhi Wang, Jason Wei, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc Le, Ed Chi, Sharan Narang, Aakanksha Chowdhery, and Denny Zhou. Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022.

- [422] Xingtong Yu, Chang Zhou, Zhongwei Kuai, Xinming Zhang, and Yuan Fang. Gcot: Chain-of-thought prompt learning for graphs. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 2*, pages 3669–3679, 2025.
- [423] Maciej Besta, Florim Memedi, Zhenyu Zhang, Robert Gerstenberger, Guangyuan Piao, Nils Blach, Piotr Nyczyk, Marcin Copik, Grzegorz Kwaśniewski, Jurgen Müller, et al. Demystifying chains, trees, and graphs of thoughts. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2025.
- [424] Jishnu Ray Chowdhury and Cornelia Caragea. Zero-shot verification-guided chain of thoughts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.13122*, 2025.
- [425] Satyadhar Joshi. Review of prompt engineering techniques in finance: An evaluation of chain-of-thought, tree-of-thought, and graph-of-thought approaches. *Tree-of-Thought, and Graph-of-Thought Approaches (January 31, 2025)*, 2025.
- [426] Xi Li, Xiping Liu, Qing Shu, Zhao Tan, Changxuan Wan, Dexi Liu, and Qizhi Wan. Automatic contrastive chain-of-thought prompting: Learning from reasoning errors of large language models. *Expert Systems with Applications*, page 130919, 2025.
- [427] Bing Wu, Chang Zou, Changlin Li, DuoJun Huang, Fang Yang, Hao Tan, Jack Peng, Jianbing Wu, Jiangfeng Xiong, Jie Jiang, Linus, Patrol, Peizhen Zhang, Peng Chen, Penghao Zhao, Qi Tian, Songtao Liu, Weijie Kong, Weiyan Wang, Xiao He, Xin Li, Xincheng Deng, Xuefei Zhe, Yang Li, Yanxin Long, Yuanbo Peng, Yue Wu, Yuhong Liu, Zhenyu Wang, Zuozhuo Dai, Bo Peng, Coopers Li, Gu Gong, Guojian Xiao, Jiahe Tian, Jiabin Lin, Jie Liu, Jihong Zhang, Jiesong Lian, Kaihang Pan, Lei Wang, Lin Niu, Mingtao Chen, Mingyang Chen, Mingzhe Zheng, Miles Yang, Qiangqiang Hu, Qi Yang, Qiuyong Xiao, Runzhou Wu, Ryan Xu, Rui Yuan, Shanshan Sang, Shisheng Huang, Siruis Gong, Shuo Huang, Weiting Guo, Xiang Yuan, Xiaojia Chen, Xiawei Hu, Wenzhi Sun, Xiele Wu, Xianshun Ren, Xiaoyan Yuan, Xiaoyue Mi, Yepeng Zhang, Yifu Sun, Yiting Lu, Yitong Li, You Huang, Yu Tang, Yixuan Li, Yuhang Deng, Yuan Zhou, Zhichao Hu, Zhiguang Liu, Zhihe Yang, Zilin Yang, Zhenzhi Lu, Zixiang Zhou, and Zhao Zhong. Hunyuanvideo 1.5 technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.18870>.
- [428] Felix Fricke, Simon Malberg, and Georg Groh. Framework of thoughts: A foundation framework for dynamic and optimized reasoning based on chains, trees, and graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.16512*, 2026.
- [429] Xiaoyu Tan, Yongxin Deng, Xihe Qiu, Weidi Xu, Chao Qu, Wei Chu, Yinghui Xu, and Yuan Qi. Thought-like-pro: Enhancing reasoning of large language models through self-driven prolog-based chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.14562*, 2024.
- [430] Robert Praas. Self-reflection on chain-of-thought reasoning in large language models, 2023.
- [431] Robert Vacareanu, Anurag Pratik, Evangelia Spiliopoulou, Zheng Qi, Giovanni Paolini, Neha Anna John, Jie Ma, Yassine Benajiba, and Miguel Ballesteros. General purpose verification for chain of thought prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.00204*, 2024.
- [432] Hsu-Chih Chiu, Iuan-Kai Fang, and Che-Rung Lee. R-cot: Reinforcement chain of thought prompting for task specific training. In *International Conference on Technologies and Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, pages 157–167. Springer, 2024.

- [433] Pengyu Liao. Research and analysis on chain of thought (cot) reasoning and interpretability in large language models. In *International Workshop on Advances in Deep Learning for Image Analysis and Computer Vision (IWADIC 2025)*, pages 509–515. Atlantis Press, 2026.
- [434] Xinyang Hu, Fengzhuo Zhang, Siyu Chen, and Zhuoran Yang. Unveiling the statistical foundations of chain-of-thought prompting methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14511*, 2024.
- [435] Shuxu Chen, Yitian Zhou, Jiaquan Zhang, Haoyu Bian, Aming Wu, Sungyoung Lee, Chaoning Zhang, and Hyundong Shin. Cap-cot: Cycle adversarial prompt for improving chain of thoughts in llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.23270*, 2026.
- [436] Xuan Zhang, Chao Du, Tianyu Pang, Qian Liu, Wei Gao, and Min Lin. Chain of preference optimization: Improving chain-of-thought reasoning in llms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:333–356, 2024.
- [437] Keqin Peng, Liang Ding, Yuanxin Ouyang, Meng Fang, and Dacheng Tao. Revisiting overthinking in long chain-of-thought from the perspective of self-doubt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.23480*, 2025.
- [438] Xingyu Chen, Jiahao Xu, Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Jianhui Pang, Dian Yu, Linfeng Song, Qiuzhi Liu, Mengfei Zhou, Zhuosheng Zhang, et al. Do not think that much for $2 + 3 = ?$ on the overthinking of o1-like llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.21187*, 2024.
- [439] Zhiyuan Li, Yi Chang, and Yuan Wu. Think-bench: Evaluating thinking efficiency and chain-of-thought quality of large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22113*, 2025.
- [440] Yang Sui, Yu-Neng Chuang, Guanchu Wang, Jiamu Zhang, Tianyi Zhang, Jiayi Yuan, Hongyi Liu, Andrew Wen, Shaochen Zhong, Na Zou, et al. Stop overthinking: A survey on efficient reasoning for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16419*, 2025.
- [441] Zilong Wang and Shuai Li. Efficient thinking via meta chain-of-thought evaluation.
- [442] Yongheng Zhang, Qiguang Chen, Jingxuan Zhou, Peng Wang, Jiasheng Si, Jin Wang, Wenpeng Lu, and Libo Qin. Wrong-of-thought: An integrated reasoning framework with multi-perspective verification and wrong information. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2024*, pages 6644–6653, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-emnlp.388. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-emnlp.388/>.
- [443] Chunlin Lu, Yongheng Zhang, Peng Wang, Wenpeng Lu, and Libo Qin. Mdcot: Medical diagnosis chain-of-thought with self-diagnostic refinement for alzheimer’s disease. In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME)*, pages 1–6, 2025. doi: 10.1109/ICME59968.2025.11209984.
- [444] Xu Liu, Yongheng Zhang, Qiguang Chen, Yao Li, Sheng Wang, and Libo Qin. Let’s think with images efficiently! an interleaved-modal chain-of-thought reasoning framework with dynamic and precise visual thoughts, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.21754>.
- [445] Iman Mirzadeh, Keivan Alizadeh-Vahid, Hooman Shahrokhi, Oncel Tuzel, Samy Bengio, and Mehrdad Farajtabar. Gsm-symbolic: Understanding the limitations of mathematical reasoning in large language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 94743–94765, 2025.

- [446] OpenAI. Learning to reason with LLMs. <https://openai.com/index/learning-to-reason-with-llms/>, 2024.
- [447] Keith E. Stanovich and Richard F. West. Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality debate? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23(5):645–665, 2000. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X00003435.
- [448] Linan Yue, Yichao Du, Yizhi Wang, Weibo Gao, Fangzhou Yao, Li Wang, Ye Liu, Ziyu Xu, Qi Liu, Shimin Di, et al. Don't overthink it: A survey of efficient r1-style large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.02120*, 2025.
- [449] Mohamed Hankal. Adaptive reasoning compression: Balancing short and long chains of thought for improved overthinking llm reasoning. *Emirates International University Journal*, 4(4):224–247, 2025.
- [450] Yongjiang Liu, Haoxi Li, Xiaosong Ma, Jie Zhang, and Song Guo. Think how to think: Mitigating overthinking with autonomous difficulty cognition in large reasoning models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.02663*, 2025.
- [451] Sohyun An, Ruochen Wang, Tianyi Zhou, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Don't think longer, think wisely: Optimizing thinking dynamics for large reasoning models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:111021–111046, 2026.
- [452] Yue Wang, Qiuzhi Liu, Jiahao Xu, Tian Liang, Xingyu Chen, Zhiwei He, Linfeng Song, Dian Yu, Juntao Li, Zhuosheng Zhang, et al. Thoughts are all over the place: On the underthinking of long reasoning models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:30591–30611, 2026.
- [453] Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jinhao Liu, Dengyun Peng, Jiannan Guan, Peng Wang, Mengkang Hu, Yuhang Zhou, Te Gao, and Wanxiang Che. Towards reasoning era: A survey of long chain-of-thought for reasoning large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.09567>.
- [454] Zayne Sprague, Fangcong Yin, Juan Rodriguez, Dongwei Jiang, Manya Wadhwa, Prasann Singhal, Xinyu Zhao, Xi Ye, Kyle Mahowald, and Greg Durrett. To cot or not to cot? chain-of-thought helps mainly on math and symbolic reasoning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 94118–94162, 2025.
- [455] Yinghui Li, Jiayi Kuang, Haojing Huang, Zhikun Xu, Xinnian Liang, Yi Yu, Wenlian Lu, Yangning Li, Xiaoyu Tan, Chao Qu, et al. One example shown, many concepts known! counterexample-driven conceptual reasoning in mathematical llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.10454*, 2025.
- [456] Yinghui Li, Haojing Huang, Jiayi Kuang, Yangning Li, Shu-Yu Guo, Chao Qu, Xiaoyu Tan, Hai-Tao Zheng, Ying Shen, and Philip S Yu. Refine knowledge of large language models via adaptive contrastive learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.07184*, 2025.
- [457] Jinyi Han, Ying Huang, Ying Liao, Zishang Jiang, Xikun Lu, Haiquan Zhao, Xinyi Wang, Guanghao Zhou, Sihang Jiang, Jiaqing Liang, et al. Your models have thought enough: Training large reasoning models to stop overthinking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23392*, 2025.

- [458] Chenzhi Hu, Qinzhe Hu, Yuhang Xu, Junyi Chen, Ruijie Wang, Shengzhong Liu, Jianxin Li, Fan Wu, and Guihai Chen. Smarthinker: Progressive chain-of-thought length calibration for efficient large language model reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.08000*, 2026.
- [459] Renliang Sun, Wei Cheng, Dawei Li, Haifeng Chen, and Wei Wang. Stop when enough: Adaptive early-stopping for chain-of-thought reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10103*, 2025.
- [460] Chen Shen, Jin Wang, and Xuejie Zhang. Alleviating overthinking in large reasoning models via self-iterative preference optimization. In *ICASSP 2026-2026 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 4496–4500. IEEE, 2026.
- [461] Qian Wan, Ziao Xu, Luona Wei, Xiaoxuan Shen, and Jianwen Sun. Mitigating overthinking in large reasoning models via difficulty-aware reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.21418*, 2026.
- [462] Yongheng Zhang, Xu Liu, Ruihan Tao, Qiguang Chen, Hao Fei, Wanxiang Che, and Libo Qin. Vitcot: Video-text interleaved chain-of-thought for boosting video understanding in large language models. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM International Conference on Multimedia, MM '25*, page 5267–5276, New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400720352. doi: 10.1145/3746027.3755837. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3746027.3755837>.
- [463] Guhao Feng, Bohang Zhang, Yuntian Gu, Haotian Ye, Di He, and Liwei Wang. Towards revealing the mystery behind chain of thought: A theoretical perspective. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:70757–70798, 2023. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/hash/dfc310e81992d2e4cedc09ac47efff13e-Abstract-Conference.html.
- [464] Maciej Besta, Nils Blach, Ales Kubicek, Robert Gerstenberger, Michal Podstawski, Lukas Gianinazzi, Joanna Gajda, Tomasz Lehmann, Hubert Niewiadomski, Piotr Nyczyk, et al. Graph of thoughts: Solving elaborate problems with large language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 38, pages 17682–17690, 2024.
- [465] Edward Yeo, Yuxuan Tong, Morry Niu, Graham Neubig, and Xiang Yue. Demystifying long chain-of-thought reasoning in llms, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03373>.
- [466] Haoyu Zheng, Zhuonan Wang, Yuqian Yuan, Tianwei Lin, Wenqiao Zhang, Zheqi Lv, Juncheng Li, Siliang Tang, Yueting Zhuang, and Hongyang He. Fast thinking for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23633*, 2025.
- [467] Yuyao Ge, Shenghua Liu, Yiwei Wang, Lingrui Mei, Lizhe Chen, Baolong Bi, and Xueqi Cheng. Innate reasoning is not enough: In-context learning enhances reasoning large language models with less overthinking. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.19602*, 2025.
- [468] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, et al. Deepseek-r1 incentivizes reasoning in llms through reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 645(8081):633–638, 2025.
- [469] Hua Cai, Shuang Zhao, Liang Zhang, Xuli Shen, Qing Xu, Weilin Shen, Zihao Wen, and Tianke Ban. Unilaw-r1: A large language model for legal reasoning with reinforcement learning and iterative inference. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 18128–18142, 2025.

- [470] Chong Zhang, Yue Deng, Xiang Lin, Bin Wang, Dianwen Ng, Hai Ye, Xingxuan Li, Yao Xiao, Zhanfeng Mo, Qi Zhang, et al. 100 days after deepseek-r1: A survey on replication studies and more directions for reasoning language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.00551*, 2025.
- [471] Runze Liu, Junqi Gao, Jian Zhao, Kaiyan Zhang, Xiu Li, Biqing Qi, Wanli Ouyang, and Bowen Zhou. Can 1B LLM surpass 405B LLM? rethinking compute-optimal test-time scaling, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.06703>.
- [472] Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jiaqi Wang, Jinxuan Zhou, and Wanxiang Che. Unlocking the capabilities of thought: A reasoning boundary framework to quantify and optimize chain-of-thought. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:54872–54904, 2024.
- [473] Xingyu Chen, Jiahao Xu, Tian Liang, Zhiwei He, Jianhui Pang, Dian Yu, Linfeng Song, Qiuzhi Liu, Mengfei Zhou, Zhuosheng Zhang, Rui Wang, Zhaopeng Tu, Haitao Mi, and Dong Yu. Do NOT think that much for $2+3=?$ on the overthinking of long reasoning models. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 267 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 9487–9499. PMLR, 2025. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v267/chen25bx.html>.
- [474] Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Penghui Qi, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. Understanding R1-Zero-like training: A critical perspective, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.20783>.
- [475] Manojkumar Parmar and Yuvaraj Govindarajulu. Challenges in ensuring ai safety in deepseek-r1 models: The shortcomings of reinforcement learning strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.17030*, 2025.
- [476] Quy-Anh Dang and Chris Ngo. Reinforcement learning for reasoning in small llms: What works and what doesn't. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16219*, 2025.
- [477] Hanmeng Liu, Zhizhang Fu, Mengru Ding, Ruoxi Ning, Chaoli Zhang, Xiaozhang Liu, and Yue Zhang. Logical reasoning in large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.09100*, 2025.
- [478] Mingyang Chen, Linzhuang Sun, Tianpeng Li, Haoze Sun, Chenzheng Zhu, Haofen Wang, Jeff Pan, Wen Zhang, Huajun Chen, Fan Yang, et al. Learning to reason with search for llms via reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38: 85287–85307, 2026.
- [479] Chi Chiu So, Yueyue Sun, Jun-Min Wang, Siu Pang Yung, Anthony Wai Keung Loh, and Chun Pong Chau. Are large language models capable of deep relational reasoning? insights from deepseek-r1 and benchmark comparisons. In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Testing (AITest)*, pages 168–177. IEEE, 2025.
- [480] Zhaowei Liu, Xin Guo, Zhi Yang, Fangqi Lou, Lingfeng Zeng, Jinyi Niu, Mengping Li, Qi Qi, Zhiqiang Liu, Yiyang Han, et al. Fin-r1: A large language model for financial reasoning through reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16252*, 2025.
- [481] Wrya Anwar Hayder. Highlighting deepseek-r1: architecture, features and future implications. *International Journal of Computer Science and Mobile Computing*, 14(2):1–13, 2025.

- [482] Haoyuan Sun, Jiaqi Wu, Bo Xia, Yifu Luo, Yifei Zhao, Kai Qin, Xufei Lv, Tiantian Zhang, Yongzhe Chang, and Xueqian Wang. Reinforcement fine-tuning powers reasoning capability of multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18536*, 2025.
- [483] Yubo Dong and Hehe Fan. Enhancing large language models through structured reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.20241*, 2025.
- [484] ZZ Ren, Zhihong Shao, Junxiao Song, Huajian Xin, Haocheng Wang, Wanjia Zhao, Liyue Zhang, Zhe Fu, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, et al. Deepseek-prover-v2: Advancing formal mathematical reasoning via reinforcement learning for subgoal decomposition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.21801*, 2025.
- [485] Zheng-Lin Lin, Chiao-Han Yen, Jia-Cheng Xu, Deborah Watty, and Shu-Kai Hsieh. Solving linguistic olympiad problems with tree-of-thought prompting. In *Proceedings of the 35th conference on computational linguistics and speech processing (ROCLING 2023)*, pages 262–269, 2023.
- [486] Andy DiJia Su, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Michael Rabbat, Yuandong Tian, and Qinqing Zheng. Dualformer: Controllable fast and slow thinking by learning with randomized reasoning traces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 95080–95117, 2025.
- [487] Fnu Neha and Deepshikha Bhati. A survey of deepseek models. *Authorea Preprints*, 2025.
- [488] Wei Du, Branislav Kisacanin, George Armstrong, Shubham Toshniwal, Ivan Moshkov, Alexan Ayrapetyan, Sadegh Mahdavi, Dan Zhao, Shizhe Diao, Dragan Masulovic, et al. The challenge of teaching reasoning to llms without rl or distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09850*, 2025.
- [489] Bairu Hou, Yang Zhang, Jiabao Ji, Yujian Liu, Kaizhi Qian, Jacob Andreas, and Shiyu Chang. Thinkprune: Pruning long chain-of-thought of llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01296*, 2025.
- [490] Shicheng Xu, Liang Pang, Yunchang Zhu, Jia Gu, Zihao Wei, Jingcheng Deng, Feiyang Pan, Huawei Shen, and Xueqi Cheng. Rlkd: Distilling llms’ reasoning via reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 34151–34159, 2026.
- [491] Shaotian Yan, Kaiyuan Liu, Chen Shen, Bing Wang, Sinan Fan, Jun Zhang, Yue Wu, Zheng Wang, and Jieping Ye. Distribution-aligned sequence distillation for superior long-cot reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.09088*, 2026.
- [492] Yixin Ye, Zhen Huang, Yang Xiao, Ethan Chern, Shijie Xia, and Pengfei Liu. LIMO: Less is more for reasoning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.03387>.
- [493] Niklas Muennighoff, Zitong Yang, Weijia Shi, Xiang Lisa Li, Li Fei-Fei, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, Percy Liang, Emmanuel Candès, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. s1: Simple test-time scaling, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.19393>.
- [494] Chengwei Dai, Kun Li, Wei Zhou, and Songlin Hu. Beyond imitation: Learning key reasoning steps from dual chain-of-thoughts in reasoning distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.19737*, 2024.

- [495] Yijia Luo, Yulin Song, Xingyao Zhang, Jiaheng Liu, Weixun Wang, GengRu Chen, Wenbo Su, and Bo Zheng. Deconstructing long chain-of-thought: A structured reasoning optimization framework for long cot distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16385*, 2025.
- [496] Bofei Gao, Yejie Wang, Yibo Miao, Ruoyu Wu, Feifan Song, Longhui Yu, Tianyu Liu, and Baobao Chang. Towards a better initial policy model for scalable long-cot reinforcement learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 7652–7665, 2025.
- [497] Sicheng Feng, Gongfan Fang, Xinyin Ma, and Xinchao Wang. Efficient reasoning models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.10903*, 2025.
- [498] Zhaoyang Zhang, Shuli Jiang, Yantao Shen, Yuting Zhang, Dhananjay Ram, Shuo Yang, Zhuowen Tu, Wei Xia, and Stefano Soatto. Reinforcement-aware knowledge distillation for llm reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.22495*, 2026.
- [499] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.06347>.
- [500] Zhaoyang Wang, Jinqi Jiang, Tian Qiu, Hui Liu, Xianfeng Tang, and Huaxiu Yao. Efficient long cot reasoning in small language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18440*, 2025.
- [501] Chenglin Li, Qianglong Chen, Liangyue Li, Caiyu Wang, Yicheng Li, Zulong Chen, and Yin Zhang. Mixed distillation helps smaller language model better reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.10730*, 2023.
- [502] Edoardo Cetin, Tianyu Zhao, and Yujin Tang. Reinforcement learning teachers of test time scaling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:107533–107567, 2026.
- [503] Kumar Shridhar, Alessandro Stolfo, and Mrinmaya Sachan. Distilling reasoning capabilities into smaller language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 7059–7073, 2023.
- [504] Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, Xiaochen Zuo, Yu Yue, Weinan Dai, Tiantian Fan, Gaohong Liu, Lingjun Liu, et al. Dapo: An open-source llm reinforcement learning system at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:113222–113244, 2026.
- [505] Aili Chen, Aonian Li, Bangwei Gong, Binyang Jiang, Bo Fei, Bo Yang, Boji Shan, Changqing Yu, Chao Wang, Cheng Zhu, et al. Minimax-m1: Scaling test-time compute efficiently with lightning attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13585*, 2025.
- [506] Chujie Zheng, Shixuan Liu, Mingze Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Bowen Yu, Chang Gao, Kai Dang, Yuqiong Liu, Rui Men, An Yang, et al. Group sequence policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.18071*, 2025.
- [507] Chang Gao, Chujie Zheng, Xiong-Hui Chen, Kai Dang, Shixuan Liu, Bowen Yu, An Yang, Shuai Bai, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. Soft adaptive policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.20347*, 2025.
- [508] Fanqi Wan, Weizhou Shen, Shengyi Liao, Yingcheng Shi, Chenliang Li, Ziyi Yang, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, Jingren Zhou, and Ming Yan. Qwenlong-l1: Towards long-context large reasoning models with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17667*, 2025.

