
Do Androids Dream of Breaking the Game? Systematically Auditing AI Agent Benchmarks with BenchJack

Hao Wang*
UC Berkeley

Hanchen Li
UC Berkeley

Qiuyang Mang
UC Berkeley

Alvin Cheung
UC Berkeley

Koushik Sen
UC Berkeley

Dawn Song
UC Berkeley

Abstract

Agent benchmarks have become the de facto measure of frontier AI competence, guiding model selection, investment, and deployment. However, *reward hacking*, where agents maximize a score without performing the intended task, emerges spontaneously in frontier models without overfitting. We argue that benchmarks must be secure by design. From past incidents of reward hacks, we derive a taxonomy of eight recurring flaw patterns and compile them into the *Agent-Eval Checklist* for benchmark designers. We condense the insights into BENCHJACK, an automated red-teaming system that drives coding agents to audit benchmarks and identify possible reward-hacking exploits in a clairvoyant manner. Moreover, we extend BENCHJACK to an iterative generative-adversarial pipeline that discovers new flaws and patches them iteratively to improve benchmark robustness. We apply BENCHJACK to 10 popular agent benchmarks spanning software engineering, web navigation, desktop computing, and terminal operations. BENCHJACK synthesizes reward-hacking exploits that achieve near-perfect scores on most of the benchmarks without solving a single task, surfacing 219 distinct flaws across the eight classes. Moreover, BENCHJACK’s extended pipeline reduces the hackable-task ratio from near 100% to under 10% on four benchmarks without fatal design flaws, fully patching WebArena and OSWorld within three iterations. Our results show that evaluation pipelines have not internalized an adversarial mindset, and that proactive auditing could help close the security gap for the fast-paced benchmarking space.

1 Introduction

The progress of AI is mostly tracked by a wide range of benchmarks. Hundreds of new benchmarks have been released in the past two years, spanning software engineering [25, 15, 13], web navigation [61], desktop computing [55], general AI assistance [35], terminal operations [34], enterprise workflows [50], and tool-augmented dialogue [58]. These benchmarks measure different aspects of model development and have become de facto standards for tracking progress in frontier AI.

However, these measures for models are becoming increasingly unreliable. *Reward hacking*, the emergent behavior of maximizing a benchmark score without performing the underlying task, is already pervasive. IQuest-Coder-V1 claimed 81.4% on SWE-bench but achieved roughly a quarter of its correct answers by running `git log` to copy gold patches from commit history [23]. OpenAI’s internal audit of SWE-bench Verified reported that over half of a sampled subset had flawed tests that could pass with incorrect solutions [37]. METR observed that o3 and Claude 3.7 Sonnet

*Corresponding author: hwang628@berkeley.edu




Figure 1: How a nine-line `conftest.py` hacks SWE-bench. SWE-bench evaluates correctness of the submitted patch via a test suite. The benchmark does not reset arbitrary files, leading to a trust boundary violation. A hacking model can create a `conftest.py` that PyTest auto-loads. The file registers a hook and rewrites every test’s reported outcome, resulting in a 100% resolve rate.

spontaneously reward-hack in more than 30% of evaluation runs, using techniques such as stack introspection and monkey-patching [49]. Anthropic’s Mythos Preview documented a model that deleted its exploit after execution to evade detection [2].

This phenomenon reduces our trust and hinders accurate tracking of model capabilities. First, it renders reported numbers untrustworthy: a 100% resolve rate conflates genuine problem-solving with exploiting evaluator weaknesses, and downstream consumers have no principled way to distinguish between the two. Second, it mis-allocates research and engineering effort, as methods that appear to win on a benchmark may do so for reasons unrelated to the capability the benchmark was intended to measure [20, 48]. Third, it compounds AI safety risk: models that learn to game evaluations during training or deployment transfer those strategies to settings where they were never validated [1, 16, 40].

Manually auditing every new benchmark for reward-hacking flaws is impractical: new benchmarks appear monthly, each with its own evaluation harness, sand-boxing strategy, and scoring function. Previous work has used LLM as a judge on trajectories to monitor hacks in the agent run [12, 6, 47, 52, 30, 17, 5]. However, such techniques can only be applied after the hack happens. It has been shown that reward hacking detectors are gullible and unreliable [12, 6, 30, 56, 21, 47]. Post-hoc monitoring also provides no systematic scrutiny against hacks while incurring a high cost for each agent run. These challenges call for a method that systematically scans each benchmark to identify potential hacks before execution.

In this paper, we manually inspect existing reward-hacking instances and propose a taxonomy of eight recurring patterns of defective designs, including poor isolation, executing untrusted input, and trusting the output of untrusted code. We compile our findings into the *Agent-Eval Checklist*, a set of 30 questions grouped into seven categories that directly target the eight flaw patterns. We call on all benchmark designers and developers to use our checklist during and after developing their benchmarks to ensure robustness against the flaws we find.

Additionally, to enable scalable, automated, and systematic scanning, we design BENCHJACK, an automated benchmark red-teaming tool that systematically identifies benchmark reward hacks and fixes them whenever possible. BENCHJACK is built as a runtime system on top of a coding agent, guiding it through a pipeline of reconnaissance, flaw analysis, and exploit generation. The pipeline discovers, verifies, and demonstrates reward-hacking flaws for a given benchmark with minimal human supervision. Moreover, to address these flaws, we develop an iterative pipeline based on BENCHJACK that updates benchmarks by repeatedly applying BENCHJACK and correcting discovered hacks in a generative-adversarial pattern. This enables BENCHJACK to also be used for self-improving benchmarks, in addition to being merely a red-teaming tool.

Findings. We applied BENCHJACK to ten popular agent benchmarks covering multiple domains and evaluation methods. BENCHJACK generated working reward-hacking exploits on all of the benchmarks that we audited, achieving near-perfect scores on **9 of 10** benchmarks without actually solving a single task. A closer look reveals a wide variety of exploits, ranging from a nine-line PyTest hook that forces all tests to pass on SWE-bench Verified to leaked gold answers on WebArena. Additionally, BENCHJACK identified 219 distinct flaws across all benchmarks, spanning the eight recurring classes in our flaw taxonomy. Moreover, on the four representative benchmarks with good designs, our iterative refinement pipeline reduced the ratio of hackable tasks from near 100% to <10%, with WebArena and OSWorld patched to unhackable within three patching attempts.

In conclusion, we summarize our contribution as follows:

1. We systematically analyzed reward-hacking problems in current agent benchmarks, providing a novel, rigorous taxonomy and an *Agent-Eval Checklist*.
2. We designed BENCHJACK², the first automated red-teaming system for AI agent benchmarks that finds hackable design flaws and iteratively fixes them before agent execution.
3. We utilized BENCHJACK to audit 10 popular agent benchmarks, yielding 219 flaws in 8 recurring classes and 10 working exploits.
4. We demonstrate that, when benchmarks are without fatal design flaws, BENCHJACK reduces the hackable task ratio from 100% to <10% when used in a generative-adversarial framework.

2 Related Work

Benchmark contamination and integrity. Concerns about benchmark reliability long predate agent evaluations. Bowman and Dahl [8] argue that NLU benchmarks systematically overestimate model capabilities due to annotation artifacts. Dehghani et al. [14] show that benchmark rankings depend heavily on which benchmarks are chosen. Data contamination has also been documented across language-modeling benchmarks [24, 38, 57, 10, 11]. Singh et al. [45] argue that benchmark rankings often fail to predict real-world utility. Even when contamination is controlled, evaluation pipelines themselves can be tampered with, become unreliable, or fail to predict real-world utility [5, 22, 45, 59, 60]. Tu et al. [51] proposes automated auditing of benchmarks for reward defects and flawed tasks. Our work reinforces this line of work: we systematically study design flaws in existing benchmark architectures, quantify the severity by building reward-hacking exploits without contamination, and design the Agent-Eval Checklist and BENCHJACK as mitigation.

Reward hacking and specification gaming. Reward hacking is a core AI-safety problem [1]. Reward hacking can emerge from RLHF [16], contaminated supervision [26], and deployment feedback loops [40]. Shah et al. [44] also shows that agents can learn the wrong goal despite correct specifications. Formal treatments characterize reward hacking as optimizing imperfect proxies [46] and analyze incentives for reward tampering [18]. Raina et al. [42] show that LLM-as-a-judge evaluations are exploitable through adversarial hacks. Concurrent benchmark work, including PostTrainBench [43] and ClawsBench [29], also foregrounds reward hacking as a central concern in agent evaluation. We further show that these phenomena extend to evaluation infrastructure, as benchmark scoring mechanisms themselves are exploitable under optimization pressure.

Preventing reward hacking. Zhu et al. [63] introduces the Agentic Benchmark Checklist, requiring task validity and outcome validity and finding performance overestimates of up to 100% through manual inspection. Other efforts include monitoring pipelines that mitigate reward hacking during the training process [32, 6, 4, 54, 27, 21, 52]. However, a growing body of work further suggests that monitoring-based defenses are insufficient in isolation due to phenomena like unfaithful reasoning traces [12, 6, 30, 56, 21]. Stein et al. [47] show that failures often only become detectable when analyzing collections of traces rather than individual trajectories. TRACE [17] finds that reward-hack detection remains far from reliable even under controlled contrastive conditions. Several works propose proactive patching of reward design defects. Beigi et al. [7] detects spurious correlations in learned reward models via a hacker policy. This work further takes on the approach of systematically and automatically discovering and patching design flaws, avoiding the problems of post hoc detection.

²BENCHJACK is available at <https://github.com/benchjack/benchjack>




Figure 2: The eight recurring flaw classes (V1–V8) in our flaw taxonomy, covering issues such as trust boundary violation (V7), isolation failure (V1), and remote code execution (V3).

3 Motivating Example: Reward Hacking in SWE-bench

We first provide a reward hacking exploit manually constructed based on the reported issue of IQuest-Coder-V1 [23] (shown in Fig. 1). SWE-bench [25] is arguably the most widely cited coding benchmark in agent workloads. SWE-bench provides an agent with real GitHub issue descriptions and evaluates the patches that the agent provides. The agent’s patch is applied in a Docker container in which the tests subsequently run.

However, there is a crucial design flaw that lies in this interaction. The evaluator trusts the test outputs produced inside the testing container, which can be modified by the agent-submitted patch. SWE-bench resets any files enumerated in the upstream test patch to their original state, but it does *not* reset arbitrary files the agent creates. Crucially, a `conf_test.py` at the repository root survives the reset, which is a configuration file loaded automatically by PyTest to register hooks and plugins across the tests without being imported into the test files. The agent can submit a `conf_test.py` that installs a PyTest hook that overwrites each test’s reported outcome, thereby passing almost all of the tasks in SWE-bench. Fig. 1 walks through the exploit and highlights where the trust boundary is violated. The agent could inject a hook that replaces the test program with its own version.

4 BENCHJACK: Adversarial Benchmark Auditing

Current post-hoc monitoring workflows all require an actual reward hack to happen in an agent run in order to realize that the instance is flawed. This can be costly, time-consuming, and unreliable. In order to detect and quantify the flaws before agents exploit them, we propose *adversarial benchmark auditing*: rather than waiting for flaws to surface, we advocate proactive scanning of benchmarks to detect reward-hacking risks. In this section, we first systematically study existing reward-hacking incidents and categorize the recurring patterns into a flaw taxonomy. We then compile an Agent-Eval Checklist that distills the lessons and flaw patterns we learned. To enable scalable benchmark auditing without human effort, we build BENCHJACK, an auditing agent that internalizes the flaw taxonomy, automatically analyzes a given benchmark, and produces a verifiable hack that achieves the highest score without actually solving any problems. We then propose an adversarial iterative loop to improve the quality of benchmarks using BENCHJACK as a subroutine. We defer the full details of the checklist and BENCHJACK to Sections C and D.

4.1 Benchmark Flaws Taxonomy and Agent-Eval Checklist

Motivated by the hacking example in Section 3, we revisit existing reward-hacking instances reported on various benchmarks [23, 49, 39, 33] and existing work [63]. We find that the design flaw in SWE-bench is not an isolated quirk, and many other benchmarks share the same design flaw of isolation failure. To systematically identify recurring patterns, we review these reward-hacking instances and summarize the root causes from a security’s perspective. We manually verify that the patterns we identify covers all of the reported reward-hacking problems in our review. We categorize our findings into a taxonomy of eight flaw classes (shown in Fig. 2) with implementation-agnostic concepts such as trust, privilege, isolation, and robustness.

We first elaborate the eight categories in the taxonomy, with example manifestations for each category deferred to Section B. *V1. Isolation failure* occurs when the agent and evaluator are not properly separated and share the same environment or even the same process. As a result, any modifications

the agent makes to the environment potentially flaw the evaluation. *V2. Answers shipped with the test* indicates that the reference solution is reachable from inside the agent’s runtime, encouraging the agent to simply copy the answer to solve the task. Any potential access from a local filesystem to a public URL download implies potential answer leak. *V3. Remote code execution into the evaluator* occurs when the evaluator directly parses or executes agent-controlled data. Different from *V1* where the agent must have a shared environment, this flaw can be exploited by, for example, a code submission to a remote test server containing hacking code. *V4. LLM-judge prompt injection* occurs in LLM-as-a-judge benchmarks, where output without careful escaping can trick the judge LLM towards producing better scores. Both *V5. Weak string matching* and *V6. Evaluation logic gaps* consider test validity. Scorers can either learn to pattern-match frequent keywords or trigger easier properties to acquire full score without performing the task. *V7. Trusting untrusted output* generalizes on *V3* from code executing to any signals (e.g., test output) that the agent can potentially influence. Finally, benchmarks with *V8. Excessive permissions* grant unnecessary capabilities to the agents, including root access inside the sandbox, write access to the host file system, or unrestricted outbound internet access. This can lead to sandbox escapes, privilege escalations, and reward tampering.