- [509] Komal Kumar, Tajamul Ashraf, Omkar Thawakar, Rao Muhammad Anwer, Hisham Cholakkal, Mubarak Shah, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Phillip HS Torr, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Salman Khan. Llm post-training: A deep dive into reasoning large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.21321*, 2025.
- [510] Kyuyoung Kim, Kevin Wang, Yunfei Xie, Peiyang Xu, Peiyao Sheng, Chen Wei, Zhangyang Wang, Jinwoo Shin, Pramod Viswanath, and Sewoong Oh. Correct answers from sound reasoning: Verifiable process supervision for language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.12519*, 2026.
- [511] Jianqiao Lu, Zhiyang Dou, Hongru Wang, Zeyu Cao, Jianbo Dai, Yingjia Wan, Yunlong Feng, and Zhijiang Guo. Autopsv: Automated process-supervised verifier. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:79935–79962, 2024.
- [512] Guoxin Chen, Minpeng Liao, Chengxi Li, and Kai Fan. Alphamath almost zero: process supervision without process. *ArXiv*, abs/2405.03553, 2024.
- [513] Jiaxing Guo, Wenjie Yang, Shengzhong Zhang, Tongshan Xu, Lun Du, Da Zheng, and Zengfeng Huang. Right is not enough: The pitfalls of outcome supervision in training llms for math reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.06877*, 2025.
- [514] Yixuan Weng, Minjun Zhu, Fei Xia, Bin Li, Shizhu He, Shengping Liu, Bin Sun, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models are better reasoners with self-verification. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 2550–2575, 2023.
- [515] Janice Ahn, Rishu Verma, Renze Lou, Di Liu, Rui Zhang, and Wenpeng Yin. Large language models for mathematical reasoning: Progresses and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 18th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*, pages 225–237, 2024.
- [516] Husnain Amjad, Raja Khurram Shahzad, Aamir Shahzad, and Mehwish Fatima. Mathematical reasoning in large language models: Benchmarks, architectures, evaluation, and open challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19723*, 2026.
- [517] Indrasen Poola. Tuning chatgpt mathematical reasoning limitations and failures with process supervision. *International Journal of Novel Research in Computer Science and Software Engineering*, 10(2):55–66, 2023.
- [518] Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, et al. Openai o1 system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.16720*, 2024.
- [519] Anthropic. System Card: Claude opus 4 and claude sonnet 4, May 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/claude-4-system-card>.
- [520] Yu Zhao, Huifeng Yin, Bo Zeng, Hao Wang, Tianqi Shi, Chenyang Lyu, Longyue Wang, Weihua Luo, and Kaifu Zhang. Marco-o1: Towards open reasoning models for open-ended solutions, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.14405>.
- [521] Moonshot AI. Kimi-Dev-72B: A strong and open-source coding llm for issue resolution, June 2025. URL <https://moonshotai.github.io/Kimi-Dev/>.

- [522] Qwen Team. QwQ: Reflect deeply on the boundaries of the unknown, November 2024. URL <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b-preview/>.
- [523] Core Team, Zihao Yue, Zhenru Lin, Yifan Song, Weikun Wang, Shuhuai Ren, Shuhao Gu, Shicheng Li, Peidian Li, Liang Zhao, Lei Li, Kainan Bao, Hao Tian, Hailin Zhang, Gang Wang, Dawei Zhu, Cici, Chenhong He, Bowen Ye, Bowen Shen, Zihan Zhang, Zihan Jiang, Zhixian Zheng, Zhichao Song, Zhenbo Luo, Yue Yu, Yudong Wang, Yuanyuan Tian, Yu Tu, Yihan Yan, Yi Huang, Xu Wang, Xinzhe Xu, Xingchen Song, Xing Zhang, Xing Yong, Xin Zhang, Xiangwei Deng, Wenyu Yang, Wenhan Ma, Weiwei Lv, Weiji Zhuang, Wei Liu, Sirui Deng, Shuo Liu, Shimao Chen, Shihua Yu, Shaohui Liu, Shande Wang, Rui Ma, Qiantong Wang, Peng Wang, Nuo Chen, Menghang Zhu, Kangyang Zhou, Kang Zhou, Kai Fang, Jun Shi, Jinhao Dong, Jiebao Xiao, Jiaming Xu, Huaqiu Liu, Hongshen Xu, Heng Qu, Haochen Zhao, Hanglong Lv, Guoan Wang, Duo Zhang, Dong Zhang, Di Zhang, Chong Ma, Chang Liu, Can Cai, and Bingquan Xia. Mimo-vl technical report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.03569>.
- [524] Skywork Team. Skywork-o1-Open-Llama-3.1-8B, 2024. URL <https://huggingface.co/Skywork/Skywork-o1-Open-Llama-3.1-8B>. Hugging Face model card.
- [525] Tencent Hunyuan Team. Hunyuan-A13B-Instruct, June 2025. URL https://github.com/Tencent-Hunyuan/Hunyuan-A13B/blob/main/report/Hunyuan_A13B_Technical_Report.pdf.
- [526] OpenAI. Introducing ChatGPT Pro, December 2024. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-chatgpt-pro/>.
- [527] Google. Gemini 2.0: Flash, flash-lite and pro, February 2025. URL <https://developers.googleblog.com/en/gemini-2-family-expands/>.
- [528] Qwen Team. Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507, July 2025. URL <https://huggingface.co/Qwen/Qwen3-235B-A22B-Thinking-2507>. Hugging Face model card.
- [529] Qwen Team. QVQ: To see the world with wisdom, December 2024. URL <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qvq-72b-preview/>.
- [530] xAI. Grok 4 Model Card, August 2025. URL <https://data.x.ai/2025-08-20-grok-4-model-card.pdf>.
- [531] Elie Bakouch, Loubna Ben Allal, Anton Lozhkov, Nouamane Tazi, Lewis Tunstall, Carlos Miguel Patino, Edward Beeching, Aymeric Roucher, Aksel Joonas Reedi, Quentin Gallouédec, et al. Smollm3: smol, multilingual, long-context reasoner. *Hugging Face Blog*, 2025.
- [532] OpenAI. OpenAI GPT-5 System Card, aug 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.03267>.
- [533] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V3.1 Release, August 2025. URL <https://api-docs.deepseek.com/news/news250821>.
- [534] OpenAI, Sahaj Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Jason Ai, Sam Altman, et al. gpt-oss-120b & gpt-oss-20b Model Card, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.10925>.

- [535] Kimi Team, Angang Du, Bofei Gao, Bowei Xing, Changjiu Jiang, Cheng Chen, Cheng Li, Chenjun Xiao, Chenzhuang Du, Chonghua Liao, Chuning Tang, Congcong Wang, Dehao Zhang, Enming Yuan, Enzhe Lu, Fengxiang Tang, Flood Sung, Guangda Wei, Guokun Lai, Haiqing Guo, Han Zhu, Hao Ding, Hao Hu, Hao Yang, Hao Zhang, Haotian Yao, Haotian Zhao, Haoyu Lu, Haoze Li, Haozhen Yu, Hongcheng Gao, Huabin Zheng, Huan Yuan, Jia Chen, Jianhang Guo, Jianlin Su, Jianzhou Wang, Jie Zhao, Jin Zhang, Jingyuan Liu, Junjie Yan, Junyan Wu, Lidong Shi, Ling Ye, Longhui Yu, Mengnan Dong, Neo Zhang, Ningchen Ma, Qiwei Pan, Qucheng Gong, Shaowei Liu, Shengling Ma, Shupeng Wei, Sihan Cao, Siying Huang, Tao Jiang, Weihao Gao, Weimin Xiong, Weiran He, Weixiao Huang, Weixin Xu, Wenhao Wu, Wenyang He, Xianghui Wei, Xianqing Jia, Xingzhe Wu, Xinran Xu, Xinxing Zu, Xinyu Zhou, Xuehai Pan, Y. Charles, Yang Li, Yangyang Hu, Yangyang Liu, Yanru Chen, Yejie Wang, Yibo Liu, Yidao Qin, Yifeng Liu, Ying Yang, Yiping Bao, Yulun Du, Yuxin Wu, Yuzhi Wang, Zaida Zhou, Zhaoji Wang, Zhaowei Li, Zhen Zhu, Zheng Zhang, Zhexu Wang, Zhilin Yang, Zhiqi Huang, Zihao Huang, Ziyao Xu, Zonghan Yang, and Zongyu Lin. Kimi k1.5: Scaling reinforcement learning with llms, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.12599>.
- [536] NovaSky Team. Sky-T1: Train your own o1 preview model within \$450, January 2025. URL <https://novasky-ai.github.io/posts/sky-t1/>.
- [537] Anthropic. Claude Opus 4.1, August 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-opus-4-1>.
- [538] Brian Hu Zhang, Eric Mitchell, Hongyu Ren, Kevin Lu, Max Schwarzer, Michelle Pokrass, Shengjia Zhao, Ted Sanders, Adam Tauman Kalai, Alexandre Passos, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Elaine Ya Le, Erik Ritter, Hao Sheng, Hanson Wang, Ilya Kostrikov, James Lee, Johannes Ferstad, Michael Lampe, Prashanth Radhakrishnan, Sean Fitzgerald, Sébastien Bubeck, Yann Dubois, Yu Bai, Andy Applebaum, Elizabeth Proehl, Evan Mays, Joel Parish, Kevin Liu, Leon Maksin, Leyton Ho, Miles Wang, Michele Wang, Olivia Watkins, Patrick Chao, Samuel Miserendino, Tejal Patwardhan, Antonia Woodford, Beth Hoover, Jake Brill, Kelly Stirman, Neel Ajarapu, Nick Turley, Nikunj Handa, Olivier Godement, Akshay Nathan, Alyssa Huang, Andy Wang, Ankit Gohel, Ben Eggers, Brian Yu, Bryan Ashley, Chengdu Huang, Davin Bogan, E. B. Sokolova, Eric Horacek, Felipe Petroski Such, Jonathan Cohen, Joshua Gross, Justin Becker, Kan Wu, Larry Lv, Lee Byron, Manoli Liodakis, Max Johnson, Mike Trpcic, Murat Yesildal, Rasmus Rygaard, RJ Marsan, Rohit Ramchandani, Rohan Kshirsagar, Sara Conlon, Tony Xia, Siyuan Fu, Srinivas Narayanan, Sulman Choudhry, Tomer Kaftan, Trevor Creech, Andrea Vallone, Andrew Du-berstein, Enis Sert, Eric Wallace, Grace Zhao, Irina Kofman, Jieqi Yu, Joaquin Quiñonero Candela, Made laine Boyd, Mehmet Ali Yatbaz, Mike McClay, Mingxuan Wang, Sandhini Agarwal, Saachi Jain, Sam Toizer, Santiago Hernández, Steve Mostovoy, Tao Li, Young Shin Cha, Yunyun Wang, Lama Ahmad, Troy A. Peterson, Carpus Chang, Kristen Ying, Aidan Clark, Dane Stuckey, Jerry Tworek, Jakub W. Pachocki, Johannes Heidecke, Kevin Weil, Liam Fedus, Mark Chen, Sam Altman, and Wojciech Zaremba. Openai o3-mini system card. . URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:276119184>.
- [539] Baidu. ERNIE-4.5-21B-A3B-Thinking, 2025. URL <https://huggingface.co/baidu/ERNIE-4.5-21B-A3B-Thinking>. Hugging Face model card.
- [540] Anthropic. Claude Sonnet 4.5 System Card, October 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/claude-sonnet-4-5-system-card>.

- [541] xAI. Grok 3 Beta: The age of reasoning agents, February 2025. URL <https://x.ai/news/grok-3>.
- [542] MiniMax. MiniMax M2 & Agent: Ingenious in simplicity, October 2025. URL <https://www.minimax.io/news/minimax-m2>.
- [543] Anthropic. Introducing Claude Haiku 4.5, October 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-haiku-4-5>.
- [544] Anthropic. Claude 3.7 Sonnet and Claude Code, February 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-7-sonnet>.
- [545] xAI. Grok 4.1 fast non-reasoning api release, 2026.
- [546] Tencent Hunyuan Team. Hunyuan T1, 2025. URL https://tencent.github.io/llm.hunyuan.T1/README_EN.html.
- [547] Ling Team, Anqi Shen, Baihui Li, Bin Hu, Bin Jing, Cai Chen, Chao Huang, Chao Zhang, Chaokun Yang, Cheng Lin, et al. Every step evolves: Scaling reinforcement learning for trillion-scale thinking model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18855*, 2025.
- [548] Jian Hu et al. Open-Reasoner-Zero: An open source approach to scaling up reinforcement learning on the base model, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.24290>.
- [549] OpenAI. GPT-5.1: A smarter, more conversational chatgpt, November 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-5-1/>.
- [550] Jiayi Pan et al. TinyZero: Minimal reproduction of deepseek r1-zero, 2025. URL <https://github.com/Jiayi-Pan/TinyZero>. GitHub repository.
- [551] Google. A New Era of Intelligence with Gemini 3, November 2025. URL <https://blog.google/products-and-platforms/products/gemini/gemini-3/>.
- [552] Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Zefan Wang, Hanbin Wang, Yuchen Zhang, Jiacheng Chen, Wendi Li, Bingxiang He, Yuchen Fan, Tianyu Yu, Qixin Xu, Weize Chen, Jiarui Yuan, Huayu Chen, Kaiyan Zhang, Xingtai Lv, Shuo Wang, Yuan Yao, Xu Han, Hao Peng, Yu Cheng, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, Bowen Zhou, and Ning Ding. PRIME: Process reinforcement through implicit rewards, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.01456>.
- [553] xAI. Grok 4.1, November 2025. URL <https://x.ai/news/grok-4-1>.
- [554] Bespoke Labs. Bespoke-Stratos-7B, 2025. URL <https://huggingface.co/bespokelabs/Bespoke-Stratos-7B>. Hugging Face model card.
- [555] Anthropic. Claude Opus 4.5 System Card, November 2025. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/claude-opus-4-5-system-card>.
- [556] Liang Wen, Yunke Cai, Fenrui Xiao, Xin He, Qi An, Zhenyu Duan, Yimin Du, Junchen Liu, Tanglifu Tanglifu, Xiaowei Lv, et al. Light-r1: Curriculum sft, dpo and rl for long cot from scratch and beyond. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 6: Industry Track)*, pages 318–327, 2025.

- [557] DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Aoxue Mei, Bangcai Lin, Bing Xue, et al. DeepSeek-V3.2: Pushing the frontier of open large language models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.02556>.
- [558] Tencent Hunyuan Team, Ao Liu, Botong Zhou, Can Xu, Chayse Zhou, ChenChen Zhang, Chengcheng Xu, Chenhao Wang, Decheng Wu, Dengpeng Wu, Dian Jiao, Dong Du, Dong Wang, Feng Zhang, Fengzong Lian, Guanghui Xu, Guanwei Zhang, Hai Wang, Haipeng Luo, Han Hu, Huilin Xu, Jiajia Wu, Jianchen Zhu, Jianfeng Yan, Jiaqi Zhu, Jihong Zhang, Jinbao Xue, Jun Xia, Junqiang Zheng, Kai Liu, Kai Zhang, Kai Zheng, Kejiao Li, Keyao Wang, Lan Jiang, Lixin Liu, Lulu Wu, Mengyuan Huang, Peijie Yu, Peiqi Wang, Qian Wang, Qianbiao Xiang, Qibin Liu, Qingfeng Sun, Richard Guo, Ruobing Xie, Saiyong Yang, Shaohua Chen, Shihui Hu, Shuai Li, Shuaipeng Li, Shuang Chen, Suncong Zheng, Tao Yang, Tian Zhang, Tinghao Yu, Weidong Han, Weijie Liu, Weijin Zhou, Weikang Wang, Wesleye Chen, Xiao Feng, Xiaoqin Ren, Xingwu Sun, Xiong Kuang, Xuemeng Huang, Xun Cao, Yanfeng Chen, Yang Du, Zhen Yang, Yangyu Tao, Yaping Deng, Yi Shen, Yigeng Hong, Yiqi Chen, Yiqing Huang, Yuchi Deng, Yue Mao, Yulong Wang, Yuyuan Zeng, Zenan Xu, Zhanhui Kang, Zhe Zhao, ZhenXiang Yan, Zheng Fang, Zhichao Hu, Zhongzhi Chen, Zhuoyu Li, Zongwei Li, Alex Yan, Ande Liang, Baitong Liu, Beiping Pan, Bin Xing, Binghong Wu, Bingxin Qu, Bolin Ni, Boyu Wu, Chen Li, Cheng Jiang, Cheng Zhang, Chengjun Liu, Chengxu Yang, Chengzhong Xu, Chiyu Wang, Chong Zha, Daisy Yi, Di Wang, Fanyang Lu, Fei Chen, Feifei Liu, Feng Zheng, Guanghua Yu, Guiyang Li, Guohua Wang, Haisheng Lin, Han Liu, Han Wang, Hao Fei, Hao Lu, Haoqing Jiang, Haoran Sun, Haotian Zhu, Huangjin Dai, Huankui Chen, Huawei Feng, Huihui Cai, Huxin Peng, Jackson Lv, Jiacheng Shi, Jiahao Bu, Jianbo Li, Jianguo Hu, Jiangtao Guan, Jianing Xu, Jianwei Cai, Jiarong Zhang, Jiawei Song, Jie Jiang, Jie Liu, Jieneng Yang, Jihong Zhang, Jin lv, Jing Zhao, Jinjian Li, Jinxing Liu, Jun Zhao, Juntao Guo, Kai Wang, Kan Wu, Lei Fu, Lei He, Lei Wang, Li Liu, Liang Dong, et al. Hunyuan-turbos: Advancing large language models through mamba-transformer synergy and adaptive chain-of-thought, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.15431>.
- [559] Google. Gemini 3 Flash: Frontier intelligence built for speed, December 2025. URL <https://blog.google/products-and-platforms/products/gemini/gemini-3-flash/>.
- [560] Qwen Team. QwQ-32B: Embracing the power of reinforcement learning. <https://qwenlm.github.io/blog/qwq-32b/>, mar 2025.
- [561] Xiaomi LLM-Core Team, Bangjun Xiao, Bingquan Xia, Bo Yang, Bofei Gao, et al. MiMo-V2-Flash Technical Report, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.02780>.
- [562] Z.ai. GLM-4.7: Advancing the coding capability, December 2025. URL <https://z.ai/blog/glm-4.7>.
- [563] Google. Gemini 2.5: Our most intelligent ai model, March 2025. URL <https://blog.google/innovation-and-ai/models-and-research/google-deepmind/gemini-model-thinking-updates-march-2025/>.
- [564] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V3-0324 Release, March 2025. URL <https://api-docs.deepseek.com/news/news250325>.
- [565] OpenAI. Introducing GPT-5.2, December 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5-2/>.

- [566] Marah Abdin, Sahaj Agarwal, Ahmed Awadallah, Vidhisha Balachandran, Harkirat Behl, Lingjiao Chen, et al. Phi-4-reasoning Technical Report, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.21318>.
- [567] Meituan LongCat Team, Anchun Gui, Bei Li, Bingyang Tao, Bole Zhou, Borun Chen, Chao Zhang, Chen Gao, Chen Zhang, Chengcheng Han, et al. Longcat-flash-thinking-2601 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.16725*, 2026.
- [568] Ailin Huang, Ang Li, Aobo Kong, Bin Wang, Binxing Jiao, Bo Dong, Bojun Wang, Boyu Chen, Brian Li, Buyun Ma, et al. Step 3.5 flash: Open frontier-level intelligence with 11b active parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.10604*, 2026.
- [569] Kimi Team, Tongtong Bai, Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, et al. Kimi K2.5: Visual agentic intelligence, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.02276>.
- [570] OpenAI. Openai o3 and o4-mini system card. <https://openai.com/index/o3-o4-mini-system-card/>, apr 2025.
- [571] Qwen Team. Qwen3.5: Towards native multimodal agents, February 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.5>.
- [572] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.1 Pro Model Card, February 2026. URL <https://deepmind.google/models/model-cards/gemini-3-1-pro/>.
- [573] OpenAI. GPT-5.3-Codex System Card, February 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-5-3-codex-system-card/>.
- [574] Z.ai. GLM-4-0414 Model Series, 2025. URL <https://github.com/zai-org/GLM-4>. Official GitHub repository and model release page.
- [575] Anthropic. Introducing Claude Opus 4.6, February 2026. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-opus-4-6>.
- [576] MiniMax. MiniMax-M2.5, February 2026. URL <https://www.minimax.io/news/minimax-m25>.
- [577] OpenAI. Introducing GPT-5.4, March 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-gpt-5-4/>.
- [578] Meta AI. The Llama 4 Herd: The beginning of a new era of natively multimodal ai innovation, April 2025. URL <https://ai.meta.com/blog/llama-4-multimodal-intelligence/>.
- [579] Zhuolin Yang, Zihan Liu, Yang Chen, Wenliang Dai, Boxin Wang, Sheng-Chieh Lin, Chankyu Lee, et al. Nemotron-Cascade 2: Post-training llms with cascade rl and multi-domain on-policy distillation, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.19220>.
- [580] OpenAI. GPT-5.3 Instant, March 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-5-3-instant/>.
- [581] ByteDance Seed. Seed-Thinking-v1.5: Advancing superb reasoning models with reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.13914>.

- [582] MiniMax. MiniMax-M2.7, March 2026. URL <https://www.minimax.io/news/minimax-m27-en>.
- [583] Amir Bercovich et al. Llama-Nemotron: Efficient reasoning models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.00949>.
- [584] Xiaomi MiMo Team. MiMo-V2.5-Pro, April 2026. URL <https://mimo.xiaomi.com/mimo-v2-5-pro/>.
- [585] Moonshot AI. Kimi-K2.6, April 2026. URL <https://huggingface.co/moonshotai/Kimi-K2.6>. Hugging Face model card.
- [586] OpenAI. Introducing Codex, May 2025. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-codex/>.
- [587] Z.ai. GLM-5.1: Towards long-horizon tasks, April 2026. URL <https://z.ai/blog/glm-5.1>.
- [588] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-R1-0528, May 2025. URL <https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-R1-0528>. Hugging Face model card.
- [589] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek V4 Preview Release, April 2026. URL <https://api-docs.deepseek.com/news/news260424>.
- [590] Qwen Team. Qwen3.6-35B-A3B: Agentic coding power, now open to all, April 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.6-35b-a3b>.
- [591] Google. Gemma 4: Byte for byte, the most capable open models, April 2026. URL <https://blog.google/innovation-and-ai/technology/developers-tools/gemma-4/>.
- [592] Xiaomi LLM-Core Team. MiMo: Unlocking the reasoning potential of language model – from pretraining to posttraining, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.07608>.
- [593] OpenAI. GPT-5.5 System Card, April 2026. URL <https://openai.com/index/gpt-5-5-system-card/>.
- [594] Anthropic. Introducing Claude Opus 4.7, April 2026. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-opus-4-7>.
- [595] ByteDance Seed. Doubao-1.5 deep thinking model, April 2025. URL <https://seed.bytedance.com/blog/bytedance-s-latest-thinking-model-seed-thinking-v1-5-technical-details-disclosure>. Official Seed blog; API availability via Volcano Engine.
- [596] Anthropic. Claude Mythos Preview, April 2026. URL <https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/08ab9158070959f88f296514c21b7facce6f52bc.pdf>.
- [597] Google. Gemini 2.5: Our most intelligent models are getting even better, May 2025. URL <https://blog.google/innovation-and-ai/models-and-research/google-deepmind/google-gemini-updates-io-2025/>.
- [598] xAI. Grok 4.3 non-reasoning, May 2026. URL <https://docs.x.ai/developers/models/grok-4.3>.

- [599] Jinguo Zhu, Weiyun Wang, Zhe Chen, et al. InternVL3: Exploring advanced training and test-time recipes for open-source multimodal models, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.10479>.
- [600] InclusionAI. Ring-2.6-1T, May 2026. URL <https://huggingface.co/inclusionAI/Ring-2.6-1T>. Hugging Face model card.
- [601] Baidu. ERNIE 5.1, May 2026. URL <https://ernie.baidu.com/blog/posts/ernie-5.1-0508-release/>.
- [602] Anthropic. Claude Opus 4.8, May 2026. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-opus-4-8>.
- [603] Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Zilin Zhu, Weixun Wang, Dehao Zhang, Yu Cao, et al. Openrlhf: An easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance rlhf framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.11143*, 6, 2024.
- [604] Guangming Sheng, Chi Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Xibin Wu, Wang Zhang, Ru Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Haibin Lin, and Chuan Wu. Hybridflow: A flexible and efficient rlhf framework. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 1279–1297, 2025.
- [605] Hugging Face. Open r1: A fully open reproduction of deepseek-r1, January 2025. URL <https://github.com/huggingface/open-r1>.
- [606] Kaya Stechly, Karthik Valmeekam, and Subbarao Kambhampati. On the self-verification limitations of large language models on reasoning and planning tasks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 98190–98243, 2025.
- [607] Hieu Le Duc and Leo Liberti. Mathematics with large language models as provers and verifiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.12829*, 2025.
- [608] John Paul Rugaba and Tang Shengbing. V-math and veri-math: Step-level verification for enhancing mathematical reasoning in llms. *Available at SSRN 6542678*, 2026.
- [609] Ayesha Gull, Muhammad Usman Safder, Rania Elbadry, Fan Zhang, Veselin Stoyanov, Preslav Nakov, and Zhuohan Xie. Engtrace: A symbolic benchmark for verifiable process supervision of engineering reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.01650*, 2025.
- [610] Fei Yu, Anningzhe Gao, and Benyou Wang. Ovm, outcome-supervised value models for planning in mathematical reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2024*, pages 858–875, 2024.
- [611] Zhouliang Yu, Ruotian Peng, Keyi Ding, Yizhe Li, Zhongyuan Peng, Minghao Liu, Yifan Zhang, Zheng Yuan, Huajian Xin, Wenhao Huang, et al. Formalmath: Benchmarking formal mathematical reasoning of large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.02735*, 2025.
- [612] Chengshu Li, Jacky Liang, Andy Zeng, Xinyun Chen, Karol Hausman, Dorsa Sadigh, Sergey Levine, Li Fei-Fei, Fei Xia, and Brian Ichter. Chain of code: Reasoning with a language model-augmented code emulator. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04474*, 2023.
- [613] Honglin Lin, Qizhi Pei, Zhuoshi Pan, Yu Li, Xin Gao, Juntao Li, Conghui He, and Lijun Wu. Scaling code-assisted chain-of-thoughts and instructions for model reasoning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:35204–35237, 2026.

- [614] Yoav Alon and Cristina David. Integrating large language models and reinforcement learning for non-linear reasoning. *Proceedings of the ACM on Software Engineering*, 2(FSE):957–977, 2025.
- [615] Ren-Biao Liu, Anqi Li, Chaoding Yang, Hui Sun, and Ming Li. Revisiting chain-of-thought in code generation: Do language models need to learn reasoning before coding? In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025.
- [616] Significant Gravitass. AutoGPT: An autonomous GPT-4 experiment. <https://github.com/Significant-Gravitas/AutoGPT>, 2023.
- [617] Yohei Nakajima. BabyAGI. <https://github.com/yoheinakajima/babyagi>, 2023.
- [618] Grégoire Mialon, Clémentine Fourrier, Craig Swift, Thomas Wolf, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. GAIA: A benchmark for general AI assistants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12983*, 2023.
- [619] Model Context Protocol. modelcontextprotocol/servers: Model context protocol servers. <https://github.com/modelcontextprotocol/servers>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [620] Aditi Singh, Abul Ehtesham, Saket Kumar, Tala Talaei Khoei, and Athanasios V. Vasilakos. Agentic retrieval-augmented generation: A survey on agentic rag. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.09136*, 2025.
- [621] Xu Huang, Weiwen Liu, Xiaolong Chen, Xingmei Wang, Hao Wang, Defu Lian, Yasheng Wang, Ruiming Tang, and Enhong Chen. Understanding the planning of llm agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.02716*, 2024.
- [622] Xiaofei Dong, Xueqiang Zhang, Weixin Bu, Dan Zhang, and Feng Cao. A survey of llm-based agents: Theories, technologies, applications and suggestions. In *2024 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Internet of Things and Cloud Computing Technology (AIoT)*, pages 407–413. IEEE, 2024.
- [623] Asaf Yehudai, Lilach Eden, Alan Li, Guy Uziel, Yilun Zhao, Roy Bar-Haim, Arman Cohan, and Michal Shmueli-Scheuer. Survey on evaluation of llm-based agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.16416*, 2025.
- [624] Syed Muntasir Mamun. Anatomical review of “toward efficient agents: A survey of memory, tool learning, and planning” vol-i, 2026.
- [625] Zhenghao Liu, Pengcheng Huang, Zhipeng Xu, Xinze Li, Shuliang Liu, Chunyi Peng, Haidong Xin, Yukun Yan, Shuo Wang, Xu Han, et al. Knowledge intensive agents. *AI Open*, 2026.
- [626] Junnan Dong, Siyu An, Yifei Yu, Qian-Wen Zhang, Linhao Luo, Xiao Huang, Yunsheng Wu, Di Yin, and Xing Sun. Youtu-graphrag: Vertically unified agents for graph retrieval-augmented complex reasoning. *ICLR*, 2026.
- [627] Pengyu Zhao, Zijian Jin, and Ning Cheng. An in-depth survey of large language model-based artificial intelligence agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14365*, 2023.
- [628] Weikai Xu, Chengrui Huang, Shen Gao, and Shuo Shang. Llm-based agents for tool learning: A survey: W. xu et al. *Data Science and Engineering*, pages 1–31, 2025.

- [629] Xiaofang Yang, Lijun Li, Heng Zhou, Tong Zhu, Xiaoye Qu, Yuchen Fan, Qianshan Wei, Rui Ye, Li Kang, Yiran Qin, et al. Toward efficient agents: Memory, tool learning, and planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.14192*, 2026.
- [630] Junlin Xie, Zhihong Chen, Ruifei Zhang, Xiang Wan, and Guanbin Li. Large multimodal agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.15116*, 2024.
- [631] Pengfei Cao, Tianyi Men, Wencan Liu, Jingwen Zhang, Xuzhao Li, Xixun Lin, Dianbo Sui, Yanan Cao, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Large language models for planning: A comprehensive and systematic survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.19683*, 2025.
- [632] Jingqing Ruan, Yihong Chen, Bin Zhang, Zhiwei Xu, Tianpeng Bao, Guoqing Du, Shiwei Shi, Hangyu Mao, Ziyue Li, Xingyu Zeng, et al. Tptu: large language model-based ai agents for task planning and tool usage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03427*, 2023.
- [633] Donghun Lee and Hyosu Kim. A survey on llm agents: Architecture, applications, and challenges. In *2026 40th International Conference on Information Networking (ICOIN)*, pages 979–982. IEEE, 2026.
- [634] Zhuocheng Shen. Llm with tools: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.18807*, 2024.
- [635] Xinyi Li, Sai Wang, Siqi Zeng, Yu Wu, and Yi Yang. A survey on llm-based multi-agent systems: workflow, infrastructure, and challenges. *Vicinagearth*, 1(1):9, 2024.
- [636] Mengkang Hu, Yuhang Zhou, Wendong Fan, Yuzhou Nie, Ziyu Ye, Bowei Xia, Tao Sun, Zhaoxuan Jin, Yingru Li, Zeyu Zhang, Yifeng Wang, Qianshuo Ye, Bernard Ghanem, Ping Luo, and Guohao Li. Owl: Optimized workforce learning for general multi-agent assistance in real-world task automation. In D. Belgrave, C. Zhang, H. Lin, R. Pascanu, P. Koniusz, M. Ghassemi, and N. Chen, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38, pages 50859–50906. Curran Associates, Inc., 2025. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2025/file/48dcc43a534c5b582f9d0fdb778e9b84-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [637] Theodore Sumers, Shunyu Yao, Karthik R Narasimhan, and Thomas L Griffiths. Cognitive architectures for language agents. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023.
- [638] Rajkumar Buyya et al. Agentic artificial intelligence (ai): Architectures, taxonomies, and evaluation of large language model agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.12560*, 2026.
- [639] Xinzhe Li. A review of prominent paradigms for llm-based agents: Tool use, planning (including rag), and feedback learning. In *Proceedings of the 31st international conference on computational linguistics*, pages 9760–9779, 2025.
- [640] Haoyuan Xu, Chang Li, Xinyan Ma, Xianhao Ou, Zihan Zhang, Tao He, Xiangyu Liu, Zixiang Wang, Jiafeng Liang, Zheng Chu, et al. The evolution of tool use in llm agents: From single-tool call to multi-tool orchestration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.22862*, 2026.
- [641] Ziqiao Xi, Shuang Liang, Qi Liu, Jiaqing Zhang, Letian Peng, Fang Nan, Meshal Nayim, Tianhui Zhang, Rishika Mundada, Lianhui Qin, et al. Toolgym: an open-world tool-using environment for scalable agent testing and data curation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.06328*, 2026.

- [642] De Chezelles, Thibault Le Sellier, Sahar Omid Shayegan, Lawrence Keunho Jang, Xing Han Lù, Ori Yoran, Dehan Kong, Frank F Xu, Siva Reddy, Quentin Cappart, et al. The browsergym ecosystem for web agent research. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.05467*, 2024.
- [643] Lars Krupp, Daniel Geißler, Paul Lukowicz, and Jakob Karolus. Web agents and benchmarks—a survey focusing on algorithmic strategies and performance ratings.
- [644] Hao Wu, Yongheng Zhang, Yuan Gao, Fan Xu, Fan Zhang, Ruobing Xie, Ruijian Gou, Yuxuan Liang, Xiaomeng Huang, and Xian Wu. Omniflow: A physics-grounded multimodal agent for generalized scientific reasoning, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.15797>.
- [645] Chunlin Lu, Yongheng Zhang, Yao Li, Sheng Wang, and Libo Qin. Lama-ad: Label-aware multi-agent alzheimer’s disease diagnosis with counterfactual reasoning. In *2025 IEEE International Conference on Bioinformatics and Biomedicine (BIBM)*, pages 2586–2593, 2025. doi: 10.1109/BIBM66473.2025.11356944.
- [646] Mengkang Hu, Yao Mu, Xinmiao Yu, Mingyu Ding, Shiguang Wu, Wenqi Shao, Qiguang Chen, Bin Wang, Yu Qiao, and Ping Luo. Tree-planner: Efficient close-loop task planning with large language models. In B. Kim, Y. Yue, S. Chaudhuri, K. Fragkiadaki, M. Khan, and Y. Sun, editors, *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 48669–48696, 2024. URL https://proceedings.iclr.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/file/d53538ba21c05fa361d2b21704172753-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- [647] Junnan Dong, Chuang Zhou, Zheng Yuan, Yifei Yu, Qiufeng Wang, Yinghui Li, Siyu An, Di Yin, Xing Sun, and Feiyue Huang. Deep tabular research via continual experience-driven execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.09151*, 2026.
- [648] Yongliang Shen, Kaitao Song, Xu Tan, Dongsheng Li, Weiming Lu, and Yueting Zhuang. Hugginggpt: Solving ai tasks with chatgpt and its friends in hugging face. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:38154–38180, 2023.
- [649] Chenfei Wu, Shengming Yin, Weizhen Qi, Xiaodong Wang, Zecheng Tang, and Nan Duan. Visual chatgpt: Talking, drawing and editing with visual foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.04671*, 2023.
- [650] Dídac Surís, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 11888–11898, 2023.
- [651] Jianwei Yang, Hao Zhang, Feng Li, Xueyan Zou, Chunyuan Li, and Jianfeng Gao. Set-of-mark prompting unleashes extraordinary visual grounding in gpt-4v. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.11441*, 2023.
- [652] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Qingsong Lv, Jiazheng Xu, Wenmeng Yu, Junhui Ji, Yan Wang, Zihan Wang, Yuxiao Dong, Ming Ding, et al. Cogagent: A visual language model for gui agents. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 14281–14290, 2024.
- [653] Kevin Qinghong Lin, Linjie Li, Difei Gao, Zhengyuan Yang, Shiwei Wu, Zechen Bai, Stan Weixian Lei, Lijuan Wang, and Mike Zheng Shou. Showui: One vision-language-action model for gui visual agent. In *Proceedings of the Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Conference*, pages 19498–19508, 2025.

- [654] Yujia Qin, Yining Ye, Junjie Fang, Haoming Wang, Shihao Liang, Shizuo Tian, Junda Zhang, Jiahao Li, Yunxin Li, Shijue Huang, et al. Ui-tars: Pioneering automated gui interaction with native agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12326*, 2025.
- [655] Zikang Guo, Benfeng Xu, Chiwei Zhu, Wentao Hong, Xiaorui Wang, and Zhendong Mao. Mcp-agentbench: Evaluating real-world language agent performance with mcp-mediated tools. In *Proceedings of the AAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 30888–30896, 2026.
- [656] Aelim Ahn, Sooyeon Lee, Hyosun Wang, Chiwan Park, Daeryong Kim, Jihyeon Roh, Kichang Yang, Wonjun Jang, Hwang Woosung, Min Seok Kim, et al. Orchestrationbench: Llm-driven agentic planning and tool use in multi-domain scenarios. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026.
- [657] Shuangrui Ding, Xuanlang Dai, Long Xing, Shengyuan Ding, Ziyu Liu, Yang JingYi, Penghui Yang, Zhixiong Zhang, Xilin Wei, Xinyu Fang, et al. Wildclawbench: A benchmark for real-world, long-horizon agent evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.10912*, 2026.
- [658] Jinchao Hu, Meizhi Zhong, Kehai Chen, Xuefeng Bai, and Min Zhang. Agentic tool use in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.00835*, 2026.
- [659] Xiaochuan Li, Ryan Ming, Pranav Setlur, Abhijay Paladugu, Andy Tang, Hao Kang, Shuai Shao, Rong Jin, and Chenyan Xiong. Benchmark test-time scaling of general llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.18998*, 2026.
- [660] Jing Yu Koh, Robert Lo, Lawrence Jang, Vikram Duvvur, Ming Lim, Po-Yu Huang, Graham Neubig, Shuyan Zhou, Russ Salakhutdinov, and Daniel Fried. Visualwebarena: Evaluating multimodal agents on realistic visual web tasks. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 881–905, 2024.
- [661] Chris Rawles, Sarah Clinckemahillie, Yifan Chang, Jonathan Waltz, Gabrielle Lau, Marybeth Fair, Alice Li, William Bishop, Wei Li, Folawiyi Campbell-Ajala, et al. Androidworld: A dynamic benchmarking environment for autonomous agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 406–441, 2025.
- [662] Junyang Wang, Haiyang Xu, Jiabo Ye, Ming Yan, Weizhou Shen, Ji Zhang, Fei Huang, and Jitao Sang. Mobile-agent: Autonomous multi-modal mobile device agent with visual perception. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.16158*, 2024.
- [663] Chi Zhang, Zhao Yang, Jiaxuan Liu, Yanda Li, Yucheng Han, Xin Chen, Zebiao Huang, Bin Fu, and Gang Yu. Appagent: Multimodal agents as smartphone users. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–20, 2025.
- [664] Kanzhi Cheng, Qiushi Sun, Yougang Chu, Fangzhi Xu, Li YanTao, Jianbing Zhang, and Zhiyong Wu. Seeclck: Harnessing gui grounding for advanced visual gui agents. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9313–9332, 2024.
- [665] Peng Wang, Yongheng Zhang, Hao Fei, Qiguang Chen, Yukai Wang, Jiasheng Si, Wenpeng Lu, Min Li, and Libo Qin. S3 agent: Unlocking the power of vllm for zero-shot multi-modal sarcasm detection. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.*, 21(11), November 2025. ISSN 1551-6857. doi: 10.1145/3690642. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3690642>.

- [666] Xin Zhang, Mingxin Li, Yanzhao Zhang, Dingkun Long, Yongqi Li, Yinghui Li, Pengjun Xie, Meishan Zhang, Wenjie Li, Min Zhang, et al. SsrB: Direct natural language querying to massive heterogeneous semi-structured data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [667] Wei-Chieh Huang, Henry Peng Zou, Yaozu Wu, Dongyuan Li, Yankai Chen, Weizhi Zhang, Yangning Li, Angelo Zangari, Jizhou Guo, Chunyu Miao, et al. Deepresearchguard: Deep research with open-domain evaluation and multi-stage guardrails for safety. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.10994*, 2025.
- [668] Yangning Li, Weizhi Zhang, Yuyao Yang, Wei-Chieh Huang, Yaozu Wu, Junyu Luo, Yuanchen Bei, Henry Peng Zou, Xiao Luo, Yusheng Zhao, et al. Towards agentic rag with deep reasoning: A survey of rag-reasoning systems in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.09477*, 2, 2025.
- [669] Yangning Li, Yinghui Li, Xinyu Wang, Yong Jiang, Zhen Zhang, Xinran Zheng, Hui Wang, Hai-Tao Zheng, Fei Huang, Jingren Zhou, et al. Benchmarking multimodal retrieval augmented generation with dynamic vqa dataset and self-adaptive planning agent. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 95582–95604, 2025.
- [670] Jiayi Kuang, Haojing Huang, Yinghui Li, Xinnian Liang, Zhikun Xu, Yangning Li, Xiaoyu Tan, Chao Qu, Meishan Zhang, Ying Shen, et al. Atomic thinking of llms: Decoupling and exploring mathematical reasoning abilities. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:166142–166167, 2026.
- [671] Xinshuai Guo, Jiayi Kuang, Linyue Pan, Yinghui Li, Yangning Li, Hai-Tao Zheng, Ying Shen, Di Yin, and Xing Sun. Evoconfig: Self-evolving multi-agent systems for efficient autonomous environment configuration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.16489*, 2026.
- [672] Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02406*, 2022.
- [673] Denny Zhou, Nathanael Schärli, Le Hou, Jason Wei, Nathan Scales, Xuezhi Wang, Dale Schuurmans, Claire Cui, Olivier Bousquet, Quoc Le, et al. Least-to-most prompting enables complex reasoning in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.10625*, 2022.
- [674] Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Wang, and Zhiting Hu. Reasoning with language model is planning with world model. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8154–8173, 2023.
- [675] Weizhi Wang, Li Dong, Hao Cheng, Xiaodong Liu, Xifeng Yan, Jianfeng Gao, and Furu Wei. Augmenting language models with long-term memory. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:74530–74543, 2023.
- [676] Lianlei Shan, Shixian Luo, Zezhou Zhu, Yu Yuan, and Yong Wu. Cognitive memory in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.02441*, 2025.
- [677] Jizhan Fang, Xinle Deng, Haoming Xu, Ziyang Jiang, Yuqi Tang, Ziwen Xu, Shumin Deng, Yunzhi Yao, Mengru Wang, Shuofei Qiao, et al. Lightmem: Lightweight and efficient memory-augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.18866*, 2025.
- [678] Pengfei Du. Memory for autonomous llm agents: Mechanisms, evaluation, and emerging frontiers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.07670*, 2026.