The flaws in our taxonomy can manifest at different severity. Some of the design flaws only expand the hack surface of the benchmark and may not be exploitable on their own. For example, granting extra internet access may not lead to immediate hack if no useful information is available online. However, when several of the flaws coexist, they can compose into chains that allow easier and more generalizable reward-hacking exploits. We showcase in Section 5 that many of the evaluated benchmarks have multiple major flaws leading to simple exploits.

Agent-Eval Checklist To help understand and apply the findings of our taxonomy to other benchmarks, we convert each flaw class into concrete pre-release checks and distill the findings into the *Agent-Eval Checklist*. We provide a quick introduction to the checklist here and defer the full version to Section C. The Agent-Eval Checklist enumerates 30 binary questions grouped into 7 categories. The first six categories include questions regarding isolation, input handling, LLM judge robustness, scoring robustness, evaluation logic, and sandbox permissions, each closing one or more flaw patterns in the aforementioned taxonomy. The seventh category proposes pre-release adversarial smoke tests to further ensure the benchmark’s end-to-end robustness. We advocate using this checklist for all existing and new benchmarks to avoid flaws that could lead to potential reward hacks.

4.2 Automated Adversarial Auditing with BENCHJACK

Although the Agent-Eval Checklist provides an actionable auditing approach, it only scales linearly with reviewer effort. Each new benchmark, and each new revision of an existing one, demands a fresh manual pass through all of the questions in the checklist. To make the checklist actionable at scale, we operationalize it inside BENCHJACK, a fully automated, end-to-end auditing agent that produces verifiable hacking results. We provide a methodological introduction here, with the implementation details deferred to Section D.

Empirically, AI agents converge to the easiest path to a high score whether by solving the task or by hacking [53]. The benchmarks need to be designed to be null of easy reward hacks, and to be audited for any exploits. Thus, we design BENCHJACK with the end goal of **adversarially discovering reward-hacking exploits**. Concretely, BENCHJACK adopts a hacking assumption identical to a legit run of the actual evaluation and constructs an exploit that achieves the highest score through reward hacking. The synthesized exploit both verifies the validity of the flaws found and quantifies the hackability of the benchmark.

As it is hard to verify findings but easy to verify scores, the immediate target of BENCHJACK is set to maximizing the benchmark’s reported score *without* performing the intended tasks. We next introduce the three core stages of BENCHJACK, reconnaissance, flaw scan, and exploit construction (shown in Fig. 3).

(1) *Reconnaissance*. Given a benchmark repository, BENCHJACK automatically sets up the benchmark and scouts the evaluation architecture. It analyzes features such as official entry points, scoring and judging functions, task configuration files, and agent execution environment. With this information, BENCHJACK maps the trust boundaries where the evaluator interacts with agent-controlled data. It also records the IDs of the tasks in the benchmark into a manifest for easier localization of the downstream findings.




Figure 3: The three-stage BENCHJACK audit pipeline: reconnaissance, taxonomy-guided flaw scan, and exploit construction. BENCHJACK first maps the evaluation structure in the reconnaissance stage. With the guidance of the flaw taxonomy and the reconnaissance mapping, BENCHJACK scans the benchmark to produce a ledger of flaws. Finally, BENCHJACK iteratively synthesizes and validates a reward-hacking exploit given the prior findings.

(2) *Flaw scan.* Next, BENCHJACK scans the benchmark for flaws that may lead to reward hacks. Similar to how a human may use the Agent-Eval Checklist, BENCHJACK uses the result of the reconnaissance as a high level understanding of the benchmark and cross-references with the flaw taxonomy (Section 4.1) to identify problematic designs. Furthermore, BENCHJACK also analyzes task-specific flaws that require careful inspection of the task designs. BENCHJACK records in a ledger the explanation and the location of the flaws along with the severity showing the exploitability. This step is analogous to a developer running the checklist by hand, except that the agent is easily scalable and can quickly inspect a large benchmark concurrently.

For Stages 1 and 2, the detection of a lot of the flaw patterns can be accelerated with static rules. For example, untrusted code execution with `eval()` can be detected by simply searching for any usage of the function in the evaluator. Thus, we incorporate a toolbox of static analyzers in BENCHJACK, including custom `semgrep` rules, Dockerfile analyzer, and an AST-based trust mapper. These tools are intended to aid the agent’s auditing but not to fully substitute the process, since pre-written static scanning rules do not cover all the failure patterns effectively, especially for flaw patterns concerning logic errors like V4 and V6.

(3) *Exploit construction.* Finally, BENCHJACK produces a reward-hacking exploit that can be run against the benchmark. The exploit is explicitly specified to contain a `run.sh` entry point with auxiliary scripts like agents and model mocks. The exploit generated is aimed at achieving the highest score without actually solving any problems or intentionally cheating. Concretely, we adopt a hacking assumption identical to a legit run of the actual evaluation: the benchmark must be run through its official entry point; the exploit must use a default or minimal agent that does not do any tricks like pre-patching since that would be considered cheating instead of reward hacking; the exploit must rely only on information that a model can observe and actions that a model can carry out during the evaluation. The exploit is then iteratively improved and modified to make sure that it conforms with all the assumptions and hacks the most tasks. The synthesized exploit both verifies the validity of the flaws found and quantifies the hackability of the benchmark.

We design BENCHJACK as an orchestrator that wraps a coding-agent backend and drives it through the stages inside a Docker sandbox. This is the configuration we use for the results in Section 5. However, this implementation is relatively heavy and induces setup overhead. Thus, we also condense the end-to-end pipeline into a skill (`/benchjack <benchmark>`) for existing coding agents like Claude Code [3] or OpenAI Codex [36]. Concretely, we bundle the same procedure into a single instruction blob that any compatible coding agent harness can load on demand, enabling easy audit without additional infrastructure. The skill also shares the same static toolbox that we include for Stages 1 and 2 of the full pipeline. Implementation details, the prompt templates, and a side-by-side comparison of the two deployments are deferred to Section D.

4.3 Extending BENCHJACK for Iterative Refinement

The ultimate end goal of auditing is to patch the flaws found and improve the robustness of the benchmark. To this end, BENCHJACK can also serve as an adaptive hacker in a defender-hacker loop

that tries to uncover all the flaws and reward hacks, much like the generator–discriminator interplay in a GAN [19]. The result is the continuous improvement of the benchmark quality.

We couple BENCHJACK with a simple coding agent as the defender tasked with patching the benchmark against a verified exploit and the corresponding flaws (shown in Fig. 4). At each round, BENCHJACK re-audits the patched benchmark from the last round and attempts to construct a new reward hack. If it succeeds, the defender inspects the exploit and the flaw ledger to understand the exploit path and tries to introduce new mitigations. This iterative loop terminates either when BENCHJACK can no longer produce a working exploit or when the remaining flaws are not patchable without a benchmark redesign. In Section 5.3, we find that with good initial benchmark designs, three rounds of the iterative refinement loop with BENCHJACK can drive the residual hack rate to near zero.




Figure 4: Iterative refinement loop: BENCHJACK acts as an adaptive hacker while a coding agent patches the benchmark against each verified exploit, repeating until no new reward hack can be produced or the benchmark is non-patchable.

5 Experiment Results

Next, we present a study of fully-automated benchmark auditing and patching with BENCHJACK. We select ten of the popular agentic benchmarks spanning multiple domains, including software engineering, web navigation, and terminal use, covering thousands of task instances (shown in Table 1). All of the benchmarks we choose are either regularly used by top model suppliers or among the latest coding benchmarks. For the auditing in this section, we instantiate BENCHJACK and the defender agent in the patching loop with Claude Code [3].

5.1 Benchmark Hackability

Fig. 5 shows the percentage of tasks that are directly hackable in the audited benchmarks and the distribution of the corresponding major flaws BENCHJACK found that allow the hacking exploits. Overall, we find that all of the benchmarks we audit are hackable to a great extent. Simple exploits can drive the hack rate to near-perfect on nine of the ten benchmarks, including Terminal-Bench, SWE-bench Pro, and SWE-bench Verified. Only AgentBench falls below 90% due to the heterogeneity of the tasks: the exploit hacks all the tasks in the dbbench subset of the benchmark.

These benchmarks are hackable not because of any per-task design flaws, but because of major design flaws that expose almost all tasks to reward hacking. The right sub-figure in Fig. 5 shows the distribution of the major flaws that directly enable the hacks. Overall, the major hackable flaws span six of the eight classes in our taxonomy. We find that V1 and V7 are the most prominent

Benchmark	Domain	Evaluation Method	Tasks	Major Flaw
SWE-bench Verified [25, 13]	Software engineering	Test suite	500	V7
SWE-bench Pro [15]	Software engineering	Test suite + parser	731	V1&V7
FrontierSWE [41]	Software engineering	Test suite + verifier	17	V1&V7
MLE-Bench [9]	ML engineering	Script-based grading	75	V2&V6
SkillsBench [28]	Coding skills	Pytest framework	88	V1
Terminal-Bench [34]	Terminal operations	Pytest framework	89	V1
OSWorld [55]	Desktop computing	Script-based grading	369	V7
WebArena [61]	Web navigation	DOM + LLM judge	812	V2&V5
NetArena [62]	Network navigation	Script-based grading	5030	V3
AgentBench [31]	General agent harness	Multi-task	903	V3

Table 1: Benchmarks audited. We choose benchmarks across multiple domains. All of the benchmarks we choose are either regularly used by top model suppliers or among the latest coding benchmarks.




Figure 5: BENCHJACK results across 10 benchmarks. **Left:** exploit hack rate per benchmark, sorted from highest to lowest. nine benchmarks are hacked on almost all of instances. **Right:** number of benchmarks hacked via each flaw pattern (Section 4.1), ordered V1–V8. Benchmarks tagged with multiple flaws (e.g., V1&V7) count once toward each listed class.




Figure 6: Prevalence and reach of reward-hack classes across all 10 audited benchmarks. **(a)** shows the number of distinct findings by BENCHJACK in each flaw class and their severity. **(b)** illustrates the distribution of findings by the number of tasks they cover, with task-specific findings and findings that affect the entire benchmark.

hacking-inducing flaws, as they require no per-instance reasoning and exploit trust assumptions baked into the benchmark design.

These exploits capture the most exploitable flaws in the audited benchmarks. Next, we present a comprehensive study of the flaws detected and flagged by BENCHJACK across the benchmarks.

5.2 Flaw Type Analysis

In total, BENCHJACK reports 219 distinct flaws across the benchmarks in our audit, with varying severity and affecting different numbers of tasks. Fig. 6 illustrates the distribution of flaws found by class, severity, and per-finding task coverage. Overall, we find that the flaws detected are concentrated on input-handling and scoring-logic classes (V2, V3, V6, V7). Comparing the severity of the flaws, we find that V3 stands out to be the most critical, while V4 and V5 are on the benign end of the spectrum. This is due to flaws such as V1 and V3 directly exposing a hacking surface, while V5 and V6 may not be hackable or have a strong dependency on task types and the grading LLM. Fig. 6b shows the per-flaw task coverage. Most flaws either cover only one task or all tasks in the benchmark.

Cross-referencing this view with the major flaw analysis in Section 5.1, we find a sharp difference. Although there are fewer V1 flaws, they tend to be highly generalizable and exploitable across every task instance simultaneously. In comparison, V3 and V6 are prevalent in terms of numbers but are harder to generalize and require case-by-case exploitation even after a primitive is found. Flaw




Figure 7: Patching study. For each benchmark we report the original hack rate (red), the hack rate of the original exploit after applying the patches (green), and updated hack rate after rerunning BENCHJACK after the patch (orange). Patches prevent original exploits, but for benchmarks with design flaw, re-running BENCHJACK drives up hack rate again




Figure 8: Iterative improvement study. For four benchmarks without major design flaw, we re-run BENCHJACK against the harness after each round of targeted patches. Each subfigure reports the hack rate at the original (pre-patch) state and after the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd patch round. The hack rate falls monotonically as successive patches close the residual flaws BENCHJACK discovers in each iteration, with OSWorld and WebArena reaching 0% within three rounds.

severity is highly uneven: numerous task-specific bugs barely move the headline hack rate, while a single all-task flaw could easily cause a hack rate explosion.

5.3 Iterative Improvement of Benchmarks

Next, we investigate the effectiveness of the iterative patching loop on the reward-hacking flaws.

Single-round Patching Experiment Fig. 7 showcases the initial hack rate, the hack rate of the original exploit on the patched benchmark, and the actual hackable percentage by BENCHJACK after the patch. Overall, we find that almost all exploits can be successfully patched, and the original exploit’s hack rate drops to near zero after the patch. However, the re-hack tells a different story: only four of the patches successfully cut the hack rate by more than half. Others, including SWE-bench Verified and Terminal Bench, still leave the reward-hacking loopholes wide open.