- [679] Mathis Pink, Qinyuan Wu, Vy Ai Vo, Javier Turek, Jianing Mu, Alexander Huth, and Mariya Toneva. Position: Episodic memory is the missing piece for long-term llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.06975*, 2025.
- [680] Guangrui Li, Yaochen Xie, Yi Liu, Ziwei Dong, Xingyuan Pan, Tianqi Zheng, Jason Choi, Michael J Morais, Binit Jha, Shaunak Mishra, et al. The world won't stay still: Programmable evolution for agent benchmarks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.05910*, 2026.
- [681] Jiachen Zhu, Menghui Zhu, Renting Rui, Rong Shan, Congmin Zheng, Bo Chen, Yunjia Xi, Jianghao Lin, Weiwen Liu, Ruiming Tang, et al. Evolutionary perspectives on the evaluation of llm-based ai agents: A comprehensive survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.11102*, 2025.
- [682] Jiarui Qin, Yunjia Xi, Junjie Huang, Renting Rui, Di Yin, Weiwen Liu, Yong Yu, Weinan Zhang, and Xing Sun. Aptbench: Benchmarking agentic potential of base llms during pre-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.24397*, 2025.
- [683] Yanna Jiang, Delong Li, Haiyu Deng, Baihe Ma, Xu Wang, Qin Wang, and Guangsheng Yu. Sok: Agentic skills—beyond tool use in llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.20867*, 2026.
- [684] Pavel Adamenko, Mikhail Ivanov, Aidar Valeev, Rodion Levichev, Pavel Zadorozhny, Ivan Lopatin, Dmitry Babayev, Alena Fenogenova, and Valentin Malykh. Swe-mera: A dynamic benchmark for agenticly evaluating large language models on software engineering tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.11059*, 2025.
- [685] Wanjun Zhong, Lianghong Guo, Qiqi Gao, He Ye, and Yanlin Wang. Memorybank: Enhancing large language models with long-term memory. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 38, pages 19724–19731, 2024.
- [686] Chenxu Hu, Jie Fu, Chenzhuang Du, Simian Luo, Junbo Zhao, and Hang Zhao. Chatdb: Augmenting llms with databases as their symbolic memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03901*, 2023.
- [687] Xiang Deng, Jeff Da, Edwin Pan, Yannis Yiming He, Charles Ide, Kanak Garg, Niklas Lauffer, Andrew Park, Nitin Pasari, Chetan Rane, et al. Swe-bench pro: Can ai agents solve long-horizon software engineering tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.16941*, 2025.
- [688] Linghao Zhang, Shilin He, Chaoyun Zhang, Yu Kang, Bowen Li, Chengxing Xie, Junhao Wang, Maoquan Wang, Yufan Huang, Shengyu Fu, et al. Swe-bench goes live! *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [689] Muxin Tian, Zhe Wang, Blair Yang, Zhenwei Tang, Kunlun Zhu, Honghua Dong, Hanchen Li, Xinni Xie, Guangjing Wang, and Jiaxuan You. Swe-bench mobile: Can large language model agents develop industry-level mobile applications? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.09540*, 2026.
- [690] Muhammad Shihab Rashid, Christian Bock, Yuan Zhuang, Alexander Buchholz, Tim Esler, Simon Valentin, Luca Franceschi, Martin Wistuba, Prabhu Teja Sivaprasad, Woo Jung Kim, et al. Swe-polybench: A multi-language benchmark for repository level evaluation of coding agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08703*, 2025.
- [691] Ibragim Badertdinov, Alexander Golubev, Maksim Nekrashevich, Anton Shevtsov, Simon Karasik, Andrei Andriushchenko, Maria Trofimova, Daria Litvintseva, and Boris Yangel. Swe-rebench: An automated pipeline for task collection and decontaminated evaluation of software engineering agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.

- [692] Reem Aleithan, Haoran Xue, Mohammad Mahdi Mohajer, Elijah Nnorom, Gias Uddin, and Song Wang. Swe-bench+: Enhanced coding benchmark for llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06992*, 2024.
- [693] John Yang, Kilian Lieret, Carlos Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kabir Khandpur, Yanzhe Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Ofir Press, Ludwig Schmidt, and Diyi Yang. Swe-smith: Scaling data for software engineering agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [694] Lilin Wang, Lucas Ramalho, Alan Celestino, Phuc Anthony Pham, Yu Liu, Umang Kumar Sinha, Andres Portillo, Onassis Osunwa, and Gabriel Maduekwe. Swe-bench++: A framework for the scalable generation of software engineering benchmarks from open-source repositories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.17419*, 2025.
- [695] Atharv Sonwane, Eng-Shen Tu, Wei-Chung Lu, Claas Beger, Carter Larsen, Debjit Dhar, Simon Alford, Rachel Chen, Ronit Pattanayak, Tuan Anh Dang, et al. Omnicode: A benchmark for evaluating software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.02262*, 2026.
- [696] Spandan Garg, Benjamin Steenhoek, and Yufan Huang. Saving swe-bench: A benchmark mutation approach for realistic agent evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.08996*, 2025.
- [697] Yang Liu, Xinshuai Song, Kaixuan Jiang, Weixing Chen, Jingzhou Luo, Guanbin Li, and Liang Lin. Meia: Multimodal embodied perception and interaction in unknown environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.00290*, 2024.
- [698] Yu Wang and Xi Chen. Mirix: Multi-agent memory system for llm-based agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.07957*, 2025.
- [699] Lin Long, Yichen He, Wentao Ye, Yiyuan Pan, Yuan Lin, Hang Li, Junbo Zhao, and Wei Li. Seeing, listening, remembering, and reasoning: A multimodal agent with long-term memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.09736*, 2025.
- [700] Jeffrey Jian Ma, Milad Hashemi, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, Kevin Swersky, Ofir Press, Enhui Li, Vijay Janapa Reddi, and Parthasarathy Ranganathan. Swe-fficiency: Can language models optimize real-world repositories on real workloads? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.06090*, 2025.
- [701] Xinyi He, Qian Liu, Mingzhe Du, Lin Yan, Zhijie Fan, Yiming Huang, Zejian Yuan, and Zejun Ma. Swe-perf: Can language models optimize code performance on real-world repositories? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.12415*, 2025.
- [702] Weihan Peng, Yuling Shi, Yuhang Wang, Xinyun Zhang, Beijun Shen, and Xiaodong Gu. Swe-qa: Can language models answer repository-level code questions? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.14635*, 2025.
- [703] Tingxu Han, Yi Zhang, Wei Song, Chunrong Fang, Zhenyu Chen, Youcheng Sun, and Lijie Hu. Swe-skills-bench: Do agent skills actually help in real-world software engineering? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.15401*, 2026.
- [704] Thanosan Prathifkumar, Noble Saji Mathews, and Meiyappan Nagappan. Does swe-bench-verified test agent ability or model memory? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.10218*, 2025.
- [705] Prateek Chhikara, Dev Khant, Saket Aryan, Taranjeet Singh, and Deshraj Yadav. Mem0: Building production-ready ai agents with scalable long-term memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.19413*, 2025.

- [706] Wujiang Xu, Zujie Liang, Kai Mei, Hang Gao, Juntao Tan, and Yongfeng Zhang. A-mem: Agentic memory for llm agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38: 17577–17604, 2026.
- [707] Zijian Zhou, Ao Qu, Zhaoxuan Wu, Sunghwan Kim, Alok Prakash, Daniela Rus, Jinhua Zhao, Bryan Kian Hsiang Low, and Paul Pu Liang. Mem1: Learning to synergize memory and reasoning for efficient long-horizon agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.15841*, 2025.
- [708] Sikuan Yan, Xiufeng Yang, Zuchao Huang, Ercong Nie, Zifeng Ding, Zonggen Li, Xiaowen Ma, Jinhe Bi, Kristian Kersting, Jeff Z Pan, et al. Memory-r1: Enhancing large language model agents to manage and utilize memories via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.19828*, 2025.
- [709] Yu Wang, Ryuichi Takanobu, Zhiqi Liang, Yuzhen Mao, Yuanzhe Hu, Julian McAuley, and Xiaojian Wu. Mem- α : Learning memory construction via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.25911*, 2025.
- [710] Shu Wang, Edwin Yu, Oscar Love, Tom Zhang, Tom Wong, Steve Scargall, and Charles Fan. Memmachine: A ground-truth-preserving memory system for personalized ai agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.04853*, 2026.
- [711] Leonhard Applis, Yuntong Zhang, Shanchao Liang, Nan Jiang, Lin Tan, and Abhik Roychoudhury. Unified software engineering agent as ai software engineer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.14683*, 2025.
- [712] Hanyu Lai, Xiao Liu, Iat Long Iong, Shuntian Yao, Yuxuan Chen, Pengbo Shen, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Xiaohan Zhang, Yuxiao Dong, et al. Autowebglm: A large language model-based web navigating agent. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 5295–5306, 2024.
- [713] Ajay Patel, Markus Hofmarcher, Claudiu Leoveanu-Condrei, Marius-Constantin Dinu, Chris Callison-Burch, and Sepp Hochreiter. Large language models can self-improve at web agent tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.20309*, 2024.
- [714] Lucas-Andrei Thil, Mirela Popa, and Gerasimos Spanakis. Navigating webai: Training agents to complete web tasks with large language models and reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM/SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 866–874, 2024.
- [715] Sagnik Anupam, Davis Brown, Shuo Li, Eric Wong, Hamed Hassani, and Osbert Bastani. Browserarena: Evaluating llm agents on real-world web navigation tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.02418*, 2025.
- [716] Hyunjoo Chae, Namyoung Kim, Kai Ong, Minju Gwak, Gwanwoo Song, Jihoon Kim, Sunghwan Kim, Dongha Lee, and Jinyoung Yeo. Web agents with world models: Learning and leveraging environment dynamics in web navigation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 63707–63738, 2025.
- [717] LARS Krupp, DANIEL Geißler, Paweł W Woźniak, Paul Lukowicz, and Jakob Karolus. Quantifying web agents—a survey on web agent performance and efficiency, 2025.
- [718] Kevin Xu, Yeganeh Kordi, Tanay Nayak, Adi Asija, Yizhong Wang, Kate Sanders, Adam Byerly, Jingyu Zhang, Benjamin Van Durme, and Daniel Khashabi. Turkingbench: A challenge

- benchmark for web agents. 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)*, pages 3694–3710, 2025.
- [719] Shikhar Murty, Hao Zhu, Dzmitry Bahdanau, and Christopher D Manning. Nnetnav: Un-supervised learning of browser agents through environment interaction in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.02907*, 2024.
- [720] Xing Han Lù, Zdeněk Kasner, and Siva Reddy. Weblinx: Real-world website navigation with multi-turn dialogue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05930*, 2024.
- [721] Xingyao Wang, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Yizhe Zhang, Yunzhu Li, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. Executable code actions elicit better llm agents. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- [722] Baian Chen, Chang Shu, Ehsan Shareghi, Nigel Collier, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Fireact: Toward language agent fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.05915*, 2023.
- [723] Luyu Gao, Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Pengfei Liu, Yiming Yang, Jamie Callan, and Graham Neubig. Pal: Program-aided language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10764–10799. PMLR, 2023.
- [724] Wenhui Chen, Xueguang Ma, Xinyi Wang, and William W Cohen. Program of thoughts prompting: Disentangling computation from reasoning for numerical reasoning tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.12588*, 2022.
- [725] Hongru Cai, Yongqi Li, Wenjie Wang, Fengbin Zhu, Xiaoyu Shen, Wenjie Li, and Tat-Seng Chua. Large language models empowered personalized web agents. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, pages 198–215, 2025.
- [726] Yixiao Song, Katherine Thai, Chau Minh Pham, Yapei Chang, Mazin Nadaf, and Mohit Iyyer. Bearcubs: A benchmark for computer-using web agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.07919*, 2025.
- [727] Chaoyun Zhang, Shilin He, Jiayu Qian, Bowen Li, Liqun Li, Si Qin, Yu Kang, Minghua Ma, Guyue Liu, Qingwei Lin, et al. Large language model-brained gui agents: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.18279*, 2024.
- [728] Diego Caples, Andis Draguns, Nikil Ravi, Pranav Putta, Naman Garg, Prannay Hebbar, Youngchul Joo, Jindong Gu, Charles London, Christian Schroeder de Witt, et al. Real: Benchmarking autonomous agents on deterministic simulations of real websites. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [729] Tanvir Bhathal and Asanshay Gupta. Websight: A vision-first architecture for robust web agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.16987*, 2025.
- [730] Shishir G. Patil et al. Gorilla: Large language model connected with massive apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.15334*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.15334. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.15334>.
- [731] Weiwen Liu, Xu Huang, Xingshan Zeng, Shuai Yu, Dexun Li, Shuai Wang, Weinan Gan, Zhengying Liu, Yuanqing Yu, Zezhong WANG, et al. Toolace: Winning the points of llm

- function calling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 41359–41381, 2025.
- [732] Yichen Pan, Dehan Kong, Sida Zhou, Cheng Cui, Yifei Leng, Bing Jiang, Hangyu Liu, Yanyi Shang, Shuyan Zhou, Tongshuang Wu, et al. Webcanvas: Benchmarking web agents in online environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12373*, 2024.
- [733] Brandon Trabucco, Gunnar A Sigurdsson, Robinson Piramuthu, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Towards internet-scale training for agents. In *Will Synthetic Data Finally Solve the Data Access Problem?*, 2025.
- [734] Mengkang Hu, Pu Zhao, Can Xu, Qingfeng Sun, Jian-Guang Lou, Qingwei Lin, Ping Luo, and Saravan Rajmohan. Agentgen: Enhancing planning abilities for large language model based agent via environment and task generation. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 1*, pages 496–507, 2025.
- [735] Zihao Wang, Shaofei Cai, Guanzhou Chen, Anji Liu, Xiaojian Ma, and Yitao Liang. Describe, explain, plan and select: Interactive planning with large language models enables open-world multi-task agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01560*, 2023.
- [736] Yuheng Cheng, Ceyao Zhang, Zhengwen Zhang, Xiangrui Meng, Sirui Hong, Wenhao Li, Zihao Wang, Zekai Wang, Feng Yin, Junhua Zhao, et al. Exploring large language model based intelligent agents: Definitions, methods, and prospects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03428*, 2024.
- [737] Yuchen Zhuang, Yue Yu, Kuan Wang, Haotian Sun, and Chao Zhang. Toolqa: A dataset for llm question answering with external tools. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:50117–50143, 2023.
- [738] Yue Huang, Jiawen Shi, Yuan Li, Chenrui Fan, Siyuan Wu, Qihui Zhang, Yixin Liu, Pan Zhou, Yao Wan, Neil Gong, et al. Metatool benchmark for large language models: Deciding whether to use tools and which to use. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 42978–43007, 2024.
- [739] Zhicheng Guo, Sijie Cheng, Hao Wang, Shihao Liang, Yujia Qin, Peng Li, Zhiyuan Liu, Maosong Sun, and Yang Liu. Stabletoolbench: Towards stable large-scale benchmarking on tool learning of large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pages 11143–11156, 2024.
- [740] Yu Du, Fangyun Wei, and Hongyang Zhang. Anytool: Self-reflective, hierarchical agents for large-scale api calls. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.04253*, 2024.
- [741] Yifan Song, Weimin Xiong, Dawei Zhu, Wenhao Wu, Han Qian, Mingbo Song, Hailiang Huang, Cheng Li, Ke Wang, Rong Yao, et al. Restgpt: Connecting large language models with real-world restful apis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06624*, 2023.
- [742] Chunyu Miao, Henry Peng Zou, Yangning Li, Yankai Chen, Yibo Wang, Fangxin Wang, Yifan Li, Wooseong Yang, Bowei He, Xinni Zhang, et al. Recode-h: A benchmark for research code development with interactive human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.06186*, 2025.
- [743] Cheng Qian, Emre Can Acikgoz, Hongru Wang, Xiusi Chen, Avirup Sil, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Gokhan Tur, and Heng Ji. Smart: Self-aware agent for tool overuse mitigation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 4604–4621, 2025.

- [744] Chengpeng Li, Mingfeng Xue, Zhenru Zhang, Jiayi Yang, Beichen Zhang, Bowen Yu, Binyuan Hui, Junyang Lin, Xiang Wang, and Dayiheng Liu. Start: Self-taught reasoner with tools. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13523–13564, 2025.
- [745] Jiazhan Feng, Shijue Huang, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yujia Qin, Baoquan Zhong, Chengquan Jiang, Jinxin Chi, and Wanjun Zhong. Retool: Reinforcement learning for strategic tool use in llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11536*, 2025.
- [746] Xuefeng Li, Haoyang Zou, and Pengfei Liu. Torl: Scaling tool-integrated rl. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23383*, 2025.
- [747] Cheng Qian, Emre Can Acikgoz, Qi He, Hongru Wang, Xiusi Chen, Dilek Hakkani-Tur, Gokhan Tur, and Heng Ji. Toolrl: Reward is all tool learning needs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:105523–105553, 2026.
- [748] Joykirat Singh, Raghav Magazine, Yash Pandya, and Akshay Nambi. Agentic reasoning and tool integration for llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.01441*, 2025.
- [749] Guanting Dong, Yifei Chen, Xiaoxi Li, Jiajie Jin, Hongjin Qian, Yutao Zhu, Hangyu Mao, Guorui Zhou, Zhicheng Dou, and Ji-Rong Wen. Tool-star: Empowering llm-brained multi-tool reasoner via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16410*, 2025.
- [750] Yifan Wei, Xiaoyan Yu, Yixuan Weng, Tengfei Pan, Angsheng Li, and Li Du. Autotir: Autonomous tools integrated reasoning via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.21836*, 2025.
- [751] Zhiheng Xi, Yiwen Ding, Wenxiang Chen, Boyang Hong, Honglin Guo, Junzhe Wang, Xin Guo, Dingwen Yang, Chenyang Liao, Wei He, et al. Agentgym: Evaluating and training large language model-based agents across diverse environments. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 27914–27961, 2025.
- [752] Sadegh Mahdavi, Raquel Aoki, Keyi Tang, and Yanshuai Cao. Leveraging environment interaction for automated pddl translation and planning with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:38960–39008, 2024.
- [753] Ziming Li, Huadong Zhang, Chao Peng, and Roshan Peiris. Exploring large language model-driven agents for environment-aware spatial interactions and conversations in virtual reality role-play scenarios. In *2025 IEEE conference virtual reality and 3d user interfaces (VR)*, pages 1–11. IEEE, 2025.
- [754] Chen Gao, Xiaochong Lan, Nian Li, Yuan Yuan, Jingtao Ding, Zhilun Zhou, Fengli Xu, and Yong Li. Large language models empowered agent-based modeling and simulation: A survey and perspectives. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11(1):1–24, 2024.
- [755] Timo Birr, Christoph Pohl, Abdelrahman Younes, and Tamim Asfour. Autogpt+ p: Affordance-based task planning with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.10778*, 2024.
- [756] Kinjal Basu, Ibrahim Abdelaziz, Subhajit Chaudhury, Soham Dan, Maxwell Crouse, Asim Munawar, Vernon Austel, Sadhana Kumaravel, Vinod Muthusamy, Pavan Kapanipathi, et al. Api-blend: A comprehensive corpora for training and benchmarking api llms. In *Proceedings*

- of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), pages 12859–12870, 2024.
- [757] Junjie Ye, Guanyu Li, Songyang Gao, Caishuang Huang, Yilong Wu, Sixian Li, Xiaoran Fan, Shihan Dou, Tao Ji, Qi Zhang, et al. Tooleyes: Fine-grained evaluation for tool learning capabilities of large language models in real-world scenarios. In *Proceedings of the 31st international conference on computational linguistics*, pages 156–187, 2025.
- [758] Shen Gao, Zhengliang Shi, Minghang Zhu, Bowen Fang, Xin Xin, Pengjie Ren, Zhumin Chen, Jun Ma, and Zhaochun Ren. Confucius: Iterative tool learning from introspection feedback by easy-to-difficult curriculum. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 38, pages 18030–18038, 2024.
- [759] Jize Wang, Zerun Ma, Yining Li, Songyang Zhang, Cailian Chen, Kai Chen, and Xinyi Le. Gta: a benchmark for general tool agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:75749–75790, 2024.
- [760] Model Context Protocol. Tools - model context protocol. <https://modelcontextprotocol.io/docs/concepts/tools>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [761] Zhiting Hu and Tianmin Shu. Language models, agent models, and world models: The law for machine reasoning and planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05230*, 2023.
- [762] Harisankar Babu, Philipp Schillinger, and Tamim Asfour. Adaptive domain modeling with language models: A multi-agent approach to task planning. In *2025 IEEE 21st International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering (CASE)*, pages 1701–1708. IEEE, 2025.
- [763] Xiang Li. Task planning and decision-making methods for intelligent agents based on large language models. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Intelligent Information Processing*, pages 817–822, 2025.
- [764] Xu Huang, Jianxun Lian, Yuxuan Lei, Jing Yao, Defu Lian, and Xing Xie. Recommender ai agent: Integrating large language models for interactive recommendations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 43(4):1–33, 2025.
- [765] JV Roig. How do llms fail in agentic scenarios? a qualitative analysis of success and failure scenarios of various llms in agentic simulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.07497*, 2025.
- [766] Xixun Lin, Yucheng Ning, Jingwen Zhang, Yan Dong, Yilong Liu, Yongxuan Wu, Xiaohua Qi, Nan Sun, Yanmin Shang, Kun Wang, et al. Llm-based agents suffer from hallucinations: A survey of taxonomy, methods, and directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.18970*, 2025.
- [767] Hongliang He, Wenlin Yao, Kaixin Ma, Wenhao Yu, Yong Dai, Hongming Zhang, Zhenzhong Lan, and Dong Yu. Webvoyager: Building an end-to-end web agent with large multimodal models. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6864–6890, 2024.
- [768] Ori Yoran, Samuel Joseph Amouyal, Chaitanya Malaviya, Ben Bogin, Ofir Press, and Jonathan Berant. Assistantbench: Can web agents solve realistic and time-consuming tasks? In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 8938–8968, 2024.

- [769] Zhiyong Wu, Chengcheng Han, Zichen Ding, Zhenmin Weng, Zhoumianze Liu, Shunyu Yao, Tao Yu, and Lingpeng Kong. Os-copilot: Towards generalist computer agents with self-improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07456*, 2024.
- [770] Chaoyun Zhang, Liqun Li, Shilin He, Xu Zhang, Bo Qiao, Si Qin, Minghua Ma, Yu Kang, Qingwei Lin, Saravan Rajmohan, et al. 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)*, pages 597–622, 2025.
- [771] Qian Huang, Jian Vora, Percy Liang, and Jure Leskovec. Mlagentbench: Evaluating language agents on machine learning experimentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03302*, 2023.
- [772] Jiayi Kuang, Yinghui Li, Xin Zhang, Yangning Li, Di Yin, Xing Sun, Ying Shen, and Philip S Yu. Process-level trajectory evaluation for environment configuration in software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.25694*, 2025.
- [773] Jingheng Ye, Yong Jiang, Xiaobin Wang, Yinghui Li, Yangning Li, Pengjun Xie, and Fei Huang. Productagent: Benchmarking conversational product search agent with asking clarification questions. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 383–398, 2025.
- [774] Bowen Jin, Hansi Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Jinsung Yoon, Sercan Arik, Dong Wang, Hamed Zamani, and Jiawei Han. Search-r1: Training llms to reason and leverage search engines with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.09516*, 2025.
- [775] Huatong Song, Jinhao Jiang, Yingqian Min, Jie Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Wayne Xin Zhao, Lei Fang, and Ji-Rong Wen. R1-searcher: Incentivizing the search capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.05592*, 2025.
- [776] Mingyang Chen, Linzhuang Sun, Tianpeng Li, Haoze Sun, Chenzheng Zhu, Haofen Wang, Jeff Pan, Wen Zhang, Huajun Chen, Fan Yang, et al. Learning to reason with search for llms via reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38: 85287–85307, 2026.
- [777] Akari Asai, Zeqiu Wu, Yizhong Wang, Avirup Sil, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Self-rag: Learning to retrieve, generate, and critique through self-reflection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [778] Shi-Qi Yan, Jia-Chen Gu, Yun Zhu, and Zhen-Hua Ling. Corrective retrieval augmented generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.15884*, 2024.
- [779] Soyeong Jeong, Jinheon Baek, Sukmin Cho, Sung Ju Hwang, and Jong C. Park. Adaptive-rag: Learning to adapt retrieval-augmented large language models through question complexity. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7036–7050, 2024.
- [780] OpenClaw. openclaw/openclaw: Personal ai assistant. <https://github.com/openclaw/openclaw>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.

- [781] Ningyan Zhu, Huacan Wang, Jie Zhou, Feiyu Chen, Shuo Zhang, Ge Chen, Chen Liu, Jiarou Wu, Wangyi Chen, Xiaofeng Mou, and Yi Xu. Semaclaw: A step towards general-purpose personal ai agents through harness engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.11548*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.11548>.
- [782] Huacan Wang, Jie Zhou, Ningyan Zhu, Shuo Zhang, Feiyu Chen, Jiarou Wu, Ge Chen, Chen Liu, Wangyi Chen, Xiaofeng Mou, and Yi Xu. Sema code: Decoupling ai coding agents into programmable, embeddable infrastructure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.11045*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.11045>.
- [783] Anthropic. Agent skills. <https://platform.claude.com/docs/en/agents-and-tools/agent-skills/overview>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [784] Anthropic. anthropics/skills: Public repository for agent skills. <https://github.com/anthropics/skills>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [785] OpenClaw. Skills - openclaw. <https://docs.openclaw.ai/tools/skills>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [786] OpenClaw. openclaw/skills: All versions of all skills that are on clawhub.com archived. <https://github.com/openclaw/skills>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [787] VoltAgent. Voltagent/awesome-openclaw-skills: The awesome collection of openclaw skills. <https://github.com/VoltAgent/awesome-openclaw-skills>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [788] George Ling, Shanshan Zhong, and Richard Huang. Agent skills: A data-driven analysis of claude skills for extending large language model functionality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.08004*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.08004>.
- [789] Varun Pratap Bhardwaj. Formal analysis and supply chain security for agentic ai skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.00195*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.00195>.
- [790] Mike A Merrill, Alexander Glenn Shaw, Nicholas Carlini, Boxuan Li, Harsh Raj, Ivan Bercovich, Lin Shi, Jeong Yeon Shin, Thomas Walshe, E. Kelly Buchanan, Junhong Shen, Guanghao Ye, Haowei Lin, Jason Poulos, Maoyu Wang, Marianna Nezhurina, Di Lu, Orfeas Menis Mastromichalakis, Zhiwei Xu, Zizhao Chen, Yue Liu, Robert Zhang, Leon Liangyu Chen, Anurag Kashyap, Jan-Lucas Uslu, Jeffrey Li, Jianbo Wu, Minghao Yan, Song Bian, Vedang Sharma, Ke Sun, Steven Dillmann, Akshay Anand, Andrew Lanpouthakoun, Bardia Koopah, Changran Hu, Etash Kumar Guha, Gabriel H. S. Dreiman, Jiacheng Zhu, Karl Krauth, Li Zhong, Niklas Muennighoff, Robert Kwesi Amanfu, Shangyin Tan, Shreyas Pimpalgaonkar, Tushar Aggarwal, Xiangning Lin, Xin Lan, Xuandong Zhao, Yiqing Liang, Yuanli Wang, Zilong Wang, Changzhi Zhou, David Heineman, Hange Liu, Harsh Trivedi, John Yang, Junhong Lin, Manish Shetty, Michael Yang, Nabil Omi, Negin Raoof, Shanda Li, Terry Yue Zhuo, Wuwei Lin, Yiwei Dai, Yuxin Wang, Wenhao Chai, Shang Zhou, Dariush Wahdany, Ziyu She, Jiaming Hu, Zhikang Dong, Yuxuan Zhu, Sasha Cui, Ahson Saiyed, Arinbjörn Kolbeinsson, Christopher Michael Rytting, Ryan Marten, Yixin Wang, Jenia Jitsev, Alex Dimakis, Andy Konwinski, and Ludwig Schmidt. Terminal-bench: Benchmarking agents on hard, realistic tasks in command line interfaces. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=a7Qa4CcHak>.

- [791] Frank F. Xu, Yufan Song, Boxuan Li, Yuxuan Tang, Kritanjali Jain, Mengxue Bao, Zora Zhiruo Wang, Xuhui Zhou, Zhitong Guo, Murong Cao, Mingyang Yang, Hao Yang Lu, Amaad Martin, Zhe Su, Leander Melroy Maben, Raj Mehta, Wayne Chi, Lawrence Keunho Jang, Yiqing Xie, Shuyan Zhou, and Graham Neubig. Theagentcompany: Benchmarking LLM agents on consequential real world tasks. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=LZnKNpvhG>.
- [792] Gonzalo Gonzalez-Pumariega, Saaket Agashe, Jiachen Yang, Ang Li, and Xin Eric Wang. On the reliability of computer use agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.17849*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.17849>.
- [793] Stephan Rabanser, Sayash Kapoor, Peter Kirgis, Kangheng Liu, Saiteja Utpala, and Arvind Narayanan. Towards a science of ai agent reliability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.16666*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.16666>.
- [794] Corby Rosset, Pratyusha Sharma, Andrew Zhao, Miguel Gonzalez-Fernandez, and Ahmed Awadallah. The art of building verifiers for computer use agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.06240*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.06240>.
- [795] Zijun Wang, Haoqin Tu, Letian Zhang, Hardy Chen, Juncheng Wu, Xiangyan Liu, Zhenlong Yuan, Tianyu Pang, Michael Qizhe Shieh, Fengze Liu, Zeyu Zheng, Huaxiu Yao, Yuyin Zhou, and Cihang Xie. Your agent, their asset: A real-world safety analysis of openclaw. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.04759*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.04759>.
- [796] Yuhang Wang et al. A systematic security evaluation of openclaw and its variants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.03131*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2604.03131. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.03131>.
- [797] Xinhao Deng, Yixiang Zhang, Jiaqing Wu, Jiaqi Bai, Siboyi, Zhuoheng Zou, Yue Xiao, Rennai Qiu, Jianan Ma, Jialuo Chen, Xiaohu Du, Xiaofang Yang, Shiwen Cui, Changhua Meng, Weiqiang Wang, Jiaying Song, Ke Xu, and Qi Li. Taming openclaw: Security analysis and mitigation of autonomous llm agent threats. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.11619*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.11619>.
- [798] Zhengyang Shan, Jiayun Xin, Yue Zhang, and Minghui Xu. Don't let the claw grip your hand: A security analysis and defense framework for openclaw. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.10387*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.10387>.
- [799] Thomas Kuntz, Agatha Duzan, Hao Zhao, Francesco Croce, J Zico Kolter, Nicolas Flammarion, and Maksym Andriushchenko. OS-harm: A benchmark for measuring safety of computer use agents. In *The Thirty-ninth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Di30GwhQsX>.
- [800] Jan Gruber and Jan-Niclas Hilgert. Foundations for agentic ai investigations from the forensic analysis of openclaw. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.05589*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.05589>.
- [801] Francisco Angulo de Lafuente, Teerth Sharma, Vladimir Veselov, Seid Mohammed Abdu, Nirmal Tej Kumar, and Guillermo Perry. Openclaw-p2p v6.0: Resilient multi-layer persistence,

- live reference verification, and production-scale evaluation of decentralized ai peer review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.19792*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.19792>.
- [802] Dongjie Huo, Haoyun Liu, Guoqing Liu, Dekang Qi, Zhiming Sun, Maoguo Gao, Jianxin He, Yandan Yang, Xinyuan Chang, Feng Xiong, Xing Wei, Zhiheng Ma, and Mu Xu. Abot-claw: A foundation for persistent, cooperative, and self-evolving robotic agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.10096*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.10096>.
- [803] Lukas Weidener, Marko Brkić, Phillip Lee, Martin Karlsson, Kevin Noessler, and Paul Kohlhaas. From agent-only social networks to autonomous scientific research: Lessons from open-claw and moltbook, and the architecture of clawdlab and beach.science. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.19810*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.19810>.
- [804] Shuolucs. Awesome openclaw research. <https://github.com/shuolucs/Awesome-OpenClaw-Research>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [805] Aram Vardanyan. Building browser agents: Architecture, security, and practical solutions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.19477*, 2025.
- [806] Zhang Qihang. When llms become os operators: Rethinking trust and isolation for vision-based computer-use agents. 2026.
- [807] Allen Thomas, Kartik Ramesh, and Shraddha Mohan. Multimodal llm agents: Exploring llm interactions in software, web and operating systems.
- [808] Xingyao Wang, Simon Rosenberg, Juan Michelini, Calvin Smith, Hoang Tran, Engel Nyst, Rohit Malhotra, Xuhui Zhou, Valerie Chen, Robert Brennan, et al. The openhands software agent sdk: A composable and extensible foundation for production agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.03690*, 2025.
- [809] Gabriele Sannia. *Design of an AI Agent for the Generation of Vulnerable Virtual Environments*. PhD thesis, Politecnico di Torino, 2025.
- [810] Haochen Gong, Chenxiao Li, Rui Chang, and Wenbo Shen. Secure and efficient access control for computer-use agents via context space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.22256*, 2025.
- [811] Samuele Marro, Alan Chan, Xinxing Ren, Lewis Hammond, Jesse Wright, Gurjyot Wanga, Tiziano Piccardi, Nuno Campos, Tobin South, Jialin Yu, et al. Permission manifests for web agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.02371*, 2025.
- [812] Kalle Kulonen. The model context protocol in llm agent architectures. 2026.
- [813] Ioannis Chrysochos. Society agent: A hierarchical multi-agent architecture with autonomous persistent and ephemeral agents and persistent evolving knowledge. 2026.
- [814] Zirui Tang, Xuanhe Zhou, Yumou Liu, Linchun Li, Weizheng Wang, Hongzhang Huang, Jun Zhou, Jiachen Song, Shaoli Yu, Jinqi Wang, et al. Workspace-bench 1.0: Benchmarking ai agents on workspace tasks with large-scale file dependencies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.03596*, 2026.
- [815] Reshabh K Sharma. Contextcov: Deriving and enforcing executable constraints from agent instruction files. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.00822*, 2026.

- [816] Jiayi Pan, Xingyao Wang, Graham Neubig, Navdeep Jaitly, Heng Ji, Alane Suhr, and Yizhe Zhang. Training software engineering agents and verifiers with swe-gym. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.21139*, 2024.
- [817] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Zhe Wang, Yan Yang, Yuxiang Wei, and Lingming Zhang. Live-swe-agent: Can software engineering agents self-evolve on the fly? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.13646*, 2025.
- [818] Zora Zhiruo Wang, Jiayuan Mao, Daniel Fried, and Graham Neubig. Agent workflow memory. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.07429*, 2024.
- [819] Yuntong Zhang, Haifeng Ruan, Zhiyu Fan, and Abhik Roychoudhury. Autocoderover: Autonomous program improvement. In *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis*, pages 1592–1604, 2024.
- [820] Niels Mündler, Mark N Müller, Jingxuan He, and Martin Vechev. Swt-bench: Testing and validating real-world bug-fixes with code agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:81857–81887, 2024.
- [821] Yizhou Liu, Pengfei Gao, Xinchun Wang, Jie Liu, Yexuan Shi, Zhao Zhang, and Chao Peng. Marscode agent: Ai-native automated bug fixing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.00899*, 2024.
- [822] Surada Suwansathit, Yuxuan Zhang, and Guofei Gu. A security analysis of the openclaw ai agent framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.27517*, 2026.
- [823] Spyridon Fotopoulos. Specialized multi-agent autonomous coordination for complex project execution using balanced cooperation, dynamic virtualized playgrounds, and extensible tool sets. Master’s thesis, Πανεπιστήμιο Πειραιώς, 2026.
- [824] Haitao Hu, Peng Chen, Yanpeng Zhao, and Yuqi Chen. Agentsentinel: An end-to-end and real-time security defense framework for computer-use agents. In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*, pages 3535–3549, 2025.
- [825] Yingqiang Ge, Yujie Ren, Wenyue Hua, Shuyuan Xu, Juntao Tan, and Yongfeng Zhang. Llm as os, agents as apps: Envisioning aios, agents and the aios-agent ecosystem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03815*, 2023.
- [826] Junde Wu, Minhao Hu, Jiayuan Zhu, Jiazhen Pan, Yuyuan Liu, Min Xu, and Yueming Jin. Git context controller: Manage the context of llm-based agents like git. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.00031*, 2025.
- [827] Chaoyun Zhang, He Huang, Chiming Ni, Jian Mu, Si Qin, Shilin He, Lu Wang, Fangkai Yang, Pu Zhao, Chao Du, et al. Ufo2: The desktop agentos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14603*, 2025.
- [828] A Oliviero, B Peccerillo, and M Procaccini. An llm-powered agent for the d4science digital infrastructure. Technical report, Technical Reports 2025/010. DOI: 10.32079/ISTI-TR-2025/010. Istituto di ...
- [829] Justus Adam, Yuchen Lu, Deepti Raghavan, Malte Schwarzkopf, and Nikos Vasilakis. Towards practically-secure tools for ai agents. In *Proceedings of the Sixth European Workshop on Machine Learning and Systems*, pages 215–224, 2026.

- [830] Christoph Bühler, Matteo Biagiola, Luca Di Grazia, and Guido Salvaneschi. Securing ai agent execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.21236*, 2025.
- [831] Yun Piao, Hongbo Min, Hang Su, Leilei Zhang, Lei Wang, Yue Yin, Xiao Wu, Zhejing Xu, Liwei Qu, Hang Li, et al. Agentbay: A hybrid interaction sandbox for seamless human-ai intervention in agentic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.04367*, 2025.
- [832] Boyang Yan. Fault-tolerant sandboxing for ai coding agents: A transactional approach to safe autonomous execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.12806*, 2025.
- [833] Yunpeng Dong, Jingkai He, Yuze Hou, Dong Du, Zhonghu Xu, Si Yu, Yubin Xia, and Haibo Chen. Deltabox: Scaling stateful ai agents with millisecond-level sandbox checkpoint/rollback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.22781*, 2026.
- [834] Luoxi Meng, Henry Feng, Iliia Shumailov, and Earlence Fernandes. cellmate: Sandboxing browser ai agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.12594*, 2025.
- [835] Muhammad Faisal Laiq. Openclaw as an ai agentic os: Gateway, memory, tool, scheduling, and security primitives for personal ai employees.
- [836] Ashwin Aravind. Agentwall: A runtime safety layer for local ai agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.16265*, 2026.
- [837] Kevin Eykholt, Dhilung Kirat, Xiaokui Shu, Jiyong Jang, Frederico Araujo, and Ian Molloy. Lessons from penetration tests on large-scale agent systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.27042*, 2026.
- [838] Shawn Wanxiang Zhong, Junxuan Liao, Jing Liu, Mai Zheng, Andrea C Arpaci-Dusseau, and Remzi H Arpaci-Dusseau. Don't let ai agents yolo your files: Shifting information and control to filesystems for agent safety and autonomy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.13536*, 2026.
- [839] Alexander Roman and Jacob Roman. Orchestral ai: A framework for agent orchestration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.02577*, 2026.
- [840] Divij H Patel. Beyond the interface: Ai integration through input stream mediation and intelligent output simulation. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science & Applications*, 17(2):35, 2026.
- [841] Kelly Peilin Chan. Coding agent is all you need: Unifying general-purpose and domain-specific ai through the meta-agent paradigm.
- [842] Shiqi Chen, Jingze Gai, Ruochen Zhou, Jinghan Zhang, Tongyao Zhu, Junlong Li, Kangrui Wang, Zihan Wang, Zhengyu Chen, Klara Kaleb, et al. Skillcraft: Can llm agents learn to use tools skillfully? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.00718*, 2026.
- [843] Renjun Xu and Yang Yan. Agent skills for large language models: Architecture, acquisition, security, and the path forward. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12430*, 2026.
- [844] Tianle Cai, Xuezhi Wang, Tengyu Ma, Xinyun Chen, and Denny Zhou. Large language models as tool makers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 54067–54089, 2024.

- [845] Zhengliang Shi, Shen Gao, Lingyong Yan, Yue Feng, Xiuyi Chen, Zhumin Chen, Dawei Yin, Suzan Verberne, and Zhaochun Ren. Tool learning in the wild: Empowering language models as automatic tool agents. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2025*, pages 2222–2237, 2025.
- [846] Tianyi Chen, Yinheng Li, Michael Solodko, Sen Wang, Nan Jiang, Tingyuan Cui, Junheng Hao, Jongwoo Ko, Sara Abdali, Leon Xu, et al. Cua-skill: Develop skills for computer using agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.21123*, 2026.
- [847] Elias Lumer, Anmol Gulati, Faheem Nizar, Dzmitry Hedroits, Atharva Mehta, Henry Hwangbo, Vamse Kumar Subbiah, Pradeep Honaganahalli Basavaraju, and James A Burke. Tool and agent selection for large language model agents in production: A survey. In *2026 IEEE Conference on Artificial Intelligence (CAI)*, pages 701–708. IEEE, 2026.
- [848] Shuwen Liu, Juan A Wibowo, and George C Polyzos. Policy-bound agent skills: Authority boundaries for reusable agent procedures. In *First Workshop on Agent Skills*.
- [849] Bhargavi Paranjape, Scott Lundberg, Sameer Singh, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Marco Tulio Ribeiro. Art: Automatic multi-step reasoning and tool-use for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.09014*, 2023.
- [850] Neelamadhav Gantayat, Renuka Sindhgatta, Sambit Ghosh, Sameep Mehta, and Soujanya Soni. Dfagent: From natural language data interactions to reusable agent-ready tools. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 40, pages 41583–41585, 2026.
- [851] Zisu Huang, Jingwen Xu, Yifan Yang, Ziyang Gong, Qihao Yang, Muzhao Tian, Xiaohua Wang, Changze Lv, Xuemei Gao, Qi Dai, et al. From raw experience to skill consumption: A systematic study of model-generated agent skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.23899*, 2026.
- [852] Xi Zhang, Meijun Gao, Yuntian Zhao, Xinyu Tan, Yilun Yao, Feiyu Wang, Yanshu Wang, Tong Yang, et al. Formal skill: Programmable runtime skills for efficient and accurate llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19604*, 2026.
- [853] Chi Zhang, Yimin Liu, Xinze Chen, and Ping Ji. What keeps agent skills from being reusable? evidence from 138k skill. md files. .
- [854] Zehui Chen, Weihua Du, Wenwei Zhang, Kuikun Liu, Jiangning Liu, Miao Zheng, Jingming Zhuo, Songyang Zhang, Dahua Lin, Kai Chen, et al. T-eval: Evaluating the tool utilization capability of large language models step by step. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9510–9529, 2024.
- [855] Aimin Zhang, Jiajing Guo, Fuwei Jia, Chen Lv, Boyu Wang, and Fangzheng Li. Evoagent: An evolvable agent framework with skill learning and multi-agent delegation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.20133*, 2026.
- [856] Runliang Niu, Jindong Li, Shiqi Wang, Yali Fu, Xiyu Hu, Xueyuan Leng, He Kong, Yi Chang, and Qi Wang. Screenagent: A vision language model-driven computer control agent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07945*, 2024.

- [857] Shreya Naveen, Shreya Srikant, Meera Reji, Meghana Aithal, et al. Command cognition: A multi-agent framework for intelligent linux cli assistance. In *2025 8th International Conference on Data Science and Information Technology (DSIT)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2025.
- [858] Junwei Liu, Kaixin Wang, Yixuan Chen, Xin Peng, Zhenpeng Chen, Lingming Zhang, and Yiling Lou. Large language model-based agents for software engineering: A survey. *ACM Transactions on Software Engineering and Methodology*, 2024.
- [859] Alex Sheng. From language models to practical self-improving computer agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11964*, 2024.
- [860] Worawalan Chatlatanagulchai, Hao Li, Yutaro Kashiwa, Brittany Reid, Kundjanasith Thonglek, Pattara Leelaprute, Arnon Rungsawang, Bundit Manaskasemsak, Bram Adams, Ahmed E Hassan, et al. Agent readmes: An empirical study of context files for agentic coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.12884*, 2025.
- [861] Pouya Pezeshkpour and Estevam Hruschka. From task solving to robust real-world adaptation in llm agents. *ArXiv*, abs/2602.02760, 2026.
- [862] Peiran Li, Xinkai Zou, Zhuohan Wu, Ruifeng Li, Shuo Xing, Han Zheng, Zhikai Hu, Yuping Wang, Haoxi Li, Qingyue Yuan, Yingmo Zhang, and Zhengzhong Tu. Safeflow: A principled protocol for trustworthy and transactional autonomous agent systems. *ArXiv*, abs/2506.07564, 2025.
- [863] Faeze Aghazade-Par and Mojtaba Vahidi-Asl. Feature-based fault localization in evolving software: Leveraging regression testing insights. *IEEE Access*, 13:147369–147382, 2025.
- [864] Mykola Yaroshynskyi, Ivan Puchko, Arsentii Prymushko, Hryhoriy Kravtsov, and V. Artemchuk. Investigating the evolution of resilient microservice architectures: A compatibility-driven version orchestration approach. *Digit.*, 5:27, 2025.
- [865] Junguang Jiang, Baixu Chen, Junwei Pan, Ximei Wang, Liu Dapeng, Jie Jiang, and Mingsheng Long. Forkmerge: Mitigating negative transfer in auxiliary-task learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36*, 2023.
- [866] Sara Meftah, N. Semmar, Y. Tamaazousti, H. Essafi, and F. Sadat. On the hidden negative transfer in sequential transfer learning for domain adaptation from news to tweets. In *ADAPT NLP*, 2021.
- [867] Junhao Zheng, Xidi Cai, Qiuke Li, Duzhen Zhang, Zhongzhi Li, Yingying Zhang, Le Song, and Qianli Ma. Lifelongagentbench: Evaluating llm agents as lifelong learners. *ArXiv*, abs/2505.11942, 2025.
- [868] Xiaojun Jia, Jie Liao, Simeng Qin, Jindong Gu, Wenqi Ren, Xiaochun Cao, Yang Liu, and Philip Torr. Skillject: Effectively automating skill-based prompt injection for skill-enabled agents. 2026.
- [869] Xinyu Liu, Yukai Zhao, Xing Hu, and Xin Xia. Exploiting llm agent supply chains via payload-less skills. 2026.
- [870] Yi Liu, Weizhe Wang, Rui Feng, Yao Zhang, Guangquan Xu, Gelei Deng, Yue-Ying Li, and L. Zhang. Agent skills in the wild: An empirical study of security vulnerabilities at scale. *ArXiv*, abs/2601.10338, 2026.