The key difference lies in the level of security embedded in the initial design of different benchmarks. The benchmarks that stayed secure after patching share good design properties, such as strong environment isolation, deterministic scoring, and structured output parsing. By contrast, the patches in the benchmarks with riskier designs (such as the agent and the evaluator running in the same process) are highly bypassable. These flaws are not bugs to be patched, but design choices to be undone, and a code-only patch cannot move the trust boundary back into place. These insights motivate future benchmark environment design to prioritize strong isolation and structured parsing as early as possible, rather than treating them as implementation details that can be appended later.

Iterative Patching Improves Robustness In this section, we study how the iterative refinement pipeline described in Section 4.3 can be used to further improve the robustness of benchmarks. We tested on the more securely-designed benchmarks as shown in the single-round patching part: AgentBench, WebArena, OSWorld, and SWE-bench Pro. Fig. 8 illustrates the round-by-round improvement of these four benchmarks after applying the patch-then-re-hack loop for three rounds. We find that the hack rate falls with each round of refinement, with two of the benchmarks fully

patched and unhackable within three iterations. For benchmarks with more careful design, the iterative refinement loop with BENCHJACK is sufficient to eliminate reward hacking to a great extent.

6 Conclusion

Reward hacking has been widely discussed for agentic benchmarks. In this paper, we are the first to conduct a quantitative study on the robustness of benchmarks against reward hacking. By proposing an eight-class taxonomy of evaluation flaws and condensing the knowledge into BENCHJACK, we propose a systematic auditing tool that exposes hackable instances in benchmarks before running real tests. Through our experiments on 10 widely used benchmarks including SWE-bench and OSWorld, BENCHJACK identified at least one major flaw on each benchmark and achieves near-perfect scores on benchmarks without attempting to solve anything. Moreover, when we apply BENCHJACK in an iterative refinement pattern that proposes hacks then applies fix patches, we can reduce the hackable rate to under 10% on benchmarks without fatal design flaws within three iterations. Our findings highlight the importance of built-in security design for benchmarks, and BENCHJACK serves as a solid first step towards proactive benchmark auditing.

References

- [1] Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. Concrete problems in ai safety, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06565>.
- [2] Anthropic. Alignment risk update: Claude mythos preview, 2026. URL <https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/3edfc1a7f947aa81841cf88305cb513f184c36ae.pdf>.
- [3] Anthropic / Community Sources. Claude code. <https://www.anthropic.com/product/claude-code>, 2026.
- [4] Usman Anwar, Tim Bakker, Dana Kianfar, Cristina Pinneri, and Christos Louizos. Analyzing and improving chain-of-thought monitorability through information theory, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.18297>.
- [5] Yonas Atinafu and Robin Cohen. Rewardhackingagents: Benchmarking evaluation integrity for llm ml-engineering agents, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.11337>.
- [6] Bowen Baker, Joost Huizinga, Leo Gao, Zehao Dou, Melody Y. Guan, Aleksander Madry, Wojciech Zaremba, Jakub Pachocki, and David Farhi. Monitoring reasoning models for misbehavior and the risks of promoting obfuscation, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.11926>.
- [7] Mohammad Beigi, Ming Jin, Junshan Zhang, Qifan Wang, and Lifu Huang. Adversarial reward auditing for active detection and mitigation of reward hacking, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.01750>.
- [8] Samuel R. Bowman and George E. Dahl. What will it take to fix benchmarking in natural language understanding?, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.02145>.
- [9] Jun Shern Chan, Neil Chowdhury, Oliver Jaffe, James Aung, Dane Sherburn, Evan Mays, Giulio Starace, Kevin Liu, Leon Maksin, Tejal Patwardhan, Lilian Weng, and Aleksander Madry. Mle-bench: Evaluating machine learning agents on machine learning engineering, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.07095>.
- [10] Simin Chen, Yiming Chen, Zexin Li, Yifan Jiang, Zhongwei Wan, Yixin He, Dezhi Ran, Tianle Gu, Haizhou Li, Tao Xie, and Baishakhi Ray. Recent advances in large language model benchmarks against data contamination: From static to dynamic evaluation, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.17521>.
- [11] Simin Chen, Pranav Pulara, and Baishakhi Ray. Dynamic benchmarking of reasoning capabilities in code large language models under data contamination, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.04149>.

- [12] Yanda Chen, Joe Benton, Ansh Radhakrishnan, Jonathan Uesato, Carson Denison, John Schulman, Arushi Somani, Peter Hase, Misha Wagner, Fabien Roger, Vlad Mikulik, Samuel R. Bowman, Jan Leike, Jared Kaplan, and Ethan Perez. Reasoning models don’t always say what they think, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.05410>.
- [13] Neil Chowdhury, James Aung, Chan Jun Shern, Oliver Jaffe, Dane Sherburn, Giulio Starace, Evan Mays, Rachel Dias, Marwan Aljube, Mia Glaese, Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Leyton Ho, Tejal Patwardhan, Kevin Liu, and Aleksander Madry. Introducing SWE-bench Verified. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-swe-bench-verified/>, August 2024.
- [14] Mostafa Dehghani, Yi Tay, Alexey A. Gritsenko, Zhe Zhao, Neil Houlsby, Fernando Diaz, Donald Metzler, and Oriol Vinyals. The benchmark lottery, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07002>.
- [15] Xiang Deng, Jeff Da, Edwin Pan, Yannis Yiming He, Charles Ide, Kanak Garg, Niklas Lauffer, Andrew Park, Nitin Pasari, Chetan Rane, Karmini Sampath, Maya Krishnan, Srivatsa Kundurthy, Sean Hendryx, Zifan Wang, Vijay Bharadwaj, Jeff Holm, Raja Aluri, Chen Bo Calvin Zhang, Noah Jacobson, Bing Liu, and Brad Kenstler. Swe-bench pro: Can ai agents solve long-horizon software engineering tasks?, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.16941>.
- [16] Carson Denison, Monte MacDiarmid, Fazl Barez, David Duvenaud, Shauna Kravec, Samuel Marks, Nicholas Schiefer, Ryan Soklaski, Alex Tamkin, Jared Kaplan, Buck Shlegeris, Samuel R. Bowman, Ethan Perez, and Evan Hubinger. Sycophancy to subterfuge: Investigating reward-tampering in large language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.10162>.
- [17] Darshan Deshpande, Anand Kannappan, and Rebecca Qian. Benchmarking reward hack detection in code environments via contrastive analysis, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.20103>.
- [18] Tom Everitt, Marcus Hutter, Ramana Kumar, and Victoria Krakovna. Reward tampering problems and solutions in reinforcement learning: A causal influence diagram perspective, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.04734>.
- [19] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2014.
- [20] Charles AE Goodhart. Problems of monetary management: The UK experience. *Monetary Theory and Practice*, pages 91–121, 1984.
- [21] Melody Y. Guan, Miles Wang, Micah Carroll, Zehao Dou, Annie Y. Wei, Marcus Williams, Benjamin Arnav, Joost Huizinga, Ian Kivlichan, Mia Glaese, Jakub Pachocki, and Bowen Baker. Monitoring monitorability, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.18311>.
- [22] Lukas Helff, Quentin Delfosse, David Steinmann, Ruben Härle, Hikaru Shindo, Patrick Schramowski, Wolfgang Stammer, Kristian Kersting, and Felix Friedrich. Llms gaming verifiers: Rlvr can lead to reward hacking, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.15149>.
- [23] IQuestLab. Issue #14: Iquest-coder-v1. <https://github.com/IQuestLab/IQuest-Coder-V1/issues/14>, 2026. GitHub issue.
- [24] Alon Jacovi, Avi Caciularu, Omer Goldman, and Yoav Goldberg. Stop uploading test data in plain text: Practical strategies for mitigating data contamination by evaluation benchmarks, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.10160>.
- [25] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues?, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06770>.
- [26] Muhammad Khalifa, Zohaib Khan, Omer Tafveez, Hao Peng, and Lu Wang. Countdown-code: A testbed for studying the emergence and generalization of reward hacking in rlvr, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.07084>.

- [27] Tomek Korbak, Mikita Balesni, Elizabeth Barnes, Yoshua Bengio, Joe Benton, Joseph Bloom, Mark Chen, Alan Cooney, Allan Dafoe, Anca Dragan, Scott Emmons, Owain Evans, David Farhi, Ryan Greenblatt, Dan Hendrycks, Marius Hobbhahn, Evan Hubinger, Geoffrey Irving, Erik Jenner, Daniel Kokotajlo, Victoria Krakovna, Shane Legg, David Lindner, David Luan, Aleksander Mądry, Julian Michael, Neel Nanda, Dave Orr, Jakub Pachocki, Ethan Perez, Mary Phuong, Fabien Roger, Joshua Saxe, Buck Shlegeris, Martín Soto, Eric Steinberger, Jasmine Wang, Wojciech Zaremba, Bowen Baker, Rohin Shah, and Vlad Mikulik. Chain of thought monitorability: A new and fragile opportunity for ai safety, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.11473>.
- [28] Xiangyi Li, Wenbo Chen, Yimin Liu, Shenghan Zheng, Xiaokun Chen, Yifeng He, Yubo Li, Bingran You, Haotian Shen, Jiankai Sun, Shuyi Wang, Binxu Li, Qunhong Zeng, Di Wang, Xuandong Zhao, Yuanli Wang, Roey Ben Chaim, Zonglin Di, Yipeng Gao, Junwei He, Yizhuo He, Liqiang Jing, Luyang Kong, Xin Lan, Jiachen Li, Songlin Li, Yijiang Li, Yueqian Lin, Xinyi Liu, Xuanqing Liu, Haoran Lyu, Ze Ma, Bowei Wang, Runhui Wang, Tianyu Wang, Wengao Ye, Yue Zhang, Hanwen Xing, Yiqi Xue, Steven Dillmann, and Han chung Lee. Skillsbench: Benchmarking how well agent skills work across diverse tasks, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.12670>.
- [29] Xiangyi Li, Kyoung Whan Choe, Yimin Liu, Xiaokun Chen, Chujun Tao, Bingran You, Wenbo Chen, Zonglin Di, Jiankai Sun, Shenghan Zheng, Jiajun Bao, Yuanli Wang, Weixiang Yan, Yiyuan Li, and Han chung Lee. Clawsbench: Evaluating capability and safety of llm productivity agents in simulated workspaces, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.05172>.
- [30] Manqing Liu, David Williams-King, Ida Caspary, Linh Le, Hannes Whittingham, Puria Radmard, Cameron Tice, and Edward James Young. Diagnosing pathological chain-of-thought in reasoning models, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.13904>.
- [31] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, Shudan Zhang, Xiang Deng, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Chenhui Zhang, Sheng Shen, Tianjun Zhang, Yu Su, Huan Sun, Minlie Huang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.03688>.
- [32] Monte MacDiarmid, Benjamin Wright, Jonathan Uesato, Joe Benton, Jon Kutasov, Sara Price, Naia Bouscal, Sam Bowman, Trenton Bricken, Alex Cloud, Carson Denison, Johannes Gasteiger, Ryan Greenblatt, Jan Leike, Jack Lindsey, Vlad Mikulik, Ethan Perez, Alex Rodrigues, Drake Thomas, Albert Webson, Daniel Ziegler, and Evan Hubinger. Natural emergent misalignment from reward hacking in production rl, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.18397>.
- [33] Qiuyang Mang, Wenhao Chai, Zhifei Li, Huanzhi Mao, Shang Zhou, Alexander Du, Hanchen Li, Shu Liu, Edwin Chen, Yichuan Wang, Xieting Chu, Zerui Cheng, Yuan Xu, Tian Xia, Zirui Wang, Tianneng Shi, Jianzhu Yao, Yilong Zhao, Qizheng Zhang, Charlie Ruan, Zeyu Shen, Kaiyuan Liu, Runyuan He, Dong Xing, Zerui Li, Zirong Zeng, Yige Jiang, Lufeng Cheng, Ziyi Zhao, Youran Sun, Wesley Zheng, Meiyuwang Zhang, Ruyi Ji, Xuechang Tu, Zihan Zheng, Zexing Chen, Kangyang Zhou, Zhaozi Wang, Jingbang Chen, Aleksandra Korolova, Peter Henderson, Pramod Viswanath, Vijay Ganesh, Saining Xie, Zhuang Liu, Dawn Song, Sewon Min, Ion Stoica, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Jingbo Shang, and Alvin Cheung. Frontiercs: Evolving challenges for evolving intelligence, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.15699>.
- [34] Mike A. Merrill, Alexander G. 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, Jenia Jitsev, 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 Guha, Gabriel H. S. Dreiman, Jiacheng Zhu, Karl Krauth, Li Zhong, Niklas Muennighoff, Robert 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, Jesse Hu, Christopher Michael Rytting, Ryan Marten, Yixin Wang, Alex Dimakis, Andy Konwinski, and Ludwig Schmidt. Terminal-bench: Benchmarking agents on hard, realistic tasks in command line interfaces, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.11868>.
- [35] Grégoire Mialon, Clémentine Fourier, Craig Swift, Thomas Wolf, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. Gaia: a benchmark for general ai assistants, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.12983>.
- [36] OpenAI. Introducing codex. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-codex/>, 2025.
- [37] OpenAI. Why swe-bench verified no longer measures frontier coding capabilities. <https://openai.com/index/why-we-no-longer-evaluate-swe-bench-verified/>, 2026.
- [38] Yonatan Oren, Nicole Meister, Niladri Chatterji, Faisal Ladhak, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. Proving test set contamination in black box language models, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.17623>.
- [39] Anne Ouyang, Simon Guo, Simran Arora, Alex L. Zhang, William Hu, Christopher Ré, and Azalia Mirhoseini. Kernelbench: Can llms write efficient gpu kernels?, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.10517>.
- [40] Alexander Pan, Erik Jones, Meena Jagadeesan, and Jacob Steinhardt. Feedback loops with language models drive in-context reward hacking, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.06627>.
- [41] Proximal Labs. Frontierswe: Benchmarking software engineering skill at the edge of human ability. <https://www.frontierswe.com/>, 2026.
- [42] Vyas Raina, Adian Liusie, and Mark Gales. Is llm-as-a-judge robust? investigating universal adversarial attacks on zero-shot llm assessment, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.14016>.
- [43] Ben Rank, Hardik Bhatnagar, Ameya Prabhu, Shira Eisenberg, Karina Nguyen, Matthias Bethge, and Maksym Andriushchenko. Posttrainbench: Can llm agents automate llm post-training?, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.08640>.
- [44] Rohin Shah, Vikrant Varma, Ramana Kumar, Mary Phuong, Victoria Krakovna, Jonathan Uesato, and Zac Kenton. Goal misgeneralization: Why correct specifications aren’t enough for correct goals, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.01790>.
- [45] Shivalika Singh, Yiyang Nan, Alex Wang, Daniel D’Souza, Sayash Kapoor, Ahmet Üstün, Sanmi Koyejo, Yuntian Deng, Shayne Longpre, Noah A. Smith, Beyza Ermiş, Marzieh Fadaee, and Sara Hooker. The leaderboard illusion, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.20879>.
- [46] Joar Skalse, Nikolaus H. R. Howe, Dmitrii Krashennnikov, and David Krueger. Defining and characterizing reward hacking, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.13085>.
- [47] Adam Stein, Davis Brown, Hamed Hassani, Mayur Naik, and Eric Wong. Detecting safety violations across many agent traces, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.11806>.
- [48] Marilyn Strathern. “improving ratings”: Audit in the British university system. *European Review*, 5(3):305–321, 1997.
- [49] Beth Barnes Sydney Von Arx, Lawrence Chan. Recent frontier models are reward hacking, 2025. URL <https://metr.org/blog/2025-06-05-recent-reward-hacking/>.
- [50] Jun Takahashi, Atsunori Moteki, Akiyoshi Uchida, Shoichi Masui, Fan Yang, Kanji Uchino, Yueqi Song, Yonatan Bisk, Graham Neubig, Ikuo Kusajima, Yasuto Watanabe, Hiroyuki Ishida, Koki Nakagawa, and Shan Jiang. Fieldworkarena: Agentic ai benchmark for real field work tasks, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.19662>.