- [871] Rushi Qiang, Yuchen Zhuang, Yinghao Li, K. DinguSagarV, Rongzhi Zhang, Changhao Li, I. Wong, Sherry Yang, Percy Liang, Chao Zhang, and Bo Dai. Mle-dojo: Interactive environments for empowering llm agents in machine learning engineering. *ArXiv*, abs/2505.07782, 2025.
- [872] Saroj Mishra, Suman Niroula, Umesh Yadav, Dilip Thakur, Srijan Gyawali, and Shiva Gaire. Sok: Agentic retrieval-augmented generation (rag): Taxonomy, architectures, evaluation, and research directions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.07379*, 2026.
- [873] Xuekai Zhu, Biqing Qi, Kaiyan Zhang, Xinwei Long, Zhouhan Lin, and Bowen Zhou. Pad: Program-aided distillation can teach small models reasoning better than chain-of-thought fine-tuning. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2571–2597, 2024.
- [874] Abdulloh Abdulloh. Efficient long chain-of-thought elicitation through synthetic data generation and targeted fine-tuning. *Authorea Preprints*, 2025.
- [875] Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Synthetic prompting: Generating chain-of-thought demonstrations for large language models. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 30706–30775. PMLR, 2023.
- [876] Xinghao Chen, Zhijing Sun, Guo Wenjin, Miaoran Zhang, Yanjun Chen, Yirong Sun, Hui Su, Yijie Pan, Dietrich Klakow, Wenjie Li, et al. Unveiling the key factors for distilling chain-of-thought reasoning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 15094–15119, 2025.
- [877] Tao Feng, Yicheng Li, Li Chenglin, Hao Chen, Fei Yu, and Yin Zhang. Teaching small language models reasoning through counterfactual distillation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 5831–5842, 2024.
- [878] Xiang Yu, Yujia Huo, Liqiong Cai, and Xuewei Luo. Chain-of-thought curriculum distillation: Teaching smaller models to reason step-by-step. In *Proceedings of the 2025 2nd International Symposium on Artificial Intelligence for Education*, pages 812–819, 2025.
- [879] Cong Thanh Do, Rama Sanand Doddipatla, and Kate Knill. Effectiveness of chain-of-thought in distilling reasoning capability from large language models. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Natural Language Generation Conference*, pages 833–845, 2025.
- [880] Anup Shirgaonkar, Nikhil Pandey, Nazmiye Ceren Abay, Tolga Aktas, and Vijay Aski. Knowledge distillation using frontier open-source llms: Generalizability and the role of synthetic data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18588*, 2024.
- [881] Chengshuai Zhao, Zhen Tan, Pingchuan Ma, Dawei Li, Bohan Jiang, Yancheng Wang, Yingzhen Yang, and Huan Liu. Is chain-of-thought reasoning of llms a mirage? a data distribution lens. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.01191*, 2025.
- [882] Elias Lumer, Matt Melich, Olivia Zino, Elena Kim, Sara Dieter, Pradeep Honaganahalli Basavaraju, Vamse Kumar Subbiah, James A. Burke, and Roberto Hernandez. Rethinking retrieval: From traditional retrieval augmented generation to agentic and non-vector reasoning systems in the financial domain for large language models. *ArXiv*, abs/2511.18177, 2025. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:283244047>.

- [883] Liunian Harold Li, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Xiang Ren, Kai-Wei Chang, and Yejin Choi. Symbolic chain-of-thought distillation: Small models can also “think” step-by-step. In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 2665–2679, 2023.
- [884] Yuntian Deng, Kiran Prasad, Roland Fernandez, Paul Smolensky, Vishrav Chaudhary, and Stuart Shieber. Implicit chain of thought reasoning via knowledge distillation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01460*, 2023.
- [885] Guanghao Li, Wenhao Jiang, Mingfeng Chen, Yan Li, Hao Yu, Shuting Dong, Tao Ren, Ming Tang, and Chun Yuan. Scout: Teaching pre-trained language models to enhance reasoning via flow chain-of-thought. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:95340–95364, 2026.
- [886] Ruohong Zhang, Bowen Zhang, Yanghao Li, Haotian Zhang, Zhiqing Sun, Zhe Gan, Yinfei Yang, Ruoming Pang, and Yiming Yang. Improve vision language model chain-of-thought reasoning. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 1631–1662, 2025.
- [887] Jianwei Wang, Ziming Wu, Fuming Lai, Shaobing Lian, and Ziqian Zeng. Synadapt: Learning adaptive reasoning in large language models via synthetic continuous chain-of-thought. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.00574*, 2025.
- [888] Victor Sanh, Albert Webson, Colin Raffel, Stephen H. Bach, Lintang Sutawika, Zaid Alyafeai, Antoine Chaffin, Arnaud Stiegler, Teven Le Scao, Arun Raja, et al. Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.08207>.
- [889] Yizhong Wang et al. Self-instruct: Aligning language models with self-generated instructions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.10560*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2212.10560. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.10560>.
- [890] Rohan Taori, Ishaan Gulrajani, Tianyi Zhang, Yann Dubois, Xuechen Li, Carlos Guestrin, Percy Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. Stanford alpaca: An instruction-following llama model, 2023.
- [891] Andreas Köpf, Yannic Kilcher, Dimitri Von Rütte, Sotiris Anagnostidis, Zhi Rui Tam, Keith Stevens, Abdullah Barhoum, Duc Nguyen, Oliver Stanley, Richárd Nagyfi, et al. Openassistant conversations-democratizing large language model alignment. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36:47669–47681, 2023.
- [892] Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, Runxin Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Yu Wu, and Zhifang Sui. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce llms step-by-step without human annotations. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 9426–9439. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.510. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.510/>.
- [893] Minghao Li et al. Api-bank: A comprehensive benchmark for tool-augmented llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08244*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2304.08244. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.08244>.

- [894] Jiarui Lu, Thomas Holleis, Yizhe Zhang, Bernhard Aumayer, Feng Nan, Haoping Bai, Shuang Ma, Shen Ma, Mengyu Li, Guoli Yin, et al. Toolsandbox: A stateful, conversational, interactive evaluation benchmark for llm tool use capabilities. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025*, pages 1160–1183, 2025.
- [895] Xiangyi Li, K. Choe, Yiming Liu, Xiaokun Chen, Chujun Tao, B. You, Wenbo Chen, Zonglin Di, Jiankai Sun, Sheng chun Zheng, Jiajun Bao, Yuanli Wang, Weixiang Yan, Yiyuan Li, and Han Lee. Clawsbench: Evaluating capability and safety of llm productivity agents in simulated workspaces. 2026.
- [896] Zhonghao Yang et al. Benchmarks for trajectory safety evaluation and diagnosis in openclaw and codex: Atbench-claw and atbench-codex. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.14858*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2604.14858. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.14858>.
- [897] Bowen Wei, Yunbei Zhang, Jinhao Pan, K. Mei, Xiao Wang, Jihun Hamm, Ziwei Zhu, and Yingqiang Ge. Clawsafety:"safe"llms, unsafe agents. 2026.
- [898] Tao Fan, Guoqiang Ma, Yuanfeng Song, Lixin Fan, and Qiang Yang. Ppc-gpt: federated task-specific compression of large language models via pruning and chain-of-thought distillation. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 14794–14805, 2025.
- [899] Ari Seff, Brian Cera, Dian Chen, Mason Ng, Aurick Zhou, Nigamaa Nayakanti, Khaled S Refaat, Rami Al-Rfou, and Benjamin Sapp. Motionlm: Multi-agent motion forecasting as language modeling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8579–8590, 2023.
- [900] Yuwei Du, Jie Feng, Jie Zhao, and Yong Li. Trajagent: An llm-agent framework for trajectory modeling via large-and-small model collaboration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:21595–21625, 2026.
- [901] Yen-Jen Wang, Bike Zhang, Jianyu Chen, and Koushil Sreenath. Prompt a robot to walk with large language models. In *2024 IEEE 63rd conference on decision and control (CDC)*, pages 1531–1538. IEEE, 2024.
- [902] Yuen Ma, Zixing Song, Yuzheng Zhuang, Jianye Hao, and Irwin King. A survey on vision–language–action models for embodied ai. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2026.
- [903] Nathan Lambert, Jacob Morrison, Valentina Pyatkin, Shengyi Huang, Hamish Ivison, Faeze Brahman, Lester James V Miranda, Alisa Liu, Nouha Dziri, Shane Lyu, et al. Tulu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.15124*, 2024.
- [904] Yann Dubois, Chen Xuechen Li, Rohan Taori, Tianyi Zhang, Ishaan Gulrajani, Jimmy Ba, Carlos Guestrin, Percy S Liang, and Tatsunori B Hashimoto. AlpacaFarm: A simulation framework for methods that learn from human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:30039–30069, 2023.
- [905] Weizhe Yuan, Richard Yuanzhe Pang, Kyunghyun Cho, Xian Li, Sainbayar Sukhbaatar, Jing Xu, and Jason Weston. Self-rewarding language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10020*, 2024.

- [906] Sungdong Kim, Sanghwan Bae, Jamin Shin, Soyoung Kang, Donghyun Kwak, Kang Yoo, and Minjoon Seo. Aligning large language models through synthetic feedback. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 13677–13700, 2023.
- [907] Shayne Longpre et al. The flan collection: Designing data and methods for effective instruction tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13688*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2301.13688. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13688>.
- [908] Yizhong Wang, Swaroop Mishra, Pegah Alipoormolabashi, Yeganeh Kordi, Amirreza Mirzaei, Anjana Arunkumar, Arjun Ashok, Arut Selvan Dhanasekaran, Atharva Naik, David Stap, et al. Super-naturalinstructions: Generalization via declarative instructions on 1600+ nlp tasks, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.07705>.
- [909] Ning Ding et al. Enhancing chat language models by scaling high-quality instructional conversations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14233*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.14233. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.14233>.
- [910] Chunting Zhou et al. Lima: Less is more for alignment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11206*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2305.11206. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11206>.
- [911] Nisan Stiennon, Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Daniel M. Ziegler, Ryan Lowe, Chelsea Voss, Alec Radford, Dario Amodei, and Paul Christiano. Learning to summarize from human feedback, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.01325>.
- [912] Reiichiro Nakano, Jacob Hilton, Suchir Balaji, Jeff Wu, Long Ouyang, Christina Kim, Christopher Hesse, Shantanu Jain, Vineet Kosaraju, William Saunders, et al. Webgpt: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.09332>.
- [913] Kawin Ethayarajh, Yejin Choi, and Swabha Swayamdipta. Stanford human preferences dataset. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/stanfordnlp/SHP>, 2022. Dataset release.
- [914] Ganqu Cui, Lifan Yuan, Ning Ding, Guanming Yao, Bingxiang He, Wei Zhu, Yuan Ni, Guotong Xie, Ruobing Xie, Yankai Lin, et al. Ultrafeedback: Boosting language models with scaled ai feedback, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.01377>.
- [915] Yizhong Wang, Hamish Ivison, Pradeep Dasigi, Jack Hessel, Tushar Khot, Khyathi Raghavi Chandu, David Wadden, Kelsey MacMillan, Noah A. Smith, Iz Beltagy, et al. How far can camels go? exploring the state of instruction tuning on open resources, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.04751>.
- [916] Wenhao Lu, Xufeng Zhao, Josua Spisak, Jae Hee Lee, and Stefan Wermter. Mental modeling of reinforcement learning agents by language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18505*, 2024.
- [917] Lingfeng Sun, Devesh K Jha, Chiori Hori, Siddarth Jain, Radu Corcodel, Xinghao Zhu, Masayoshi Tomizuka, and Diego Romeres. Interactive planning using large language models for partially observable robotic tasks. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 14054–14061. IEEE, 2024.

- [918] Zhiheng Xi, Yiwen Ding, Wenxiang Chen, Boyang Hong, Honglin Guo, Junzhe Wang, Xin Guo, Dingwen Yang, Chenyang Liao, Wei He, et al. Agentgym: Evaluating and training large language model-based agents across diverse environments. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 27914–27961, 2025.
- [919] Xu Zheng, Zhuomin Chen, Chaohao Lin, Hua Wei, Haifeng Chen, Wei Cheng, and Dongsheng Luo. Trajectory graph copilot: Pre-action error diagnosis in llm agents. 2025.
- [920] Gokul Puthumanaim, Paulo Padrao, Jose Fuentes, Pranay Thangeda, William E Schafer, Jae Hyuk Song, Karan Jagdale, Leonardo Bobadilla, and Melkior Ornik. Trace: A self-improving framework for robot behavior forecasting with vision-language models. In *2025 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 11128–11135. IEEE, 2025.
- [921] Yao Zhao, Rishabh Joshi, Tianqi Liu, Misha Khalman, Mohammad Saleh, and Peter J Liu. Slic-hf: Sequence likelihood calibration with human feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10425*, 2023.
- [922] Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chuanqi Tan, Wei Wang, Songfang Huang, and Fei Huang. Rrhf: Rank responses to align language models with human feedback without tears. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05302*, 2023.
- [923] Prasann Singhal, Tanya Goyal, Jiacheng Xu, and Greg Durrett. A long way to go: Investigating length correlations in rlhf. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03716*, 2023.
- [924] Rui Zheng, Shihan Dou, Songyang Gao, Yuan Hua, Wei Shen, Binghai Wang, Yan Liu, Senjie Jin, Qin Liu, Yuhao Zhou, et al. Secrets of rlhf in large language models part i: Ppo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04964*, 2023.
- [925] Yongheng Zhang, Xu Liu, Ruoxi Zhou, Qiguang Chen, Hao Fei, Wenpeng Lu, and Libo Qin. CCHall: A novel benchmark for joint cross-lingual and cross-modal hallucinations detection in large language models. In Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 30728–30749, Vienna, Austria, July 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-251-0. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.1485. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.acl-long.1485/>.
- [926] Qiguang Chen, Libo Qin, Jin Zhang, Zhi Chen, Xiao Xu, and Wanxiang Che. M³CoT: A novel benchmark for multi-domain multi-step multi-modal chain-of-thought. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8199–8221, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.446. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.acl-long.446/>.
- [927] Qiguang Chen, Chengyu Luan, Jiajun Wu, Qiming Yu, Yi Yang, Yizhuo Li, Jingqi Tong, Xiachong Feng, Libo Qin, and Wanxiang Che. Omibench: Benchmarking olympiad-level multi-image reasoning in large vision-language model, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.20806>.

- [928] Zihui Cheng, Qiguang Chen, Jin Zhang, Hao Fei, Xiaocheng Feng, Wanxiang Che, Min Li, and Libo Qin. Comt: A novel benchmark for chain of multi-modal thought on large vision-language models. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 39, pages 23678–23686, 2025.
- [929] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: A method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 311–318, 2002. doi: 10.3115/1073083.1073135. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P02-1040/>.
- [930] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text Summarization Branches Out*, pages 74–81, 2004. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W04-1013/>.
- [931] Dan Hendrycks et al. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.03300*, 2020. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2009.03300. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.03300>.
- [932] Aarohi Srivastava et al. Beyond the imitation game: Quantifying and extrapolating the capabilities of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.04615*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2206.04615. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.04615>.
- [933] Percy Liang et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09110*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2211.09110. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.09110>.
- [934] Yubo Wang et al. Mmlu-pro: A more robust and challenging multi-task language understanding benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01574*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2406.01574. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.01574>.
- [935] Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.16502>.
- [936] Yi Xu, Ruining Yang, Yitian Zhang, Jianglin Lu, Mingyuan Zhang, Yizhou Wang, Lili Su, and Yun Fu. Trajectory prediction meets large language models: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.03408*, 2025.
- [937] Yiheng Xu, Dunjie Lu, Zhennan Shen, Junli Wang, Zekun Wang, Yuchen Mao, Caiming Xiong, and Tao Yu. Agenttrek: Agent trajectory synthesis via guiding replay with web tutorials. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2025, pages 79822–79843, 2025.
- [938] Jing-Cheng Pang, Si-Hang Yang, Kaiyuan Li, Xiong-Hui Chen, Nan Tang, and Yang Yu. Kalm: Knowledgeable agents by offline reinforcement learning from large language model rollouts. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:126620–126652, 2024.
- [939] Hanlin Wang, Jian Wang, Chak Tou Leong, and Wenjie Li. Steca: Step-level trajectory calibration for llm agent learning. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 11597–11614, 2025.

- [940] Dang Nguyen, Viet Dac Lai, Seunghyun Yoon, Ryan A Rossi, Handong Zhao, Ruiyi Zhang, Puneet Mathur, Nedim Lipka, Yu Wang, Trung Bui, et al. Dynasaur: Large language agents beyond predefined actions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01747*, 2024.
- [941] Peng Wang, Ruihan Tao, Qiguang Chen, Mengkang Hu, and Libo Qin. X-webagentbench: A multilingual interactive web benchmark for evaluating global agentic system. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 19320–19335, 2025.
- [942] Jeffrey Zhou et al. Instruction-following evaluation for large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07911*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2311.07911. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.07911>.
- [943] Jason Wei et al. Measuring short-form factuality in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04368*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2411.04368. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.04368>.
- [944] Lianmin Zheng et al. Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05685*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.05685. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05685>.
- [945] Teng Wang, Yanting Lu, and Ruize Wang. Autotraces: Autoregressive trajectory forecasting via multimodal large language models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 4054–4064, 2026.
- [946] Thai Quoc Hoang, Kung-Hsiang Huang, Shirley Kokane, Jianguo Zhang, Zuxin Liu, Ming Zhu, Jake Grigsby, Tian Lan, Michael S Ryoo, Chien-Sheng Wu, et al. Lam simulator: Advancing data generation for large action model training via online exploration and trajectory feedback. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2025*, pages 12921–12934, 2025.
- [947] Chang Ma, Junlei Zhang, Zhihao Zhu, Cheng Yang, Yujiu Yang, Yaohui Jin, Zhenzhong Lan, Lingpeng Kong, and Junxian He. Agentboard: An analytical evaluation board of multi-turn llm agents. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 37:74325–74362, 2024.
- [948] Manling Li, Shiyu Zhao, Qineng Wang, Kangrui Wang, Yu Zhou, Sanjana Srivastava, Cem Gokmen, Tony Lee, Li E Li, Ruohan Zhang, et al. Embodied agent interface: Benchmarking llms for embodied decision making. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37: 100428–100534, 2024.
- [949] Mahmoud Mohammadi, Yipeng Li, Jane Lo, and Wendy Yip. Evaluation and benchmarking of llm agents: A survey. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 2*, pages 6129–6139, 2025.
- [950] Weizhe Chen, Sven Koenig, and Bistra Dilkina. Solving multi-agent path finding as an llm benchmark: How, how good and why. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2025.
- [951] Danyang Cao and Ben Yu. Survey of emerging trends in llm agent benchmarking. In *Proceedings of the 2025 2nd Symposium on Big Data, Neural Networks, and Deep Learning*, pages 31–35, 2025.
- [952] Hongliu Cao, Ilias Driouich, and Eoin Thomas. Beyond task completion: Revealing corrupt success in llm agents through procedure-aware evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.03116*, 2026.