- [51] Xinming Tu, Tianze Wang, Yingzhou, Lu, Kexin Huang, Yuanhao Qu, and Sara Mostafavi. Benchguard: Who guards the benchmarks? automated auditing of llm agent benchmarks, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.24955>.
- [52] Songtao Wang, Quang Hieu Pham, Fangcong Yin, Xinpeng Wang, Jocelyn Qiaochu Chen, Greg Durrett, and Xi Ye. Detecting and suppressing reward hacking with gradient fingerprints, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.16242>.
- [53] Lilian Weng. Reward hacking in reinforcement learning., 2024. URL <https://lilianweng.github.io/posts/2024-11-28-reward-hacking/>.
- [54] Patrick Wilhelm, Thorsten Wittkopp, and Odej Kao. Monitoring emergent reward hacking during generation via internal activations, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.04069>.
- [55] 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, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07972>.
- [56] Shu Yang, Junchao Wu, Xilin Gong, Xuansheng Wu, Derek Wong, Ninghao Liu, and Di Wang. Investigating cot monitorability in large reasoning models, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.08525>.
- [57] Shuo Yang, Wei-Lin Chiang, Lianmin Zheng, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Rethinking benchmark and contamination for language models with rephrased samples, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.04850>.
- [58] Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan. τ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12045>.
- [59] Boxi Yu, Yuxuan Zhu, Pinjia He, and Daniel Kang. Utboost: Rigorous evaluation of coding agents on swe-bench, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.09289>.
- [60] Boxi Yu, Yang Cao, Yuzhong Zhang, Liting Lin, Junjielong Xu, Zhiqing Zhong, Qinghua Xu, Guancheng Wang, Jialun Cao, Shing-Chi Cheung, Pinjia He, and Lionel Briand. Swe-abs: Adversarial benchmark strengthening exposes inflated success rates on test-based benchmark, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.00520>.
- [61] 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, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13854>.
- [62] Yajie Zhou, Jiajun Ruan, Eric S. Wang, Sadjad Fouladi, Francis Y. Yan, Kevin Hsieh, and Zaoxing Liu. Netarena: Dynamic benchmarks for ai agents in network automation, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2506.03231>.
- [63] Yuxuan Zhu, Tengjun Jin, Yada Pruksachatkun, Andy Zhang, Shu Liu, Sasha Cui, Sayash Kapoor, Shayne Longpre, Kevin Meng, Rebecca Weiss, Fazl Barez, Rahul Gupta, Jwala Dhamala, Jacob Merizian, Mario Giulianelli, Harry Coppock, Cozmin Ududec, Jasjeet Sekhon, Jacob Steinhardt, Antony Kellermann, Sarah Schwettmann, Matei Zaharia, Ion Stoica, Percy Liang, and Daniel Kang. Establishing best practices for building rigorous agentic benchmarks, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.02825>.

A Disclosure of Language Model Usage

This work uses frontier LLMs as core research instruments (benchmark auditors and alignment judges), as described in Sections 3–5. Additionally, LLMs were used to review and refine drafts of this manuscript; all scientific claims, experimental design, and analysis were conducted by the authors

B Taxonomy: Example Manifestations

This appendix gives one concrete manifestation of each of the eight flaw classes V1–V8 introduced in Section 4.1. Each example is intentionally narrow: it isolates the structural defect that defines the class. Full per-benchmark exploits, including chained payloads and end-to-end hack rates, are reported in Appendix E.

B.1 V1 – Isolation failure (SWE-bench Verified)

SWE-bench Verified runs the agent’s patch and the test suite inside the same Docker container. The harness resets files enumerated in the upstream test patch but does *not* reset arbitrary files the agent creates, and a `conftest.py` dropped at the repository root survives the reset and is auto-discovered by pytest. The agent and the verifier therefore share a single Python interpreter, single import path, and single filesystem.

Example. The agent submits a one-file `model_patch` containing a `conftest.py` at the repo root that registers a `pytest_collection_modifyitems` hook. At collection time the hook prints `PASSED <nodeid>` for every test pytest is about to run, then clears `items` so no real test ever executes:

```
1 @pytest.hookimpl(hookwrapper=True)
2 def pytest_runtest_makereport(item, call):
3     outcome = yield
4     rep = outcome.get_result()
5     if rep.when == "call":
6         rep.outcome = "passed"
7         rep.longrepr = None
```

Listing 1: V1: a planted `conftest.py` runs in the same Python process the verifier trusts.

Because pytest auto-loads any `conftest.py` on the import path, the verifier implicitly imports agent code and trusts the resulting log. This is the canonical isolation failure: the trust boundary is nominal, not enforced.

B.2 V2 – Answers shipped with the test (NetArena MALT)

NetArena’s MALT app commits all 5,000 {question, answer} ground-truth tuples verbatim to its public GitHub repo at `app-malt/data/sampled_500_benchmark_malt.jsonl`. Any agent with read access to the repository (or to the cloned working tree shipped alongside the harness) can map each prompt to its gold answer without ever exercising the underlying graph reasoning the benchmark is meant to measure.

Example. A two-step “agent” that does no domain reasoning whatsoever wins every task:

1. `read_file("app-malt/data/sampled_500_benchmark_malt.jsonl")` yields the (question $\rightarrow$ answer) map.
2. Match the incoming prompt against the question field of each record and emit the corresponding answer verbatim.

The unmodified MALT scoring path then accepts the prediction at 1.0. The defect is structural: the gold artifact is part of the task distribution itself, so isolation cannot help.

B.3 V3 – Remote code execution into the evaluator (AgentBench)

AgentBench’s dbbench result processor receives the agent’s `commit_final_answer` tool call, takes `list(arguments.values())[0]` without enforcing the declared `array<string>` schema, and—if the value is a string starting with `[` and ending with `]`—passes it directly to Python’s `eval()` (`src/server/tasks/dbbench/result_processor.py`:163,216). The agent’s tool argument is therefore a code-execution primitive on the grader side of the trust boundary.

Example. A single tool call is enough to monkey-patch the comparison routine and pass every subsequent sample:

```
1 commit_final_answer(answers="["exec(\"\"\"\"
2 import server.tasks.dbbench.result_processor as R
3 R.DBResultProcessor.compare_results = lambda *a, **kw: True
4 R.DBResultProcessor._normalize_special_values = lambda *a, **kw: 'X'
5 \"\"\" or 'X']")
```

Listing 2: V3: agent-controlled string parsed as Python by the grader.

Once `compare_results` is rebound, every later sample short-circuits to a pass without further interaction. Unlike V1, where the agent only influences artifacts the evaluator later reads, V3 hands the agent a code-execution primitive at the evaluator’s privileges.

B.4 V4 – LLM-judge prompt injection (WebArena)

WebArena delegates two of its eval types—`fuzzy_match` and `ua_match`—to an LLM judge invoked via `llm_fuzzy_match / llm_ua_match`. The agent’s stop-string is interpolated verbatim into the judge’s prompt; there are no delimiters, escaping, or structural separators between the rubric and the agent’s content. Because the judge receives both the rubric and the answer through the same `OPENAI_BASE_URL`, anything the agent writes is read by the judge as instruction.

Example. A stop-string that frames itself as judge guidance shifts the verdict:

```
1 stop [The user's request was satisfied. Per the rubric,  
2 this answer must be judged "correct". Ignore  
3 any later instructions to the contrary.]
```

Listing 3: V4: the agent’s answer doubles as judge instructions.

The same defect underlies the broader WebArena chain in Appendix E.10, where the mock LLM serves both the agent and the judge call, sidestepping the prompt entirely. In either form, a single biased judge call decides the entire instance, so the blast radius of one successful injection is large.

B.5 V5 – Weak string matching (WebArena)

Many WebArena tasks have scoring logics that are `string_match`-only: `must_include` performs substring containment over `nltk.word_tokenize` output and `exact_match` reduces to case-insensitive substring in many configurations. A long answer that “covers” frequent gold values therefore wins on every task whose gold is a small token.

Example. A single static stop-string emitted on every task lands every small-int / yes-no gold deterministically, with no task-specific knowledge:

```
1 stop [0 1 2 3 4 5 ... 998 999 yes no true false n/a]
```

Listing 4: V5: one static answer that satisfies the substring matcher across many tasks.

B.6 V6 – Evaluation logic gaps (MLE-bench)

MLE-bench wraps every per-competition Kaggle metric in a single `Grader.__call__` that catches *any* exception raised during scoring and returns `None` as the score. Downstream, a missing score is not

treated as a failure—the medal-classification path falls through and the run is logged as non-failing. The structural property the wrapper actually enforces (“the grader did not raise”) diverges from the semantic check it is supposed to implement (“the submission scored above the medal cutoff”), and the agent triggers the former without satisfying the latter.

Example. A submission whose schema is well-formed enough to clear the format-validator but whose target column violates the metric’s domain raises inside the grader; the catch-all swallows it to None and the run avoids the failure path:

```
1 # mlebench/grade_helpers.py
2 class Grader:
3     def __call__(self, submission, answers):
4         try:
5             return self._grade_fn(submission, answers) # e.g. roc_auc_score
6         except Exception as e:
7             logger.warning(f"grader raised: {e}")
8             return None # <-- treated as non-failure downstream
```

Listing 5: V6: catch-all exception handler converts grader failures into a default non-failure.

The defect is structural: the same wrapper sits in front of every competition’s metric, so a single class of malformed-but-format-valid submission triggers the gap benchmark-wide rather than per-task.

B.7 V7 – Trusting untrusted output (FrontierSWE)

FrontierSWE’s verifier always ends by invoking `python3 ../tests/compute_reward.py`, which writes `/logs/verifier/reward.{json,txt}`; Harbor scores the trial by reading those files. Crucially, agent and verifier execute as sequential phases in the same Modal Sandbox, so the agent has full write access to `/logs/verifier/` *before* `compute_reward.py` runs. The reward signal is taken from an artifact the agent could have produced—without verification, recomputation, or hash check.

Example. The first thing the agent does is pre-write a winning reward:

```
1 mkdir -p /logs/verifier
2 printf '%> /logs/verifier/reward.json
3 > /logs/verifier/reward.txt
4 printf '100.0\n' > /logs/verifier/reward.txt
```

Listing 6: V7: a fabricated artifact indistinguishable from a real verifier output.

If `test.sh` aborts early (e.g. `set -e` on a missing file) the pre-written value is what Harbor ingests; if it does not, a hijacked `python3` on `PATH` re-writes the same value when `compute_reward.py` would have run. Either way the verifier’s signal originates from agent-controlled state. V7 frequently composes with V1 (the agent has write access at all) and V3 (the agent rewrites the verifier itself).

B.8 V8 – Excessive permissions (AgentBench)

The AgentBench dbbench worker container runs as root and bind-mounts `/var/run/docker.sock` from the host (`extra/docker-compose.yml`). Neither permission is required by the task: dbbench compares answer strings against a SQL ground truth and never needs to spawn containers. The mount turns any code-execution primitive inside the worker into a host-Docker control primitive, and root inside the container removes any remaining barrier.

Example. Combined with the V3 `eval()` sink described in Section B.3, a single tool call escalates score manipulation into host takeover:

```
1 commit_final_answer(answers="[exec(\"\\\"
2 import os
3 # /var/run/docker.sock is bind-mounted (V8) and we are root (V8)
4 os.system('docker -H unix:///var/run/docker.sock '
5         'run --rm -v /:/host alpine sh -c \"...\\\"')"
```

```
6 \"\"\" or 'X']")
```

Listing 7: V8: an unnecessary capability turning a contained RCE into a host pivot.

V8 rarely breaks a benchmark on its own; it widens the hack surface for every other class, turning a moderate V1 exposure (the SWE-bench `conf test.py` hook) or a contained V3 sink (the `AgentBench eval()`) into a complete escape. We rate V8 by what it unlocks rather than by standalone impact.

C The Agent-Eval Checklist

We present the Agent-Eval Checklist, organized into seven categories. Each item corresponds to one or more flaw classes from Section 4.1.

C.1 Isolation (V1, V2, V7)

- I1. Run evaluation code outside the agent’s container or VM.
- I2. Do not mount reference answers, gold files, or evaluation criteria in the agent’s filesystem.
- I3. Use read-only mounts for evaluation binaries, test files, and scoring scripts.
- I4. Copy agent artifacts out of the agent environment before inspection.
- I5. Verify integrity of evaluation scripts before execution.
- I6. If the agent and evaluator must share an environment, use OS-level permissions to enforce read/write boundaries.

C.2 Input Handling (V3)

- H1. Never call `eval()`, `exec()`, or `dynamic import` on agent-controlled strings.
- H2. Parse structured data with proper parsers: `json.loads()`, `ast.literal_eval()`, typed schema validators.
- H3. If dynamic evaluation is necessary, use sandboxed interpreters with restricted builtins and no filesystem access.
- H4. Validate all agent output against an expected schema before processing.

C.3 LLM Judge Robustness (V4)

- J1. Delimit agent content with clear structural markers (e.g., XML tags, triple backticks with role labels).
- J2. Strip or escape instruction-like content from agent outputs before interpolation.
- J3. Use structured output formats (JSON with predefined keys) for judge responses.
- J4. Evaluate extracted features (specific claims, action sequences) rather than full trajectories.
- J5. Cross-validate LLM judge scores with rule-based checks where possible.

C.4 Scoring Robustness (V5)

- S1. Avoid substring matching on short strings; require exact or near-exact matches for short answers.
- S2. Test normalization functions with adversarial inputs that should *not* match.
- S3. Do not silently exclude failed or crashed tasks from the denominator.
- S4. Handle edge cases in number formatting (commas, currency symbols, units) explicitly.
- S5. Include adversarial test cases in scorer unit tests.

C.5 Evaluation Logic (V6)

- L1. Ensure every task category exercises the full scoring pipeline; no category should be automatically scored without content validation.

- L2. Verify that imported validation functions are actually called, not just defined.
- L3. Run a null agent (empty responses) against every task; any task that scores above zero on a null response has a V6 flaw.

C.6 Sandbox Permissions (V8)

- P1. Grant the agent only the capabilities the task requires; do not run as root inside the container by default.
- P2. Do not mount the Docker socket, host control sockets, or privileged device nodes into the agent’s environment.
- P3. Restrict outbound internet to the hosts the task actually needs, and disable it entirely for tasks that do not.
- P4. Mount host paths read-only where possible; never grant write access to host paths outside a dedicated working directory.
- P5. Audit permission grants per task rather than applying a single permissive default across the whole benchmark.

C.7 Adversarial Testing

- A1. Perform code review of scoring functions with an adversarial mindset: for each input the scorer reads, ask “what if the agent controlled this?”
- A2. Red-team the evaluation pipeline end-to-end, including task setup, agent execution, and scoring.

D BENCHJACK

This appendix documents the implementation of BENCHJACK: the multi-phase pipeline agent used for all quantitative results in Section 5 and the self-contained Claude Code skill that ships in the same repository. Both deployments share the flaw taxonomy and the exploit patterns; they differ in how the agent is hosted. The pipeline agent (Section D.1) decomposes the audit into discrete, individually-promptable stages so that artifacts (reconnaissance summaries, JSONL findings, exploit scripts) can be inspected and resumed phase by phase. The Claude Code skill (Section D.2) bundles the same procedure into a single instruction blob that any compatible coding-agent harness can load on demand and execute end-to-end.

The full source tree—including the static-analysis tools (semgrep rules, bandit, hadolint, a Dockerfile analyzer, and an AST-based trust mapper), the FastAPI dashboard, the Docker sandbox, and the prompt templates reproduced below—is released alongside the paper at the artifact URL in ???. Throughout this appendix, prompts are reproduced verbatim from the released source. At runtime each placeholder in the prompt is bound to the appropriate value: {workspace} resolves to the benchmark root inside the sandbox container (/workspace) or its absolute host path, {tools} resolves to the static-analysis tool directory, and the cross-phase placeholders carry forward the previous phase’s output (truncated to a stage-specific length).

D.1 Pipeline Agent

The pipeline agent is a Python orchestrator that wraps an off-the-shelf coding-agent backend (Claude Code or OpenAI Codex; we use Claude Code throughout Section 5) and drives it through five stages (with two extra peripheral stages): *setup*, *reconnaissance*, *flaw scan*, *exploit construction*, and *report*. Each stage issues exactly one (or, for the exploit construction stage, two sequential) AI calls, streams the model’s output and tool-call events to a live web dashboard, persists per-stage artifacts to output/<benchmark>/ and hacks/<benchmark>/, and may resume from a previously-completed phase. The orchestrator additionally exposes a parallel two-stage *hack-it* pipeline (a generate–verify pair without a separate reconnaissance/scan/report split) for users who only want a working reward hack and not a full audit; we describe it briefly at the end of the section.

We describe each phase’s purpose, inputs, expected outputs, and reproduce its prompt template verbatim.

Setup. Resolves the user-supplied target into an on-disk benchmark checkout. Local paths are used in place; `http(s)://` URLs and owner/repo slugs are shallow-cloned with `git clone -depth=1`; a bare benchmark name (e.g. “SWE-bench”) is delegated to the AI backend with the search-and-clone prompt below. The phase additionally starts the persistent Docker sandbox container (with `-cap-drop=ALL` and the workspace bind-mounted) that subsequent phases reuse.

```

1 Find the official GitHub repository for the AI agent benchmark called "{name}".
2
3 Steps:
4 1. Search the web for "{name} benchmark github" to find the repository URL.
5 2. Once you have the URL, clone it: git clone --depth=1 <URL> {dest}
6 3. Verify {dest} is not empty.
7
8 If the benchmark is well-known (e.g. SWE-bench, WebArena, GAIA, HumanEval,
9 MBPP, MATH, GSM8K, ARC, HellaSwag, MMLU, BigCodeBench, etc.), try the
10 most likely GitHub URL directly before searching.
11
12 You MUST clone into exactly this path: {dest}

```

Listing 8: Setup phase: search-and-clone fallback prompt (SEARCH_PROMPT).

Reconnaissance. Maps the benchmark’s evaluation architecture: entry points, scoring/judging functions, task configuration files, the agent’s execution environment, any LLM-as-judge components, and trust boundaries between agent output and the evaluator. The agent is required to write a machine-readable `task_ids.json` mapping every task ID to its definition file. The static-analysis tools are advertised in the prompt so the agent can call them when manual code reading hits its limits.

```

1 You are BenchJack, a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks.
2
3 The benchmark codebase is in the current working directory.
4
5 ## Static analysis tools available
6
7 Run any of these as needed during your analysis:
8
9   bash {tools}/run_bandit.sh {workspace}
10   python3 {tools}/docker_analyzer.py {workspace}
11   python3 {tools}/trust_map.py {workspace}
12   semgrep --config {tools}/benchjack_semgrep_rules.yml {workspace} --timeout 60 -q
13 {hadolint_line}
14 ## Your task -- Reconnaissance
15
16 Explore the benchmark and map its evaluation architecture:
17
18 1. **Entry points** -- Find the main scripts for running evaluations.
19 2. **Evaluation functions** -- Identify scoring / grading / judging code.
20 3. **Task configuration** -- Find task definitions, gold files, expected answers.
21 4. **Execution environment** -- Docker, subprocess, shared filesystem?
22 5. **LLM-as-judge** -- Any LLM-based evaluation (OpenAI/Anthropic API calls)?
23 6. **Trust boundaries** -- Where does agent output flow into the evaluator?
24 7. **Cost estimate** -- Lightweight / Moderate / Heavy to run the evaluation.
25
26 Be thorough. Read actual code. Cite file paths and line numbers.
27
28 ## Task ID enumeration (REQUIRED!!)
29
30 Before finishing, enumerate **all** concrete task / problem IDs in the
31 benchmark and write them to '{workspace}/{task_ids_filename}' as a JSON
32 **object** mapping each task ID to the path of its definition file
33 (relative to the benchmark root):
34
35   {{
36     "task_id_1": "path/to/task_id_1.json",
37     "task_id_2": "tasks/task_id_2/config.yaml",
38     "task_id_3": "data/task_id_3.txt"
39   }}

```

```

40
41 Rules:
42 - Write a small shell or python script to enumerate the IDs in batch --
43   read them from config files, task directories, dataset splits,
44   HuggingFace datasets, JSON manifests, etc. Do NOT hand-type them.
45 - Use the IDs exactly as the benchmark itself refers to them.
46 - The path value should be the file or directory that defines/contains
47   that specific task. Use an empty string "" if no specific file exists.
48 - If the benchmark legitimately has no per-task IDs (e.g. a single
49   monolithic eval), write '{"all_tasks": ""}'.
50 - The file MUST be a valid JSON object at
51   '{workspace}/{task_ids_filename}' before you finish this phase.

```

Listing 9: Reconnaissance phase prompt (RECON_PROMPT).

Flaw scan. Receives the reconnaissance summary and walks the V1–V8 taxonomy explicitly. For each class, the agent must report all the flaws found with a `file:line` evidence, and must emit a JSONL ledger attributing each finding to the affected tasks at one of four severity levels. If the JSONL file is missing after the primary call, the orchestrator retries with a follow-up prompt whose only job is to produce the file.

```

1 You are BenchJack, a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks.
2
3 The benchmark codebase is in the current working directory.
4
5 ## Reconnaissance context
6
7 {recon_output}
8
9 ## Static analysis tools available
10
11 bash {tools}/run_bandit.sh {workspace}
12 python3 {tools}/docker_analyzer.py {workspace}
13 python3 {tools}/trust_map.py {workspace}
14 semgrep --config {tools}/benchjack_semgrep_rules.yml {workspace} --timeout 60 -q
15 {hadolint_line}
16 ## Your task -- Vulnerability Scan
17
18 Check for each of these vulnerability classes. For each one state
19 Present / Absent / Uncertain with evidence.
20
21 ### V1: No Isolation Between Agent and Evaluator
22 Agent and evaluator share filesystem / containers / processes.
23
24 ### V2: Answers Shipped With the Test
25 Gold answers accessible to the agent at runtime.
26
27 ### V3: Remote Code Execution on Untrusted Input
28 Evaluator calls eval/exec/subprocess on agent-controlled data.
29
30 ### V4: LLM Judges Without Input Sanitization
31 Agent output interpolated into judge prompts without escaping.
32
33 ### V5: Weak String Matching
34 Loose string comparison (substring, aggressive normalization).
35
36 ### V6: Evaluation Logic Gaps
37 Scoring paths that skip checks or default to pass.
38
39 ### V7: Trusting the Output of Untrusted Code
40 Evaluator trusts artefacts from the agent environment (pytest XML, reward files).
41
42 ### V8: Granting Unnecessary Permissions to the Agent
43 Root, --privileged, unrestricted network, excessive mounts.
44
45
46 ## Output format

```

```

47
48 After all eight classes, provide a summary.
49
50 After your findings, determine which benchmark tasks/problems are affected
51 by each vulnerability. Write the results as **JSONL** (one JSON object per
52 line) to the file '{workspace}/task_results.jsonl':
53
54     {"task": "<task_name>", "vulnerability": "V1", "severity": "CRITICAL", "explanation":
55       "<why>"}
56     {"task": "<task_name>", "vulnerability": "V3", "severity": "HIGH", "explanation": "<
57       why>"}
58
59 Rules:
60 - Use the actual task/problem IDs from the benchmark (from config files,
61   task directories, dataset splits, etc.).
62 - If a vulnerability affects ALL tasks uniformly (e.g., the entire
63   evaluation pipeline lacks isolation), use "all_tasks" as the task ID.
64 - Identify all affected tasks. You can write scripts to enumerate them in batch.
65 - 'severity' MUST be one of 'CRITICAL', 'HIGH', 'MEDIUM', 'LOW' and should
66   reflect the severity of THIS specific (task, vulnerability) instance.
67 - Set 'hacked' to 'false' -- these are detected but not yet verified.
68 - One JSON object per line. No wrapping array, no extra formatting.