- [953] Xing Han Lù, Amirhossein Kazemnejad, Nicholas Meade, Arkil Patel, Dongchan Shin, Alejandra Zambrano, Karolina Stańczak, Peter Shaw, Christopher J Pal, and Siva Reddy. Agentrewardbench: Evaluating automatic evaluations of web agent trajectories. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08942*, 2025.
- [954] Luca Gioacchini, Giuseppe Siracusano, Davide Sanvito, Kiril Gashteovski, David Friede, Roberto Bifulco, and Carolin Lawrence. Agentquest: A modular benchmark framework to measure progress and improve llm agents. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies (Volume 3: System Demonstrations)*, pages 185–193, 2024.
- [955] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah D. Goodman. Star: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.14465*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2203.14465. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.14465>.
- [956] Eric Zelikman, Georges Harik, Yijia Shao, Varuna Jayasiri, Nick Haber, and Noah D. Goodman. Quiet-star: Language models can teach themselves to think before speaking, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09629>.
- [957] Yihong Chen, Shuai Wang, Yaqing Wang, and Quanming Yao. A survey on benchmarks of llm-based gui agents. *Authorea Preprints*, 2025.
- [958] Jiaxuan Wang, Yulan Hu, Wenjin Yang, Zheng Pan, Xin Li, and Lan-Zhe Guo. Aligning agents via planning: A benchmark for trajectory-level reward modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.08178*, 2026.
- [959] Kunlun Zhu, Hongyi Du, Zhaochen Hong, Xiaocheng Yang, Shuyi Guo, Daisy Zhe Wang, Zhenhailong Wang, Cheng Qian, Robert Tang, Heng Ji, et al. Multiagentbench: Evaluating the collaboration and competition of llm agents. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 8580–8622, 2025.
- [960] Wanyi Chen, Xiao Yang, Xu Yang, Tianming Sha, Qizheng Li, Zhuo Wang, Bowen Xian, Fang Kong, Weiqing Liu, and Jiang Bian. Agent² rl-bench: Can llm agents engineer agentic rl post-training? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.10547*, 2026.
- [961] Sheng Yin, Xianghe Pang, Yuanzhuo Ding, Menglan Chen, Yutong Bi, Yichen Xiong, Wenhao Huang, Zhen Xiang, Jing Shao, and Siheng Chen. Safeagentbench: A benchmark for safe task planning of embodied llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.13178*, 2024.
- [962] Longhui Yu, Weisen Jiang, Han Shi, Jincheng Yu, Zhengying Liu, Yu Zhang, James Kwok, Zhenguo Li, Adrian Weller, and Weiyang Liu. Metamath: Bootstrap your own mathematical questions for large language models. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=N8N0hgNDRt>.
- [963] Xiang Yue, Xingwei Qu, Ge Zhang, Yao Fu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhao Chen. Mammoth: Building math generalist models through hybrid instruction tuning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.05653>.
- [964] Zhibin Gou, Zhihong Shao, Yeyun Gong, Yelong Shen, Yujiu Yang, Minlie Huang, Nan Duan, and Weizhu Chen. Tora: A tool-integrated reasoning agent for mathematical problem solving, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.17452>.

- [965] Junjie Wang, Yawen Wang, Mengzhuo Chen, Xiaofei Xie, Chunyang Chen, Fangwen Mu, Zhe Liu, and Qing Wang. A survey for llm agent trajectory analysis: From failure attribution to enhancement. 2026.
- [966] Wenjie Tang, Yuan Zhou, Keyan Cheng, Erqiang Xu, Liquan Xiao, and Minne Li. Dsgbench: A diverse strategic game benchmark for evaluating llm-based agents in complex decision-making environments. In *ICASSP 2026-2026 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, pages 16987–16991. IEEE, 2026.
- [967] Wentao Zhang, Liang Zeng, Yuzhen Xiao, Yongcong Li, Ce Cui, Yilei Zhao, Rui Hu, Yang Liu, Yahui Zhou, and Bo An. Agentorchestra: Orchestrating multi-agent intelligence with the tool-environment-agent (tea) protocol. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.12508*, 2025.
- [968] Aditya Bharat Soni, Boxuan Li, Xingyao Wang, Valerie Chen, and Graham Neubig. Coding agents with multimodal browsing are generalist problem solvers. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EACL 2026*, pages 6052–6069, 2026.
- [969] Adam Fourney, Gagan Bansal, Hussein Mozannar, Cheng Tan, Eduardo Salinas, Friederike Niedtner, Grace Proebsting, Griffin Bassman, Jack Gerrits, Jacob Alber, et al. Magentic-one: A generalist multi-agent system for solving complex tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04468*, 2024.
- [970] Jonathan Uesato, Nate Kushman, Ramana Kumar, Francis Song, Noah Siegel, Lisa Wang, Antonia Creswell, Geoffrey Irving, and Irina Higgins. Solving math word problems with process- and outcome-based feedback, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.14275>.
- [971] Haoming Li, Zhaoliang Chen, Jonathan Zhang, and Fei Liu. Planet: A collection of benchmarks for evaluating llms’ planning capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.14773*, 2025.
- [972] Atsuyuki Miyai, Zaiying Zhao, Kazuki Egashira, Atsuki Sato, Tatsumi Sunada, Shota Onohara, Hiromasa Yamanishi, Mashiro Toyooka, Kunato Nishina, Ryoma Maeda, et al. Webchorearena: Evaluating web browsing agents on realistic tedious web tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.01952*, 2025.
- [973] Chengyue Yu, Siyuan Lu, Chenyi Zhuang, Dong Wang, Qintong Wu, Zongyue Li, Runsheng Gan, Chunfeng Wang, Siqi Hou, Gaochi Huang, et al. Aworld: Orchestrating the training recipe for agentic ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.20404*, 2025.
- [974] Rogerio Bonatti, Dan Zhao, Francesco Bonacci, Dillon Dupont, Sara Abdali, Yinheng Li, Yadong Lu, Justin Wagle, Kazuhito Koishida, Arthur Bucker, et al. Windows agent arena: Evaluating multi-modal os agents at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.08264*, 2024.
- [975] Haonian Ji, Kaiwen Xiong, Siwei Han, Peng Xia, Shi Qiu, Yiyang Zhou, Jiaqi Liu, Jinlong Li, Bingzhou Li, Zeyu Zheng, et al. Clawarena: Benchmarking ai agents in evolving information environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.04202*, 2026.
- [976] Nathan Lambert, Valentina Pyatkin, Jacob Morrison, LJ Miranda, Bill Yuchen Lin, Khyathi Chandu, Nouha Dziri, Sachin Kumar, Tom Zick, Yejin Choi, et al. Rewardbench: Evaluating reward models for language modeling. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: NAACL 2025*, pages 1755–1797, 2025.

- [977] Qianli Ma, Haotian Zhou, Tingkai Liu, Jianbo Yuan, Pengfei Liu, Yang You, and Hongxia Yang. Let's reward step by step: Step-level reward model as the navigators for reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10080*, 2023.
- [978] Xin Lai, Zhuotao Tian, Yukang Chen, Senqiao Yang, Xiangru Peng, and Jiaya Jia. Step-dpo: Step-wise preference optimization for long-chain reasoning of llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18629*, 2024.
- [979] Hyeonbin Hwang, Doyoung Kim, Seungone Kim, Seonghyeon Ye, and Minjoon Seo. Self-explore: Enhancing mathematical reasoning in language models with fine-grained rewards. pages 1444–1466, 2024.
- [980] Shuang Zeng, Xinyuan Chang, Mengwei Xie, Xinran Liu, Yifan Bai, Zheng Pan, Mu Xu, and Xing Wei. Futuresightdrive: Thinking visually with spatio-temporal cot for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.17685*, 2025.
- [981] Zihui Cheng, Qiguang Chen, Xiao Xu, Jiaqi Wang, Weiyun Wang, Hao Fei, Yidong Wang, Alex Jinpeng Wang, Zhi Chen, Wanxiang Che, et al. Visual thoughts: A unified perspective of understanding multimodal chain-of-thought. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:96084–96112, 2026.
- [982] David Rein et al. Gpqa: A graduate-level google-proof q&a benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12022*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2311.12022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12022>.
- [983] Naman Jain et al. Livecodebench: Holistic and contamination free evaluation of large language models for code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.07974*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2403.07974. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07974>.
- [984] Elliot Glazer et al. Frontiermath: A benchmark for evaluating advanced mathematical reasoning in ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.04872*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2411.04872. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.04872>.
- [985] Long Phan et al. Humanity's last exam. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.14249*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2501.14249. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.14249>.
- [986] Colin White et al. Livebench: A challenging, contamination-limited llm benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19314*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2406.19314. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.19314>.
- [987] Francois Chollet, Mike Knoop, Gregory Kamradt, Bryan Landers, and Henry Pinkard. Arcagi-2: A new challenge for frontier ai reasoning systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.11831*, 2025.
- [988] Chujie Zheng et al. Processbench: Identifying process errors in mathematical reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.06559*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2412.06559. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.06559>.
- [989] Mingyang Song, Zhaochen Su, Xiaoye Qu, Jiawei Zhou, and Yu Cheng. Prmbench: A fine-grained and challenging benchmark for process-level reward models. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 25299–25346, 2025.

- [990] Qiaoyu Tang et al. Toolalpaca: Generalized tool learning for language models with 3000 simulated cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.05301*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.05301. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.05301>.
- [991] Fanqing Meng, Lingxiao Du, Zijian Wu, Guanzheng Chen, Xiangyan Liu, Jiaqi Liao, Chonghe Jiang, Zhenglin Wan, Jiawei Gu, Pengfei Zhou, Rui Huang, Ziqi Zhao, Shengyuan Ding, Ailing Yu, Bo Peng, Bawei Xia, Hao Sun, Haotian Liang, Ji Xie, Jiajun Chen, Jiajun Song, Liu Yang, Ming Xu, Qionglin Qiu, Runhao Fu, Shengfang Zhai, Shijian Wang, Tengfei Ma, Tianyi Wu, Weiyang Jin, Yan Wang, Yang Dai, Yao Lai, Youwei Shu, Yue Liu, Yunzhuo Hao, Yuwei Niu, Jinkai Huang, Jiayuan Zhuo, Zhennan Shen, Linyu Wu, Hannah Yao, Charles Chen, Cihang Xie, Yuyin Zhou, Jiaheng Zhang, Zeyu Zheng, Mengkang Hu, and Michael Qizhe Shieh. Clawmark: A living-world benchmark for multi-turn, multi-day, multimodal coworker agents, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.23781>.
- [992] Saaket Agashe et al. Agent s: An open agentic framework that uses computers like a human. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.08164*, 2024. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2410.08164. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.08164>.
- [993] Songyang Liu, Chaozhuo Li, Chenxu Wang, Jinyu Hou, Zejian Chen, Litian Zhang, Zheng Liu, Qiwei Ye, Yiming Hei, Xi Zhang, et al. Clawkeeper: Comprehensive safety protection for openclaw agents through skills, plugins, and watchers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.24414*, 2026.
- [994] Shunyu Yao et al. Webshop: Towards scalable real-world web interaction with grounded language agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01206*, 2022. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.01206. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.01206>.
- [995] Xiang Deng et al. Mind2web: Towards a generalist agent for the web. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.06070*, 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2306.06070. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.06070>.
- [996] Jason Wei, Zhiqing Sun, Spencer Papay, Scott McKinney, Jeffrey Han, Isa Fulford, Hyung Won Chung, Alex Tachard Passos, William Fedus, and Amelia Glaese. Browsecomp: A simple yet challenging benchmark for browsing agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.12516>.
- [997] Yuxuan Zhang, Yubo Wang, Yipeng Zhu, Penghui Du, Junwen Miao, Xuan Lu, Wendong Xu, Yunzhuo Hao, Songcheng Cai, Xiaochen Wang, et al. Clawbench: Can ai agents complete everyday online tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.08523*, 2026.
- [998] Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan. τ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12045*, 2024.
- [999] Zhiwei Liu, Weiran Yao, Jianguo Zhang, Le Xue, Shelby Heinecke, Rithesh Murthy, Yihao Feng, Zeyuan Chen, Juan Carlos Niebles, Devansh Arpit, et al. Bolaa: Benchmarking and orchestrating llm-augmented autonomous agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.05960*, 2023.
- [1000] Xingyao Wang, Zihan Wang, Jiateng Liu, Yangyi Chen, Lifan Yuan, Hao Peng, and Heng Ji. Mint: Evaluating llms in multi-turn interaction with tools and language feedback. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pages 32593–32627, 2024.

- [1001] Jiaju Lin, Haoran Zhao, Aochi Zhang, Yiting Wu, Huqiuyue Ping, and Qin Chen. Agentsims: An open-source sandbox for large language model evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.04026*, 2023.
- [1002] John Yang, Carlos E Jimenez, Alex L Zhang, Kilian Lieret, Joyce Yang, Xindi Wu, Ori Press, Niklas Muennighoff, Gabriel Synnaeve, Karthik R Narasimhan, et al. Swe-bench multimodal: Do ai systems generalize to visual software domains? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.03859*, 2024.
- [1003] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01489*, 2024.
- [1004] Kun Wang, Guibin Zhang, Zhenhong Zhou, Jiahao Wu, Miao Yu, Shiqian Zhao, Chenlong Yin, Jinhu Fu, Yibo Yan, Hanjun Luo, et al. A comprehensive survey in llm (-agent) full stack safety: Data, training and deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15585*, 2025.
- [1005] Kai Greshake, Sahar Abdelnabi, Shailesh Mishra, Christoph Endres, Thorsten Holz, and Mario Fritz. Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world llm-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM workshop on artificial intelligence and security*, pages 79–90, 2023.
- [1006] Yupei Liu, Yuqi Jia, Runpeng Geng, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Formalizing and benchmarking prompt injection attacks and defenses. In *33rd USENIX Security Symposium (USENIX Security 24)*, pages 1831–1847, 2024.
- [1007] Jingwei Yi, Yueqi Xie, Bin Zhu, Emre Kiciman, Guangzhong Sun, Xing Xie, and Fangzhao Wu. Benchmarking and defending against indirect prompt injection attacks on large language models. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 1*, pages 1809–1820, 2025.
- [1008] ClawGuard Contributors. Claw-guard/clawguard: A runtime security framework for tool-augmented llm agents against indirect prompt injection. <https://github.com/Claw-Guard/ClawGuard>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [1009] CAISI. We gave an ai agent full tool access and hit stop. it didn’t stop. <https://caisi.dev/openclaw-2026/>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [1010] Jai Minton and Ryan Dowd. “malware, from the outside!”: How a threat actor used fake openclaw installers to infect systems with ghostsocks and information stealers. <https://www.huntress.com/blog/openclaw-github-ghostsocks-infostealer>, 2026. Published 2026-03-04; accessed 2026-04-27.
- [1011] KnownSec. knownsec/openclaw-security: Openclaw security guide. <https://github.com/knownsec/openclaw-security>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.
- [1012] MITRE Corporation. Mitre atlas openclaw investigation. <https://www.mitre.org/sites/default/files/2026-02/PR-26-00176-1-MITRE-ATLAS-OpenClaw-Investigation.pdf>, 2026. Published 2026-02-09; accessed 2026-04-27.
- [1013] Oasis Security. Your browser is a backdoor to your ai agent. <https://pages.oasis.security/rs/106-PZV-596/images/openclaw-vulnerability.pdf>, 2026. Accessed 2026-04-27.

- [1014] SecurityScorecard STRIKE Threat Intelligence. How exposed openclaw deployments turn agentic ai into an attack surface. <https://securityscorecard.com/blog/how-exposed-openclaw-deployments-turn-agentic-ai-into-an-attack-surface/>, 2026. Published 2026-02-11; accessed 2026-04-27.
- [1015] Saidakhror Gulyamov, Said Gulyamov, Andrey Rodionov, Rustam Khursanov, Kamariddin Mekhmonov, Djakhongir Babaev, and Akmaljon Rakhimjonov. Prompt injection attacks in large language models and ai agent systems: A comprehensive review of vulnerabilities, attack vectors, and defense mechanisms. *Information*, 17(1):54, 2026.
- [1016] Erik Derner, Kristina Batistič, Jan Zahálka, and Robert Babuška. A security risk taxonomy for prompt-based interaction with large language models. *IEEE Access*, 12:126176–126187, 2024.
- [1017] Eleena Mathew. Enhancing security in large language models: A comprehensive review of prompt injection attacks and defenses. *Authorea Preprints*, 2024.
- [1018] Mohammed Rashed Alnuaimi. Advancing security safeguards in large language models through multi-agent systems. 2025.
- [1019] Rizwan Tanveer. Prompt injection and jailbreak attacks in large language model-based agents. Available at SSRN 6740060, 2026.
- [1020] Narek Maloyan and Dmitry Namiot. Prompt injection attacks on agentic coding assistants: A systematic analysis of vulnerabilities in skills, tools, and protocol ecosystems. *International Journal of Open Information Technologies*, 14(2):1–10, 2026.
- [1021] Jefferson Kanjirakkattu Joseph, Esther Daniel, V Kathiresan, and Manimegalai MAP. Prompt injection in large language model exploitation: A security perspective. In *2025 International Conference on Electronics, Computing, Communication and Control Technology (ICECCC)*, pages 1–8. IEEE, 2025.
- [1022] Aleksi Kalliomäki. Large language model (llm) agents: Applications and security. 2025.
- [1023] Ninghui Li, Kaiyuan Zhang, Kyle Polley, and Jerry Ma. Security considerations for artificial intelligence agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.12230*, 2026.
- [1024] Anshuman Chhabra, Shrestha Datta, Shahriar Kabir Nahin, and Prasant Mohapatra. Agentic ai security: Threats, defenses, evaluation, and open challenges. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.23883*, 2025.
- [1025] Diego Gosmar, Deborah A Dahl, and Dario Gosmar. Prompt injection detection and mitigation via ai multi-agent nlp frameworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.11517*, 2025.
- [1026] Joseph Vincent and Peter Taiwo. Securing large language models: Addressing data privacy and prompt injection attacks. 2025.
- [1027] Hritesh Yadav, Varun Singh, and Kshitij Sharma. Adversarial prompt injection in large language models: Taxonomy, exploits, and mitigation frameworks. In *2025 Seventh International Conference on Research in Computational Intelligence and Communication Networks (ICRCICN)*, pages 244–251. IEEE, 2025.

- [1028] Vivek Kumar Anand, Anirban Das, and Deeksha Chandawat. *Securing Large Language Models: Adversarial Attacks, Data Privacy, and Artificial Intelligence Safety*. Deep Science Publishing, 2026.
- [1029] Miles Q Li and Benjamin CM Fung. Security concerns for large language models: A survey. *Journal of Information Security and Applications*, 95:104284, 2025.
- [1030] DeepSeek-AI. DeepSeek-V4-Pro. <https://huggingface.co/deepseek-ai/DeepSeek-V4-Pro>, April 2026. Hugging Face model card.
- [1031] Qwen Team. Qwen3.7: Flagship models for agent-centric workloads. <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.7>, May 2026.
- [1032] Basab Jha, Firoj Paudel, Ujjwal Puri, Ethan Henkel, Yuting Zhang, M. Kowalczyk, Mei-Ling Huang, Donghyuk Choi, and Junhao Wang. Sage-32b: Agentic reasoning via iterative distillation. *ArXiv*, abs/2601.04237, 2026.
- [1033] S. Shrestha, Minwu Kim, Aadim Nepal, Anubhav Shrestha, and Keith Ross. Warm up before you train: Unlocking general reasoning in resource-constrained settings. *ArXiv*, abs/2505.13718, 2025.
- [1034] Zihan Liu, Yang Chen, M. Shoeybi, Bryan Catanzaro, and Wei Ping. Acemath: Advancing frontier math reasoning with post-training and reward modeling. *ArXiv*, abs/2412.15084, 2024.
- [1035] An Yang, Beichen Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Bofei Gao, Bowen Yu, Chengpeng Li, Dayiheng Liu, Jianhong Tu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, Keming Lu, Mingfeng Xue, Runji Lin, Tianyu Liu, Xingzhang Ren, and Zhenru Zhang. Qwen2.5-math technical report: Toward mathematical expert model via self-improvement. *ArXiv*, abs/2409.12122, 2024.
- [1036] Xueliang Zhao, Wei Wu, Jian Guan, and Lingpeng Kong. Promptcot: Synthesizing olympiad-level problems for mathematical reasoning in large language models. pages 18167–18188, 2025.
- [1037] Syeda Nahida Akter, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Matvei Novikov, Seungju Han, Ying Lin, Evelina Bakhturi, Eric Nyberg, Yejin Choi, M. Patwary, M. Shoeybi, and Bryan Catanzaro. Nemotron-crossthink: Scaling self-learning beyond math reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2504.13941, 2025.
- [1038] Brandon Cui, Ximing Lu, Jaehun Jung, Syeda Nahida Akter, Hyunwoo Kim, Yuxiao Qu, David Acuna, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yejin Choi, and Prithviraj Ammanabrolu. Introspective x training: Feedback conditioning improves scaling across all llm training stages. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.20285*, 2026.
- [1039] Siyuan Ma, Bo Gao, Zikai Xiao, Hailong Wang, Xinlei Yu, Rui Qian, Jiayu Qian, Luqi Gong, and Yang Liu. Cot2-meta: Budgeted metacognitive control for test-time reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28135*, 2026.
- [1040] Jiaxiang Chen, Zhuo Wang, Mingxi Zou, Qifan Wang, and Zenglin Xu. Guideline forest: Experience-induced multi-guideline reasoning with stepwise aggregation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.07820*, 2025.

- [1041] Chenjun Xu, Zhennan Zhou, Zhan Su, Bill Howe, Lucy Lu Wang, and Bingbing Wen. Stop: Structured on-policy pruning of long-form reasoning in low-data regimes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.13165*, 2026.
- [1042] Peiji Li, Kai Lv, Yunfan Shao, Yichuan Ma, Linyang Li, Xiaoqing Zheng, Xipeng Qiu, and Qipeng Guo. Fastmcts: A simple sampling strategy for data synthesis. *ArXiv*, abs/2502.11476, 2025.
- [1043] NovaSky Team. Think less, achieve more: Cut reasoning costs by 50% without sacrificing accuracy. <https://novasky-ai.github.io/posts/reduce-overthinking>, January 2025. Blog post.
- [1044] Junlong Li, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Runxin Xu, Yu Wu, and Junxian He. Codei/o: Condensing reasoning patterns via code input-output prediction. *ArXiv*, abs/2502.07316, 2025.
- [1045] Ke Wang, Houxing Ren, Aojun Zhou, Zimu Lu, Sichun Luo, Weikang Shi, Renrui Zhang, Linqi Song, Mingjie Zhan, and Hongsheng Li. Mathcoder: Seamless code integration in llms for enhanced mathematical reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2310.03731, 2023.
- [1046] OpenAI. Hello GPT-4o. <https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>, May 2024.
- [1047] Zhenru Zhang, Chujie Zheng, Yang Wu, Beichen Zhang, Runji Lin, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Jingren Zhou, and Junyang Lin. The lessons of developing process reward models in mathematical reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2501.07301, 2025.
- [1048] Xiaoyu Tan, Tianchu Yao, Chao Qu, Bin Li, Minghao Yang, Dakuan Lu, Haozhe Wang, Xu Yinghui, and Xihe Qiu. Aurora: Automated training framework of universal process reward models via ensemble prompting and reverse verification. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 1*, pages 1378–1389, 2026.
- [1049] Keyu Duan, Zi-Yan Liu, Xin Mao, Tianyu Pang, Changyu Chen, Qiguang Chen, Michael Shieh, and Longxu Dou. Efficient process reward model training via active learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2504.10559, 2025.
- [1050] Qiaoyu Tang, Hao Xiang, Le Yu, Bowen Yu, Hongyu Lin, Yaojie Lu, Xianpei Han, Le Sun, and Junyang Lin. Refcritic: Training long chain-of-thought critic models with refinement feedback. *ArXiv*, abs/2507.15024, 2025.
- [1051] Jianyuan Zhong, Zeju Li, Zhijian Xu, Xiangyu Wen, Kezhi Li, and Qiang Xu. Solve-detect-verify: Inference-time scaling with flexible generative verifier. *ArXiv*, abs/2505.11966, 2025.
- [1052] Jian Zhao, Runze Liu, Kaiyan Zhang, Zhimu Zhou, Junqi Gao, Dong Li, Jiafei Lyu, Zhouyi Qian, Biqing Qi, Xiu Li, and Bowen Zhou. Genprm: Scaling test-time compute of process reward models via generative reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2504.00891, 2025.
- [1053] Jiaqi Chen, Bang Zhang, Ruotian Ma, Peisong Wang, Xiaodan Liang, Zhaopeng Tu, Xiaolong Li, and Kwan-Yee K. Wong. Spc: Evolving self-play critic via adversarial games for llm reasoning. *ArXiv*, abs/2504.19162, 2025.
- [1054] Jie Cheng, Lijun Li, Gang Xiong, Jing Shao, and Yisheng Lv. PURE: Prm is still effective and compute-efficient for llm math reasoning. <https://github.com/CJReinforce/PURE>, 2025. GitHub repository.