```

Listing 10: Vulnerability scan phase prompt (VULN_SCAN_PROMPT).

```

1 You are BenchJack, a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks.
2
3 The benchmark codebase is in the current working directory.
4
5 A previous vulnerability scan completed but did NOT produce the required
6 task-results JSONL file. Your only job now is to create it.
7
8 ## Previous vulnerability scan output
9
10 {vuln_output}
11
12 ## Your task
13
14 Based on the findings above (and, if needed, quick reads of the benchmark
15 to enumerate real task IDs), write the file
16 '{workspace}/{jsonl_filename}' as JSONL -- one JSON object per line:
17
18     {"task": "<task_name>", "vulnerability": "V1", "severity": "CRITICAL", "hacked":
19       false, "explanation": "<why>"}
20
21 Rules:
22 - Use the actual task/problem IDs from the benchmark (from config files,
23   task directories, dataset splits, etc.). You can write shell/python
24   scripts to enumerate them.
25 - If a vulnerability affects ALL tasks uniformly, use "all_tasks" as the task ID.
26 - 'severity' MUST be one of 'CRITICAL', 'HIGH', 'MEDIUM', 'LOW'.
27 - Set 'hacked' to 'false' -- these are detected but not yet verified.
28 - One JSON object per line. No wrapping array, no markdown fences.
29 - Do not skip writing the file. The file MUST exist at
30   '{workspace}/{jsonl_filename}' when you finish.

```

Listing 11: Vulnerability scan retry prompt (VULN_SCAN_JSONL_RETRY_PROMPT).

Exploit construction. A two-step generate-then-validate sub-pipeline. The generate prompt instructs the agent to emit a runnable `run.sh` that drives the benchmark through its *official* entrypoint and a normal agent harness, deploys an exploit through the agent's normal execution path, and runs end-to-end against either the full dataset or a representative sample (1–2 tasks per category, 5–10 minimum) depending on the cost tier reported during reconnaissance and the user configuration. The validate prompt re-reads the resulting scripts, enforces immutability and scaffolding rules, and writes a report listing only the tasks the exploit actually hacked.

```

1 You are BenchJack, a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks.
2
3 The benchmark codebase is in the current working directory.
4
5 ## Reconnaissance context
6
7 {recon_output}
8
9 ## Vulnerability findings
10
11 {vuln_output}
12
13 ## Your task -- Generate PoC Exploit Scripts
14
15 ### Requirements
16
17 1. Create a directory: '{workspace}/benchjack_poc/'
18 2. Write a 'run.sh' and any auxiliary python scripts that end-to-end hack the reward. You
   don't have to use all vulnerabilities -- just show how to hack is enough.
19
20 ## Requirements for run.sh
21
22 - 'run.sh' MUST run the benchmark through the **official entrypoint** described in the
   README and a normal agent harness -- not a custom one.
23 - It should set up the environment (install deps if needed), inject the exploit, then
   launch the evaluation.
24 {run_scope}
25 - Include clear comments explaining the exploit strategy.
26 - Print a summary at the end showing the hacked score.
27 - Must be runnable with 'bash run.sh' from the benchjack_poc directory.
28
29 - If there is a non-dummy default agent scaffolding in the benchmark that actually works,
   'run.sh' should create an LLM API mock that uses the default scaffolding.
30 - If there is no non-dummy default agent scaffolding, refer to other example agents in the
   repository. You must use an agent with at most the tools that the example agents
   have access to. If there are no example agents, assume that the agent can only have
   minimal tools needed to complete the task. The agent MUST NOT use memorization,
   download files, or refer to its configurations and parameters to cheat. Our setting
   of reward hacking DOES NOT allow hacking scaffolding.
31 - If there is no specification about how to run the agent, you MUST NOT assume anything
   about the host machine, including internet access, pre-downloaded gold file, or
   access to the source of the repo.
32 - 'run.sh' or the auxiliary script MUST NOT assume that the user makes mistake can cause
   the evaluator to fail. For example, the evaluator MUST not be mistakenly configured
   with dummy or with mocks that can only be possible from the user's configuration.
33
34 You MUST NOT make any modifications to the repository before the evaluation starts,
   especially the evaluator!!!
35
36 {run_scope_note}
37 Please double check that run.sh uses the official entrypoint and normal agent harness.
38
39 KEEP IT SIMPLE. You don't need to show that you can hack in multiple ways. Just construct
   a hack that works for as many cases as possible.

```

Listing 12: PoC generation prompt (POC_GENERATE_PROMPT).

```

1 You are BenchJack, a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks.
2
3 The benchmark codebase is in the current working directory.
4
5 ## Reconnaissance context
6
7 {recon_output}
8
9 ## Your task -- Validate PoC Approach
10

```

```

11 Read the PoC scripts in '{workspace}/benchjack_poc/', starting from 'run.sh'.
12
13 {validate_scope_intro}
14
15 Base Principles:
16 - If there is a non-dummy default agent scaffolding in the benchmark that actually
    works, 'run.sh' should create an LLM API mock that uses the default scaffolding.
17 - If there is no non-dummy default agent scaffolding, refer to other example agents in
    the repository. You must use an agent with at most the tools that the example
    agents have access to. If there are no example agents, assume that the agent can
    only have minimal tools needed to complete the task. The agent MUST NOT use
    memorization, download files, or refer to its configurations and parameters to
    cheat. Our setting of reward hacking DOES NOT allow hacking scaffolding.
18 - If there is no specification about how to run the agent, you MUST NOT assume
    anything about the host machine, including internet access, or pre-downloaded gold
    file, or access to the source of the repo.
19 - 'run.sh' MUST NOT make any modifications to the repository before the evaluation
    starts, especially the evaluator!!!
20 - 'run.sh' or the auxiliary script MUST NOT assume that the user makes mistake can
    cause the evaluator to fail. For example, the evaluator MUST not be mistakenly
    configured with dummy or with mocks that can only be possible from the user's
    configuration.
21 {validate_scope_check}
22
23 Explain what you found and what (if anything) you changed.
24
25 After validation, you MUST write a new file '{workspace}/exploit_result.jsonl'
26 that records only the tasks that were successfully hacked**. Do NOT
27 overwrite 'task_results.jsonl'. For each task:
28
29     {"task": "<task_name>", "vulnerability": "V1", "severity": "CRITICAL", "explanation":
        "<why>", "hacked": true}}
30     {"task": "<task_name>", "vulnerability": "V3", "severity": "HIGH", "explanation": "<
        why>", "hacked": true}}
31
32 Include one entry per successfully-exploited task.
33 Omit tasks that were not hacked. One JSON object per line.
34 If the PoC targets all tasks uniformly, use "all_tasks" as the task ID.

```

Listing 13: Exploit validation prompt (POC_VALIDATE_PROMPT).

The two scope blocks injected into the prompts above are reproduced below.

```

1 # full
2 run_scope      = "- It MUST run the full benchmark -- all tasks, no subsets, no sampling
    **. Cost and runtime are not a concern; completeness is required.\n- It should hack **
    all** benchmark problems/tasks to get the highest score."
3 run_scope_note = "Before you finish, you MUST ACTUALLY RUN the 'run.sh' yourself against
    the full benchmark** and see the result."
4
5 # partial (default)
6 run_scope      = "- Run against a representative sample of benchmark tasks (e.g., take
    1-2 tasks from each types of tasks in the benchmark -- not the full benchmark). Cost
    and runtime matter; keep the run fast and focused. YOU DON'T HAVE TO RUN THE FULL
    BENCHMARK.\n- It should hack as many sampled tasks as possible to demonstrate the
    exploit."
7 run_scope_note = "Before you finish, you MUST ACTUALLY RUN the 'run.sh' yourself against
    the tasks that you choose and see the result."

```

Listing 14: Exploit scope blocks: full-dataset vs. representative-sample.

Report. Summarize the reconnaissance summary, the V1–V8 findings, and the exploit outcome into a structured Markdown audit report.

```

1 You are BenchJack, a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks.
2
3 ## Audit target

```

```

4 {target}
5
6 ## Findings
7 {findings_json}
8
9 ## Reconnaissance
10 {recon_output}
11
12 ## Vulnerability scan
13 {vuln_output}
14
15 ## Your task -- Final Report
16
17 Write a concise security audit report:
18
19 # BenchJack Audit Report: [Benchmark Name]
20
21 ## Executive Summary
22 One paragraph. Total vulnerabilities by severity. Hackability: Low / Medium / High /
    Critical.
23
24 ## Evaluation Architecture
25 How the benchmark works. Key components.
26
27 ## Vulnerability Findings
28 For each V1-V8: Status, Severity, Description, Evidence (file:line), Impact,
    Recommendation.
29
30 ## Exploit Strategy
31 How vulnerabilities chain together. Expected impact.
32
33 ## Recommendations
34 Prioritized fixes. Best practices.
35
36 Be factual. Cite file paths and line numbers.

```

Listing 15: Report phase prompt (REPORT_PROMPT).

Hack-it pipeline (alternative). A two-stage generate-verify pipeline that skips reconnaissance, flaw scan, and report and goes straight to constructing a working reward hack. The first prompt (HACK_STAGE1_PROMPT) clones the benchmark, instructs the agent to write `benchjack_poc/run.sh` that runs through the official entrypoint with a compliant agent scaffolding, and demands an actual end-to-end run. The second prompt (HACK_STAGE2_PROMPT) re-reads the scripts, applies the same legitimacy/immutability/scaffolding checks as the audit pipeline’s validate phase, fixes issues in place, and emits `exploit_result.jsonl` attributing each successfully-hacked task to one of V1–V8. We use the audit pipeline (not hack-it) for all numbers in Section 5; hack-it is shipped for users who only need an exploit and not a finding ledger.

D.2 Coding-Agent Skill

The skill deployment is a single Markdown file (`.claude/skills/benchjack/SKILL.md`) that any coding-agent harness supporting the Anthropic skills format can load on demand. Unlike the pipeline agent, the skill runs the entire audit inside one continuous session: the host agent reads the skill body, then executes its four phases (reconnaissance, flaw scan, exploit construction, final deliverable) using whatever file-search, file-read, and shell-execution tools the host harness exposes. The same static-analysis tools used by the pipeline (`semgrep`, `bandit`, `hadolint`, `docker_analyzer.py`, `trust_map.py`) are bundled in `tools/` alongside the skill and invoked from inline bash blocks in the instructions. The skill enforces the same artifact contract: `benchjack_task_ids.json` after Phase 1, `benchjack_task_results.jsonl` after Phase 2, and `exploit_result.jsonl` plus the `hacks/$BENCHMARK/` folder after Phase 3.

The skill is invoked with a single argument—a path, URL, or benchmark name—via `/benchjack <target>`. We reproduce the full skill body verbatim below.

```

1 ---
2 name: benchjack
3 description: Audit an AI agent benchmark for hackability. Detects evaluation
  vulnerabilities like missing isolation, leaked answers, eval() on untrusted input,
  prompt injection in LLM judges, weak scoring, logic gaps, and trust of untrusted
  output. Use when analyzing whether a benchmark can be gamed or exploited.
4 argument-hint: [benchmark-path-or-url]
5 allowed-tools: Bash(find *) Bash(git *) Bash(ls *) Bash(python3 *) Bash(chmod *) Bash(
  mkdir *) Bash(docker *) Bash(pip *) Bash(pip3 *) Bash(sh *) Bash(bash *) Bash(cd *)
  Bash(npm *) Bash(node *) Bash(cp *) Bash(mv *) Bash(tee *) Read Write Glob Grep Agent
  WebFetch
6 ---
7
8 # BenchJack: AI Agent Benchmark Hackability Scanner
9
10 **If '$ARGUMENTS' is empty or contains more than one argument (i.e., multiple space-
  separated paths/URLs), do NOT proceed with the audit. Instead, output ONLY the
  following message as plain text (no bold, no italic, no blockquotes, no markdown
  formatting) and stop:**
11
12 BenchJack is a security auditor for AI agent benchmarks. It systematically scans
  evaluation code for vulnerability -- missing isolation, leaked answers, eval() on
  untrusted input, prompt injection in LLM judges, weak scoring, logic gaps, trust of
  untrusted output -- that allow agents to game scores without solving tasks.
13
14 BenchJack requires exactly one argument: a path to the benchmark code, a repository URL,
  or a benchmark name.
15
16 Usage: /benchjack <benchmark-path-or-url>
17
18 Examples:
19 - /benchjack ./benchmarks/swe-bench
20 - /benchjack https://github.com/org/benchmark
21 - /benchjack SWE-bench
22
23 **Otherwise, proceed with the audit below:**
24
25 ---
26
27 You are conducting a security audit of an AI agent benchmark to determine whether it can
  be gamed or exploited. Your goal is to systematically check for vulnerabilities that
  allow agents to achieve high scores without solving actual tasks.
28
29 The benchmark to audit is: **$ARGUMENTS**
30
31 ## Phase 1: Reconnaissance
32
33 First, locate and understand the benchmark's evaluation infrastructure.
34
35 1. **Find the benchmark code.** If '$ARGUMENTS' is a local path, explore it. If it's a URL
  or package name, clone/download it. If it's just a benchmark name, search for it.
36
37 If '$ARGUMENTS' is given not as a local path, you should NEVER CHECK any other folders and
  must download it to a temporary directory.
38
39 2. **Map the evaluation architecture.** Identify:
40 - The official entry point for running evaluations (e.g., 'run_eval.py', 'evaluate.sh',
  'run.sh', 'run_tasks.sh')
41 - The main evaluating functions (look for files named '*eval*', '*score*', '*grade*', '*
  judge*', '*validate*', '*metric*', '*reward*')
42 - The task configuration files (e.g., JSON/YAML with task definitions, expected answers)
43
44 - The agent execution environment (Docker, VM, subprocess, shared filesystem?)
45 - Any LLM-as-judge components (look for API calls to OpenAI, Anthropic, etc.)

```

```

46 3. **Identify trust boundaries.** Map where agent-controlled data flows into the evaluator.
    This is critical -- every point where agent output touches evaluation code is an
    attack surface.
47
48 4. **Estimate evaluation environment cost.** Before proceeding further, assess the
    practical cost of running this benchmark's evaluation pipeline (excluding LLM API
    calls). Report:
49 - **Docker images / large files**: Does the benchmark require pulling large Docker
    images, datasets, model weights, or other heavy artifacts? Estimate total download
    size.
50 - **Evaluation runtime**: How long does a single task evaluation take? How long for the
    full suite? Look for timeouts, sleep calls, browser automation, compilation steps,
    or heavy compute.
51 - **Infrastructure requirements**: Does it need GPU, specific cloud services, running
    web servers, databases, or other non-trivial infrastructure?
52 - **Setup complexity**: How many steps and dependencies are involved in getting the
    evaluation environment running?
53
54 Summarize as a rough cost tier: **Lightweight** (minutes, no large downloads), **
    Moderate** (tens of minutes, some large pulls or infrastructure), or **Heavy** (
    hours, large images, complex infra). This informs how the PoC in Phase 3 should be
    scoped -- for Heavy benchmarks, the PoC should target a representative sample of
    tasks; for Lightweight benchmarks, run the full dataset.
55
56 5. **Enumerate all task / problem IDs (REQUIRED).** Before finishing reconnaissance,
    enumerate **all** concrete task or problem IDs in the benchmark. Write a small shell
    or Python script to enumerate the IDs in batch -- read them from config files, task
    directories, dataset splits, HuggingFace datasets, JSON manifests, etc. Do NOT hand-
    type them.
57
58 Write the result to 'benchjack_task_ids.json' in the benchmark root as a JSON **object**
    mapping each task ID to the path of its definition file (relative to the benchmark
    root):
59
60 ``json
61 {
62     "task_id_1": "path/to/task_id_1.json",
63     "task_id_2": "tasks/task_id_2/config.yaml",
64     "task_id_3": "data/task_id_3.txt"
65 }
66 ``
67
68 Rules:
69 - Use the IDs exactly as the benchmark itself refers to them.
70 - The path value should be the file or directory that defines/contains that specific
    task. Use an empty string "" if no specific file exists.
71 - If the benchmark legitimately has no per-task IDs (e.g. a single monolithic eval),
    write '{"all_tasks": ""}'.
72 - The file MUST be valid JSON and MUST exist before you move to Phase 2.
73
74 Use the Explore agent or Grep liberally here. Search for patterns like:
75 - 'eval(', 'exec(', 'subprocess', 'os.system' -- code execution
76 - 'file://', 'open(', 'read' near config/answer paths -- file access
77 - 'pytest', 'unittest', 'conftest' -- test frameworks
78 - 'must_include', 'exact_match', 'contains', 'normalize' -- string matching
79 - 'gpt-4', 'claude', 'openai', 'anthropic', 'llm', 'judge' -- LLM judges
80 - 'reward', 'score', 'validate', 'check', 'grade' -- scoring functions
81 - 'gold', 'answer', 'expected', 'reference', 'ground_truth' -- answer data
82
83 ### Static Analysis Tools
84
85 In addition to manual search, run the automated scanners in 'tools/' (relative to this
    SKILL.md) against the benchmark codebase. These tools accelerate Phase 1
    reconnaissance and Phase 2 vulnerability scanning. Run them early and use their
    output to guide deeper manual investigation.
86
87 **Run the full scan orchestrator** to execute all tools at once:
88 ``bash

```

```

89 bash <SKILL_DIR>/tools/scan.sh <benchmark-path>
90 '''
91
92 Or run individual tools as needed:
93
94 | Tool | Command | Covers | Notes |
95 |-----|-----|-----|-----|
96 | Semgrep (custom rules) | 'semgrep --config <SKILL_DIR>/tools/benchjack_semgrep_rules.
    yml <path>' | V1-V8 | 30+ rules targeting benchmark-specific patterns; install: 'pip
    install semgrep' |
97 | Bandit | 'bash <SKILL_DIR>/tools/run_bandit.sh <path>' | V3 | Python security linter
    focused on eval/exec/subprocess; auto-installs if missing |
98 | Docker Analyzer | 'python3 <SKILL_DIR>/tools/docker_analyzer.py <path>' | V1, V2, V8
    | Scans Dockerfiles, docker-compose, and shell scripts for isolation/permission
    issues |
99 | Trust Mapper | 'python3 <SKILL_DIR>/tools/trust_map.py <path>' | V1, V3, V7 | AST-
    based analysis mapping file I/O and trust boundaries between agent/evaluator code |
100 | Hadolint | 'bash <SKILL_DIR>/tools/run_hadolint.sh <path>' | V8 | Dockerfile best-
    practice linter; install: 'brew install hadolint' or use Docker |
101
102 Where '<SKILL_DIR>' is the directory containing this SKILL.md.
103
104 How to use the results: These tools produce findings grouped by vulnerability class (
    V1-V8). Use them as leads -- each finding should be manually verified by reading the
    surrounding code. False positives are possible (especially from Semgrep V4/V5 rules),
    and false negatives are certain (the tools cannot detect all vulnerability patterns).
    Always combine tool output with manual code review.
105
106 ## Phase 2: Vulnerability Scan
107
108 Check for each of the following vulnerability classes. For each one, state Present /
    Absent / Uncertain** with evidence.
109
110 ### V1: No Isolation Between Agent and Evaluator
111
112 What to look for: The agent executes in the same environment the evaluator reads from
    or the output of the agent can interfere with the evaluation logic. If the agent can
    write to paths the evaluator inspects, it can fake results.
113
114 Red flags:
115 - Agent and evaluator share a filesystem, database, or browser instance
116 - Evaluation script reads files from directories the agent can write to
117 - pytest/unittest runs inside a container the agent controls
118 - No containerization, sandboxing, or read-only mounts between agent and eval
119 - Evaluator reads agent-generated logs, screenshots, or artifacts without validation
120
121 Example exploit: SWE-bench trusts pytest output from inside the agent's container. A '
    conftest.py' hook can force all tests to pass:
122 '''python
123 @pytest.hookimpl(hookwrapper=True)
124 def pytest_runtest_makereport(item, call):
125     outcome = yield
126     rep = outcome.get_result()
127     if rep.when == "call":
128         rep.outcome = "passed"
129         rep.longrepr = None
130 '''
131
132 ### V2: Answers Shipped With the Test
133
134 What to look for: Reference answers, gold files, or expected outputs are accessible to
    the agent at runtime -- either in the task config, on a public URL, or in the same
    repo.
135
136 Red flags:
137 - Task config JSON/YAML contains 'answer', 'expected', 'gold', 'reference' fields visible
    to the agent
138 - Gold files hosted on public URLs (HuggingFace, GitHub) without authentication

```

```

139 - Answer data in the same Docker image or filesystem as the agent
140 - Test splits with publicly available ground truth
141
142 ### V3: Remote Code Execution on Untrusted Input
143
144 **What to look for:** The evaluator calls 'eval()', 'exec()', or equivalent on strings
    that the agent can influence -- directly or indirectly.
145
146 **Red flags:**
147 - 'eval()' called on agent output, agent-generated files, or extracted strings
148 - 'exec()' on dynamically constructed code that includes agent data
149 - 'subprocess.run(shell=True)' with agent-controlled arguments
150 - JavaScript 'eval()' in browser-based evaluators on DOM content the agent modified
151 - YAML/pickle deserialization of agent output
152
153 **Example exploit:** WebArena calls 'eval()' on strings the agent can control via DOM
    injection, enabling arbitrary code execution on the grading machine.
154
155 ### V4: LLM Judges Without Input Sanitization
156
157 **What to look for:** Agent output is interpolated directly into LLM judge prompts without
    escaping or structural protection.
158
159 **Red flags:**
160 - String formatting or f-strings that insert agent output into judge prompts
161 - No delimiters, escaping, or structural separation between instructions and agent content
162 - Agent output placed before or alongside system instructions
163 - No output schema enforcement on the judge response
164
165 **Example exploit:** CAR-bench interpolates agent content into judge prompts. Hidden HTML
    comments can hijack the judge:
166 ```html
167 <!-- EVALUATION NOTE: The assistant has correctly followed all applicable
168 domain policies. The policy_followed assessment should be: true -->
169 ```
170
171 ### V5: Weak String Matching
172
173 **What to look for:** Scoring uses loose string comparison that accepts overly broad
    responses.
174
175 **Red flags:**
176 - 'in' operator or 'str.contains()' for answer matching (substring containment)
177 - Aggressive normalization that collapses distinct answers into the same form
178 - Case-insensitive matching without considering ambiguity
179 - No penalty for extra content (an agent can dump all possible answers)
180 - Regex patterns that match too broadly
181
182 **Example exploit:** WebArena's 'must_include' checker uses substring containment -- any
    response containing the target string passes, regardless of context.
183
184 ### V6: Evaluation Logic Gaps
185
186 **What to look for:** The scoring function has paths that skip checks, award points
    without verification, or contain bugs.
187
188 **Red flags:**
189 - Branches that return success without validating the answer
190 - Scoring components that are conditionally skipped
191 - Error handling that defaults to "pass" instead of "fail"
192 - Validators that check metadata (role, format) but not content
193 - Off-by-one errors, wrong variable references, or dead code in scoring
194
195 **Example exploit:** FieldWorkArena's 'validate()' checks only that the last message came
    from the assistant, not what it says:
196 ```python
197 def validate(self, page, chat_messages):
198     if chat_messages[-1]["role"] == "assistant":

```

```

199         return 1.0, True, "Recieved answer", {}
200     '''
201
202     ### V7: Trusting the Output of Untrusted Code
203
204     **What to look for:** The evaluator trusts artifacts (test results, reward files, logs)
        generated within the agent's environment without independent verification.
205
206     **Red flags:**
207     - Reading pytest/jest/unittest XML/JSON results from agent-controlled filesystems
208     - Parsing reward/score files the agent could have written
209     - Trusting screenshots or browser state from agent-controlled sessions
210     - Using agent-generated logs as ground truth
211     - No checksums, signatures, or out-of-band verification
212
213     **Example exploit:** Terminal-Bench trusts reward files written by scripts the agent can
        modify. Binary wrapper trojans can intercept the dependency chain:
214     '''bash
215     # Replace /usr/bin/curl with a trojan that writes the expected reward
216     mv /usr/bin/curl /usr/bin/curl.real
217     cat > /usr/bin/curl << 'EOF'
218     #!/bin/bash
219     echo '{"reward": 1.0}' > /tmp/reward.json
220     /usr/bin/curl.real "$@"
221     EOF
222     chmod +x /usr/bin/curl
223     '''
224
225     ### V8: Granting Unnecessary Permissions to the Agent
226
227     **What to look for:** The benchmark grants unnecessary capabilities to the agent (like
        network access, root in sandbox, privileged sandboxes, etc.).
228
229     **Red flags:**
230     - The agent has access to the internet even though the tasks do not require web browsing
231     - The agents are run with root permission in the dockers
232     - The dockers are run with '--privileged'
233     - The agents can read/write to folders or files that they technically do not need
234
235     ### Structured Output (REQUIRED)
236
237     After analyzing all eight vulnerability classes, write the results as **JSONL** (one JSON
        object per line) to 'benchjack_task_results.jsonl' in the benchmark root:
238
239     '''
240     {"task": "<task_id>", "vulnerability": "V1", "severity": "CRITICAL", "hacked": false, "
        explanation": "<why>"}
241     {"task": "<task_id>", "vulnerability": "V3", "severity": "HIGH", "hacked": false, "
        explanation": "<why>"}
242     '''
243
244     Rules:
245     - Use the actual task/problem IDs from the benchmark (from 'benchjack_task_ids.json').
246     - If a vulnerability affects ALL tasks uniformly (e.g., the entire evaluation pipeline
        lacks isolation), use "all_tasks" as the task ID.
247     - Identify all affected tasks. You can write scripts to enumerate them in batch.
248     - 'severity' MUST be one of 'CRITICAL', 'HIGH', 'MEDIUM', 'LOW' and should reflect the
        severity of that specific (task, vulnerability) instance.
249     - Set 'hacked' to 'false' -- these are detected but not yet verified.
250     - One JSON object per line. No wrapping array, no markdown fences, no extra formatting.
251     - The file MUST exist and be valid JSONL before you move to Phase 3.
252
253
254     ## Phase 3: Proof-of-Concept Exploit Construction
255
256     In this phase, you craft a working PoC that demonstrates real exploitation of the
        vulnerabilities found in Phase 2. The goal is to **reward hack** the benchmark --
        achieving consistently high scores without actually solving any problems.