- [1055] Skywork Team. Skywork-PRM-7B. <https://huggingface.co/Skywork/Skywork-PRM-7B>, 2024. Hugging Face model card.
- [1056] Wei Xiong, Hanning Zhang, Nan Jiang, and Tong Zhang. An implementation of generative prm. <https://github.com/RLHFlow/RLHF-Reward-Modeling>, 2024. GitHub repository.
- [1057] Shijie Xia, Xuefeng Li, Yixin Liu, Tongshuang Wu, and Pengfei Liu. Evaluating mathematical reasoning beyond accuracy. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 27723–27730, 2024.
- [1058] Jiaru Zou, Ling Yang, Jingwen Gu, Jiahao Qiu, Ke Shen, Jingrui He, and Mengdi Wang. Reasonflux-prm: Trajectory-aware prms for long chain-of-thought reasoning in llms. *ArXiv*, abs/2506.18896, 2025.
- [1059] Artyom Gadetsky, Maxim Kodryan, Siba Smarak Panigrahi, Hang Guo, and Maria Brbic. Unsupervised process reward models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.10158*, 2026.
- [1060] Ivan Evtimov, Arman Zharmagambetov, Aaron Grattafiori, Chuan Guo, and Kamalika Chaudhuri. Wasp: Benchmarking web agent security against prompt injection attacks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38, 2026.
- [1061] Tongcheng Geng, Zhiyuan Xu, Yubin Qu, and W Eric Wong. Prompt injection attacks on large language models: A survey of attack methods, root causes, and defense strategies. *Computers, Materials, & Continua*, 87(1), 2026.
- [1062] Miao Yu, Fanci Meng, Xinyun Zhou, Shilong Wang, Junyuan Mao, Linsey Pan, Tianlong Chen, Kun Wang, Xinfeng Li, Yongfeng Zhang, et al. A survey on trustworthy llm agents: Threats and countermeasures. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining V. 2*, pages 6216–6226, 2025.
- [1063] Alessio Faccia. Prompting autonomous agents and llms in energy operations, efficiency gains or hidden liabilities? In *Abu Dhabi International Petroleum Exhibition and Conference*, page D021S081R006. SPE, 2025.
- [1064] Kun Wang, Guibin Zhang, Zhenhong Zhou, Jiahao Wu, Miao Yu, Shiqian Zhao, Chenlong Yin, Jinhu Fu, Yibo Yan, Hanjun Luo, et al. A comprehensive survey in llm (-agent) full stack safety: Data, training and deployment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15585*, 2025.
- [1065] Steve Wilson. *The Developer’s Playbook for Large Language Model Security*. " O’Reilly Media, Inc.", 2024.
- [1066] Ron F Del Rosario, Klaudia Krawiecka, and Christian Schroeder de Witt. Architecting resilient llm agents: A guide to secure plan-then-execute implementations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.08646*, 2025.
- [1067] Haoyu Wang, Zibo Xiao, Yedi Zhang, Christopher M Poskitt, and Jun Sun. Safeclaw-r: Towards safe and secure multi-agent personal assistants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28807*, 2026.
- [1068] Parth Shah and Harshil Shah. *Building Secure AI Applications: A technical guide to secure GenAI/LLM-integrated applications (English Edition)*. BPB Publications, 2026.

- [1069] Peiran Wang, Ying Li, and Yuan Tian. Reframing llm agent security as an agent-human interaction problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.24309*, 2026.
- [1070] Junnan Dong, Zijin Hong, Yuanchen Bei, Feiran Huang, Xinrun Wang, and Xiao Huang. Clr-bench: Evaluating large language models in college-level reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.17558*, 2024.
- [1071] ByteDance Seed. UI-TARS-2 Technical Report: Advancing gui agent with multi-turn reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.02544>.
- [1072] Xinyuan Wang, Bowen Wang, Dunjie Lu, Junlin Yang, Tianbao Xie, Junli Wang, Jiaqi Deng, Xiaole Guo, Yiheng Xu, Chen Henry Wu, et al. OpenCUA: Open foundations for computer-use agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.09123>.
- [1073] Silin Chen, Shaoxin Lin, Yuling Shi, Heng Lian, Xiaodong Gu, Longfei Yun, Dong Chen, Lin Cao, Jiyang Liu, Nu Xia, and Qianxiang Wang. SWE-Exp: Experience-driven software issue resolution, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.23361>.
- [1074] Zonghan Yang, Shengjie Wang, Kelin Fu, Wenyang He, Weimin Xiong, Yibo Liu, Yibo Miao, Bofei Gao, Yejie Wang, Yingwei Ma, et al. Kimi-dev: Agentless training as skill prior for swe-agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.23045*, 2025.
- [1075] Huatong Song, Lisheng Huang, Shuang Sun, Jinhao Jiang, Ran Le, Daixuan Cheng, Guoxin Chen, Yiwen Hu, Zongchao Chen, Yiming Jia, Wayne Xin Zhao, Yang Song, Tao Zhang, and Ji-Rong Wen. SWE-Master: Unleashing the potential of software engineering agents via post-training, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.03411>.
- [1076] Joongwon Kim, Wannan Yang, Kelvin Niu, Hongming Zhang, Yun Zhu, Eryk Helenowski, Ruan Silva, Zhengxing Chen, Srinivasan Iyer, Manzil Zaheer, et al. Scaling test-time compute for agentic coding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.16529*, 2026.
- [1077] Yuan Sui, Yulin Chen, Yibo Li, Xue Jiang, Yufei He, Yihong Dong, Xiaoxin He, Tianyu Gao, and Bryan Hooi. TACT: Mitigating overthinking and overacting in coding agents via activation steering, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.05980>.
- [1078] Linyue Pan, Lexiao Zou, Shuo Guo, Jingchen Ni, and Hai-Tao Zheng. Natural-language agent harnesses, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.25723>.
- [1079] Binfeng Xu, Hao Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Songyang Han, Mingjie Liu, Jian Hu, Shizhe Diao, Zhenghui Jin, Yunheng Zou, Michael Demoret, Jan Kautz, and Yi Dong. Polar: Agentic rl on any harness at scale, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.24220>.
- [1080] Shiyi Cao, Dacheng Li, Fangzhou Zhao, Shuo Yuan, Sumanth Hegde, Connor Chen, Charlie Ruan, Tyler Griggs, Shu Liu, Eric Tang, Richard Liaw, Philipp Moritz, Matei Zaharia, Joseph Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Skyrl-agent: Efficient rl training for multi-turn llm agent. *ArXiv, abs/2511.16108*, 2025.
- [1081] Yanzhou Li, Yiran Zhang, Xiaoyu Zhang, Xiaoxia Liu, and Yang Liu. Codeskill: Learning self-evolving skills for coding agents. 2026.
- [1082] Lintang Sutawika, Aditya Bharat Soni, Bharath Sriraam R R, Apurva Gandhi, Taha Yassine, Sanidhya Vijayvargiya, Yuchen Li, Xuhui Zhou, Yilin Zhang, Leander Melroy Maben, and

- Graham Neubig. CodeScout: An effective recipe for reinforcement learning of code search agents, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.17829>.
- [1083] Jincheng Ren, Siwei Wu, Yizhi Li, Kang Zhu, Shu Xu, Boyu Feng, Ruibin Yuan, Wei Zhang, Riza Batista-Navarro, Jian Yang, et al. A self-evolving framework for efficient terminal agents via observational context compression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.19572*, 2026.
- [1084] Hanyu Lai, Xiao Liu, Yanxiao Zhao, Han Xu, Hanchen Zhang, Bohao Jing, Yanyu Ren, Shuntian Yao, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. ComputerRL: Scaling end-to-end online reinforcement learning for computer use agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.14040>.
- [1085] Yuhao Yang, Zhen Yang, Zi-Yi Dou, Anh Nguyen, Keen You, Omar Attia, Andrew Szot, Michael Feng, Ram Ramrakhya, Alexander Toshev, Chao Huang, Yinfei Yang, and Zhe Gan. UltraCUA: A foundation model for computer use agents with hybrid action, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.17790>.
- [1086] Bowen Yang, Kaiming Jin, Zhenyu Wu, Zhaoyang Liu, Qiushi Sun, Zehao Li, Jingjing Xie, Zhoumianze Liu, Fangzhi Xu, Kanzhi Cheng, Qingyun Li, Yian Wang, Yu Qiao, Zun Wang, and Zichen Ding. OS-Symphony: A holistic framework for robust and generalist computer-using agent, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.07779>.
- [1087] XU HU, HAOMING LI, SABBIR AHMED, MD NAHIYAN UDDIN, QIANNAN LI, JESSICA OUYANG, LATIFUR KHAN, FENG CHEN, and BINGZHE LI. Toward trustworthy computer-use agents: Risk propagation, evaluation gaps, and human governance.
- [1088] Keltin Grimes, Julie Lawler, Robert C Garrett, Emil Mathew, Marco Christiani, Sara Kingsley, Zhiwei Steven Wu, and Nathan VanHoudnos. Sok: Bridging research and practice in llm agent security, 2025.
- [1089] Lukas Pirch, Micha Horlboge, Patrick Großmann, Syeda Mahnur Asif, Klim Kireev, Thorsten Holz, and Konrad Rieck. Toward securing ai agents like operating systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.14932*, 2026.
- [1090] Ali Dehghantanha and Sajad Homayoun. Sok: The attack surface of agentic ai-tools, and autonomy. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.22928*, 2026.
- [1091] Partha Pratim Ray. A survey on model context protocol: Architecture, state-of-the-art, challenges and future directions. *Authorea Preprints*, 2025.
- [1092] Anthropic. Claude Sonnet 4.6, February 2026. URL <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-sonnet-4-6>.
- [1093] Meta. Muse Spark. <https://claw-eval.github.io>, 2026. Claw-Eval public leaderboard entry.
- [1094] Qwen Team. Qwen3.6 Plus. <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.6-plus>, 2026. Model release page.
- [1095] Aohan Zeng, Xin Lv, Zhenyu Hou, Zhengxiao Du, Qinkai Zheng, Bin Chen, Da Yin, Chendi Ge, Chengxing Xie, Cunxiang Wang, et al. GLM-5: From vibe coding to agentic engineering, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.15763>.

- [1096] Google DeepMind. Gemini 3.1 Flash-Lite, February 2026. URL <https://deepmind.google/models/gemini/flash-lite/>.
- [1097] Haiquan Zhao, Chenhan Yuan, Fei Huang, Xiaomeng Hu, Yichang Zhang, An Yang, Bowen Yu, Dayiheng Liu, Jingren Zhou, Junyang Lin, et al. Qwen3Guard technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.14276*, 2025.
- [1098] Meta. Llama-Guard-4-12B. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-Guard-4-12B>, 2025. Hugging Face model card.
- [1099] Zhaorun Chen, Mintong Kang, and Bo Li. ShieldAgent: Shielding agents via verifiable safety policy reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.22738*, 2025.
- [1100] Meta. Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct. <https://huggingface.co/meta-llama/Llama-3.3-70B-Instruct>, 2024. Hugging Face model card.
- [1101] Dongrui Liu, Qihan Ren, Chen Qian, Shuai Shao, Yuejin Xie, Yu Li, Zhonghao Yang, Haoyu Luo, Peng Wang, Qingyu Liu, Bin Hu, Ling Tang, Jilin Mei, Dadi Guo, Lei Yuan, Junyao Yang, Guanxu Chen, Qihao Lin, Yi Yu, Bo Zhang, Jiaxuan Guo, Jie Zhang, Wenqi Shao, Huiqi Deng, Zhiheng Xi, Wenjie Wang, Wenxuan Wang, Wen Shen, Zhikai Chen, Haoyu Xie, Jialing Tao, Juntao Dai, Jiaming Ji, Zhongjie Ba, Linfeng Zhang, Yong Liu, Quanshi Zhang, Lei Zhu, Zhihua Wei, Hui Xue, Chaochao Lu, Jing Shao, and Xia Hu. Agentdog: A diagnostic guardrail framework for ai agent safety and security. 2026.
- [1102] HKUDS. Nanobot. <https://github.com/HKUDS/nanobot>, 2026. Agent scaffold evaluated by ClawSafety.
- [1103] NVIDIA. NemoClaw. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/ai/nemocl原因>, 2026. Agent scaffold evaluated by ClawSafety.
- [1104] Bowen Ye, Rang Li, Qibin Yang, and Lei Li. Claw-Eval: A transparent benchmark for real-world agents. <https://github.com/claw-eval/claw-eval>, 2026. Public leaderboard and benchmark repository.
- [1105] Francesco La Rota. *Design and Deployment of a Multi-Agent Chatbot for Incident Management and System Monitoring*. PhD thesis, Politecnico di Torino, 2026.
- [1106] Alif Al Hasan and Sumon Biswas. What breaks when llms code? characterizing operational safety failures of agentic code assistants. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.30777*, 2026.
- [1107] Vincenzo Catalano and Alessio Gioe. *Agent Engineering for the Enterprise: An MCP-Based Framework*. PhD thesis, Politecnico di Torino, 2025.
- [1108] Chiyu Zhang, Huiqin Yang, Bendong Jiang, Xiaolei Zhang, Yiran Zhao, Ruyi Chen, Lu Zhou, Xiaogang Xu, Jiafei Wu, Liming Fang, et al. Litmus: Benchmarking behavioral jailbreaks of llm agents in real os environments. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.10779*, 2026.
- [1109] Yuxu Ge. Governance architecture for autonomous agent systems: Threats, framework, and engineering practice. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.07191*, 2026.
- [1110] Yuyang Hu, Shichun Liu, Yanwei Yue, Guibin Zhang, Boyang Liu, Fangyi Zhu, Jiahang Lin, Honglin Guo, Shihan Dou, Zhiheng Xi, et al. Memory in the age of ai agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.13564*, 2025. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2512.13564. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.13564>.

- [1111] Richard S. Sutton. The bitter lesson. <http://www.incompleteideas.net/IncIdeas/BitterLesson.html>, 2019.
- [1112] Andrej Karpathy. Software in the era of AI. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LCEmiRjPEtQ>, 2025. Talk at Y Combinator AI Startup School.
- [1113] Jiayi Weng. Learning beyond gradients. <https://trinkle23897.github.io/learning-beyond-gradients/>, 2026.
- [1114] Libo Qin, Qiguang Chen, Yuhang Zhou, Zhi Chen, Yinghui Li, Lizi Liao, Min Li, Wanxiang Che, and Philip S. Yu. A survey of multilingual large language models. *Patterns*, 6(1):101118, 2025. ISSN 2666-3899. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2024.101118>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2666389924002903>.
- [1115] Hyeongyo Jeong, Haechan Lee, Changwon Kim, and Sungtae Shin. A survey of robot intelligence with large language models. *Applied sciences*, 14(19):8868, 2024.
- [1116] Yupeng Chang, Xu Wang, Jindong Wang, Yuan Wu, Linyi Yang, Kaijie Zhu, Hao Chen, Xiaoyuan Yi, Cunxiang Wang, Yidong Wang, et al. A survey on evaluation of large language models. *ACM transactions on intelligent systems and technology*, 15(3):1–45, 2024.
- [1117] Godfred Asante, Marisa Ellis, and Julius Fredrick. Evaluation and benchmarking of small language models for agentic reasoning, planning, and tool use. 2026.
- [1118] Tula Masterman, Sandi Besen, Mason Sawtell, and Alex Chao. The landscape of emerging ai agent architectures for reasoning, planning, and tool calling: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11584*, 2024.
- [1119] Qiguang Chen, Mingda Yang, Libo Qin, Jinhao Liu, Zheng Yan, Jiannan Guan, Dengyun Peng, Yiyan Ji, Hanjing Li, Mengkang Hu, Yimeng Zhang, Yihao Liang, Yuhang Zhou, Jiaqi Wang, Zhi Chen, and Wanxiang Che. Ai4research: A survey of artificial intelligence for scientific research, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.01903>.
- [1120] Hui Wei, Zihao Zhang, Shenghua He, Tian Xia, Shijia Pan, and Fei Liu. Plangenllms: A modern survey of llm planning capabilities. In *Proceedings of the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 19497–19521, 2025.
- [1121] Sadia Sultana Chowa, Riasad Alvi, Subhey Sadi Rahman, Md Abdur Rahman, Mohaimenul Azam Khan Raiaan, Md Rafiqul Islam, Mukhtar Hussain, and Sami Azam. From language to action: a review of large language models as autonomous agents and tool users. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 2026.
- [1122] Jinyang Chen, Haolun Wu, Jianhong Pang, Yihua Wang, Dell Zhang, and Changzhi Sun. Tool learning with language models: a comprehensive survey of methods, pipelines, and benchmarks. *Vicinagearth*, 2(1):16, 2025.
- [1123] Wenshuo Zhai, Jinzhi Liao, Ziyang Chen, Bolun Su, and Xiang Zhao. A survey of task planning with large language models. *Intelligent Computing*, 4:0124, 2025.
- [1124] Christopher Rawles, Sarah Clinckemaillie, Yifan Chang, J. Waltz, G. Lau, Marybeth Fair, Alice Li, Will Bishop, Wei Li, Folawiyo Campbell-Ajala, Daniel Toyama, Robert Berry, Divya

- Tyamagundlu, Timothy P. Lillicrap, and O. Riva. Androidworld: A dynamic benchmarking environment for autonomous agents. *ArXiv*, abs/2405.14573, 2024.
- [1125] Rogerio Bonatti, Dan Zhao, Francesco Bonacci, Dillon Dupont, Sara Abdali, Yinheng Li, Yadong Lu, Justin Wagle, K. Koishida, A. Bucker, Lawrence Jang, and Zack Hui. Windows agent arena: Evaluating multi-modal os agents at scale. *ArXiv*, abs/2409.08264, 2024.
- [1126] Raghav Kapoor, Yash Butala, M. Russak, Jing Yu Koh, Kiran Kamble, Waseem Alshikh, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Omniact: A dataset and benchmark for enabling multimodal generalist autonomous agents for desktop and web. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.17553, 2024.
- [1127] Frank F. Xu, Yufan Song, Boxuan Li, Yuxuan Tang, Kritanjali Jain, Meng Bao, Z. Wang, Xuhui Zhou, Zhitong Guo, Murong Cao, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Hao Lu, Amaad Martin, Zhe Su, L. Maben, Raj Mehta, Wayne Chi, L. Jang, Yiqing Xie, Shuyan Zhou, and Graham Neubig. Theagentcompany: Benchmarking llm agents on consequential real world tasks. *ArXiv*, abs/2412.14161, 2024.
- [1128] Mike A. Merrill, Alexander G Shaw, Nicholas Carlini, Boxuan Li, Harsh Raj, I. Bercovich, Lin Shi, J. Shin, Thomas Walshe, E. K. Buchanan, Junhong Shen, Guanghao Ye, Hao Lin, Jason Poulos, Maoyu Wang, Marianna Nezhurina, J. Jitsev, Di Lu, O. M. Mastromichalakis, Zhiwei Xu, Zizao Chen, Yue Liu, Robert Zhang, L. Chen, Anurag Kashyap, Jan-Lucas Uslu, Jeffrey Li, Jianbo Wu, Minghao Yan, Song Bian, Vedang Sharma, Ke Sun, S. Dillmann, Akshay Anand, Andrew Lanpouthakoun, Bardia Koopah, Changran Hu, E. Guha, Gabriel H. S. Dreiman, Jiacheng Zhu, Karl Krauth, Li Zhong, Niklas Muennighoff, Robert K. Amanfu, Shangyin Tan, Shreyas Pimpalgaonkar, Tushar Aggarwal, Xia Lin, Xin Lan, Xuandong Zhao, Yiqing Liang, Yuanli Wang, Zilong Wang, Changzhi Zhou, David Heineman, Hange Liu, H. Trivedi, John Yang, Junhong Lin, Manish Shetty, Michael Yang, Nabil Omi, Negin Raouf, Shanda Li, Terry Yue Zhuo, Wu Lin, Yiwei Dai, Yuxin Wang, Wenhao Chai, Shang Zhou, Dariush Wahdany, Ziyu She, Jiaming Hu, Zhikang Dong, Yuxuan Zhu, Sasha Cui, Ahson Saiyed, Arinbjörn Kolbeinsson, Jesse Hu, Christopher Rytting, Ryan Marten, Yixin Wang, A. Dimakis, A. Konwinski, and Ludwig Schmidt. Terminal-bench: Benchmarking agents on hard, realistic tasks in command line interfaces. *ArXiv*, abs/2601.11868, 2026.
- [1129] L'eo Boisvert, Megh Thakkar, Maxime Gasse, Massimo Caccia, Thibault Le Sellier de Chezelles, Quentin Cappart, Nicolas Chapados, Alexandre Lacoste, and Alexandre Drouin. Workarena++: Towards compositional planning and reasoning-based common knowledge work tasks. *ArXiv*, abs/2407.05291, 2024.