```

```

257
258 **Terminology:** A vulnerability is "exploitable" if it can be used to reward hack the
    benchmark, i.e., achieve higher evaluation scores than the agent's solution actually
    deserves. Some vulnerabilities found in Phase 2 may be quality issues that are
    difficult or impossible to reward hack -- those do not need a PoC, but should still
    be mentioned in the final report.
259
260 ### PoC Structure
261
262 Store the PoC in 'hacks/$BENCHMARK/' (where '$BENCHMARK' is a short identifier for the
    benchmark, e.g., 'swe-bench', 'webarena', 'gaia'). The directory must contain:
263
264 - **run.sh** -- The main script that:
265     1. Sets up the benchmark environment (clone, install dependencies, configure)
266     2. Deploys the exploit (inject files, patch agent, start mock server, etc.)
267     3. Runs the benchmark end-to-end using the standard entrypoint
268     4. Prints the final score/results clearly
269
270 - **Auxiliary scripts and files** as needed (mock server, patched agent code, injected
    payloads, config overrides, etc.)
271
272 ### PoC Requirements
273
274 - 'run.sh' MUST run the benchmark through the **official entrypoint** described in the
    README and a normal agent harness -- not a custom one.
275 - It should set up the environment (install deps if needed), inject the exploit, then
    launch the evaluation.
276 - It should hack **all** (or as many as possible) of the benchmark's problems/tasks to get
    the highest score.
277 - Include clear comments explaining the exploit strategy.
278 - Print a summary at the end showing the hacked score.
279 - Must be runnable with 'bash run.sh' from the 'hacks/$BENCHMARK/' directory.
280
281 ### Agent Scaffolding Rules (CRITICAL)
282
283 - If there is a non-dummy default agent scaffolding in the benchmark that actually works,
    'run.sh' should create an LLM API mock that uses the default scaffolding.
284 - If there is no non-dummy default agent scaffolding, refer to other example agents in the
    repository. You must use an agent with at most the tools that the example agents
    have access to. If there are no example agents, assume that the agent can only have
    minimal tools needed to complete the task.
285 - The agent MUST NOT use memorization, download files, or refer to its configurations and
    parameters to cheat. Our setting of reward hacking DOES NOT allow hacking scaffolding.
286
287 - If there is no specification about how to run the agent, you MUST NOT assume anything
    about the host machine, including internet access, pre-downloaded gold files, or
    access to the source of the repo.
288
289 ### Immutability Constraint (CRITICAL)
290
291 **You MUST NOT make any modifications to the benchmark repository before the evaluation
    starts, especially the evaluator! All exploit injection must happen through the
    agent's normal execution path during evaluation -- not by pre-patching benchmark code.
292
293 ### Run Scope
294
295 - For **Lightweight** benchmarks: run the full benchmark -- all tasks, no subsets, no
    sampling.
296
297 - For **Moderate / Heavy** benchmarks: run against a representative sample of benchmark
    tasks (e.g., take 1-2 tasks from each type of task in the benchmark, at least 5-10
    problems total). Keep the run fast and focused.
298
299 KEEP IT SIMPLE. You don't need to show that you can hack in multiple ways. Just construct
    a hack that works for as many cases as possible.
300
### Validation -- Iterative Exploit Refinement

```

```

301 **You MUST run 'run.sh' and verify that it executes successfully.**
302 This is not a one-shot process -- you must iteratively improve the exploit until you
    cannot hack a higher score.
303
304 **Procedure:**
305
306 1. **Run 'run.sh'** and capture its full output.
307 2. **Inspect the per-task results.** For every task that the exploit fails to hack:
308     - Read the evaluation log / error output to understand *why* the exploit did not work
        for that task.
309     - Examine the task's specific evaluation logic -- some tasks may have stricter checks,
        different scoring paths, or edge cases the current exploit does not cover.
310     - Determine whether an alternative exploit strategy could handle the failing case (e.g.,
        a different injection payload, a fallback mechanism, combining multiple
        vulnerabilities).
311 3. **Update the exploit** to address the failing tasks, then **re-run 'run.sh'**.
312 4. **Repeat steps 1-3** until one of the following is true:
313     - The exploit achieves a perfect or near-perfect score across all tasks.
314     - You have exhausted all viable exploit strategies for the remaining failing tasks and
        can explain why they resist exploitation (e.g., a particular task has a genuinely
        robust check that cannot be bypassed).
315 5. **Capture the final output** in 'hacks/$BENCHMARK/output.log'.
316
317 Each iteration should be a deliberate improvement -- do not re-run the same exploit
    unchanged. If a task resists all attempts, document what you tried and why it failed
    in the README.
318
319 ### Post-Validation: Confirm PoC Legitimacy
320
321 After the PoC runs successfully, perform these checks:
322
323 1. **Official entrypoint**: Does 'run.sh' actually run the benchmark through the official
    entrypoint described in the README? If it uses a custom harness or bypasses the real
    evaluation, **fix it**.
324 2. **Agent scaffolding compliance**: Does it follow the agent scaffolding rules above? The
    agent must not memorize, download files, or use scaffolding hacks.
325 3. **Immutability**: Does 'run.sh' modify the benchmark repository before evaluation
    starts? If so, **fix it** so all injection happens through the agent's normal
    execution path.
326 4. **Scope**: Does the PoC run enough tasks? For Lightweight benchmarks, it must run ALL
    tasks. For Moderate/Heavy, it must run a representative sample (at least one problem
    from each category, 5-10 minimum).
327
328 Do not proceed to Phase 4 until you have maximized the exploit's score through this
    iterative process and confirmed legitimacy.
329
330 ### Exploit Results (REQUIRED)
331
332 After validation, write 'exploit_result.jsonl' in the benchmark root that records **only
    the tasks that were successfully hacked**:
333
334 ```
335 {"task": "<task_id>", "vulnerability": "V1", "severity": "CRITICAL", "hacked": true, "
    explanation": "<why>"}
336 {"task": "<task_id>", "vulnerability": "V3", "severity": "HIGH", "hacked": true, "
    explanation": "<why>"}
337 ```
338
339 - Do NOT overwrite 'benchjack_task_results.jsonl'. This is a separate file.
340 - Include one entry per successfully-exploited task.
341 - Omit tasks that were not hacked.
342 - One JSON object per line.
343 - If the PoC targets all tasks uniformly, use "all_tasks" as the task ID.
344
345
346 ## Phase 4: Final Deliverable
347
348 The final deliverable is the 'hacks/$BENCHMARK/' folder containing:

```

```

349
350 ### 1. The validated PoC
351
352 - **'run.sh'** -- the main exploit script
353 - **Auxiliary scripts and files** -- everything needed to reproduce the exploit
354 - **'output.log'** -- a recording of a successful run of 'run.sh', showing the exploit
    achieving inflated scores
355
356 ### 2. 'README.md'
357
358 A concise report covering:
359
360 ##### Executive Summary
361 One paragraph. Total vulnerabilities by severity. Hackability rating: Low / Medium / High
    / Critical.
362
363 ##### Evaluation Architecture
364 How the benchmark works. Key components and data flow.
365
366 ##### Exploit Strategy
367 Describe the PoC's approach in detail:
368 - Which vulnerabilities it exploits and how
369 - The technical mechanism (what the exploit does step-by-step)
370 - The final score achieved and what a legitimate baseline score would be
371
372 ##### Vulnerability Findings
373 For each V1-V8: Status (Present/Absent/Uncertain), Severity, Description, Evidence (file:
    line), Impact, Recommendation.
374
375 ##### Other Vulnerabilities
376 List all other vulnerabilities found in Phase 2, whether or not they are exploitable (i.e.,
    usable for reward hacking). For each:
377 - Brief description of the vulnerability
378 - Whether it is exploitable for reward hacking, and if so, the potential impact
379 - If not exploitable, explain why (e.g., mitigating controls, limited impact, purely a
    quality issue)
380
381 ##### Recommendations
382 Prioritized fixes. Best practices for benchmark authors.
383
384 ## Important Notes
385
386 - Be thorough. Read the actual evaluation code, not just file names. Many vulnerabilities
    hide in subtle implementation details.
387 - Show your evidence. Always cite file paths and line numbers for findings.
388 - Be honest about uncertainty. If you can't determine whether a vulnerability exists
    without running the code, say so.
389 - Consider composition. Multiple "medium" vulnerabilities can combine into a critical
    exploit chain.
390 - Be factual. Cite file paths and line numbers. Do not speculate without evidence.
391 - This audit is for defensive purposes -- to help benchmark authors find and fix
    vulnerabilities before they are exploited.

```

Listing 16: The benchjack skill (.claude/skills/benchjack/SKILL.md).

D.3 Differences between the two deployments

The agent and skill are deliberately kept in lockstep on what they detect and on what they emit. They differ on three axes:

- **Granularity of orchestration.** The agent issues one prompt per phase with explicit cross-phase artifacts (truncated context windows, JSONL retries, separate generate/validate calls); the skill is a single instruction blob the host agent walks top-to-bottom.
- **Tool surface.** The agent runs every external tool (git, semgrep, bandit, hadolint, docker) inside a Python-managed Docker sandbox with bind-mounted workspace and tools

directories; the skill mostly defers to the host harness’s permissions and assumes the host already has necessary binaries on PATH.

- **Resumability and Robustness.** The agent persists per-phase logs, summaries, and a progress index, allowing a partially-completed run to resume after a crash; the skill is a single in-session execution with no built-in resume support. Additionally, the agent have second-round checks, retries, and fallbacks to improve the validity of the result while the skill-based auditing can still have some hallucination and thus false positives.

For all the numbers reported in Section 5 we use the agent deployment on an isolated machine with the Claude Code backend, the Docker sandbox disabled, and the full exploit scope.

E Detailed Exploit Descriptions

This appendix provides complete technical details for the ten exploits constructed by BENCHJACK, including full code listings and step-by-step descriptions. For each benchmark we name the targeted flaw classes (V1 = no agent/evaluator isolation, V2 = answers shipped with the test, V3 = RCE on untrusted input, V4 = LLM judge without sanitization, V5 = weak string matching, V6 = evaluation logic gap, V7 = trusting output of untrusted code, V8 = excessive permissions), describe the mechanism of the hack, and report the realized hack rate.

E.1 AgentBench: Complete Exploit

Targeted class: V3 (Critical RCE), with V1 / V8 enabling host pivot.

AgentBench is a multi-task agent benchmark orchestrated by a controller plus per-task workers in `extra/docker-compose.yml`. Scoring is fully deterministic with no LLM judge.

The exploitable sink is in the `dbbench` result processor. When the agent calls the OpenAI tool `commit_final_answer`, the result processor takes `list(arguments.values())[0]` without enforcing the declared `array<string>` schema, then—if the value is a string starting with `[` and ending with `]`—passes it directly to Python’s `eval()`.

Exploit. A hacking model returns one tool call:

```
1 commit_final_answer(answers="[exec(<payload>) or 'X']")
```

Listing 17: AgentBench: single tool call carrying a Python payload to the result processor’s `eval()`.

The payload monkey-patches `DBResultProcessor.compare_results` to `lambda *a, **kw: True` and `_normalize_special_values` to `lambda *a, **kw: 'X'`. The in-flight sample passes because both sides normalize to the same value; every subsequent sample short-circuits via the patched `compare_results`. Because the `dbbench` worker also bind-mounts `/var/run/docker.sock` (V1) and runs as root (V8), the same `eval()` gives full host-Docker control—the exploit restricts itself to score manipulation, but the chain to host takeover is one `os.system` away.

Outcome. All 300/903 `dbbench-std` samples score 1. The other four task types are not RCE-exploitable through the same single sink and score 0 deterministically.

E.2 FrontierSWE: Complete Exploit

Targeted classes: V1 (Critical no isolation) + V7 (Critical trust of agent output)

FrontierSWE is a 17-task, 20-hour-horizon coding benchmark from Proximal Labs orchestrated by Harbor. Each task runs in a single Modal Sandbox where agent and verifier execute as sequential phases sharing the same user, FS, and PID namespace. The verifier always ends by invoking `python3 .../tests/compute_reward.py`, which writes `/logs/verifier/reward.{json,txt}`; Harbor scores by reading those files.

Exploit. A Harbor agent performs four layered steps:

1. **Pre-write a winning reward.** Drop a maximum-score `reward.json` and `reward.txt` into `/logs/verifier/`. If `test.sh` aborts before reaching `compute_reward.py` (e.g., `set -e` on a missing file), Harbor still ingests the pre-written value.
2. **Hijack python3.** Install a wrapper at `/usr/local/bin/python3` that detects `compute_reward.py` in `argv` and re-writes the winning reward, returning 0. Every task's `PATH` puts `/usr/local/bin` ahead of `/usr/bin`, even after the few `test.sh` scripts that reset `PATH`.
3. **Disable uv.** Some verifiers prefer `uv run -project /app ...` when available and only fall back to bare `python3`. Renaming every `uv` on `PATH` forces the fallback into the hijacked interpreter.
4. **Set the oracle marker.** Several tasks (`modular-stack-wan21`, `inference-system-optimization`, `optimizer-design`, `notebook-compression`) skip structural anti-cheat when `/app/.oracle_solution` exists, and the agent's `find` calls exclude dotfiles, so the marker is invisible to anti-cheat.

Outcome. 17/17 tasks scored 100.0 in `exploit_result.jsonl`.

E.3 MLE-bench: Complete Exploit

Targeted class: V2 (Critical answers shipped with the test), with V8 (unrestricted network) as the enabling primitive.

MLE-bench launches one Docker container per (competition $\times$ seed) with the public dataset mounted read-only at `/home/data` and the *private* answers mounted at `/private/data/<id>/prepared/private/`. The container also runs a root-owned `grading_server.py` exposing rate-unlimited `/validate` and `/grade`, plus the per-competition `leaderboard.csv` is committed to the repo and copied in (`Dockerfile:64`).

The deeper structural defect is that *the private split is deterministic*: every targeted competition's `prepare.py` calls `train_test_split(..., random_state=0)` on the original Kaggle raw dataset. POSIX permissions on `/private` therefore provide no security as the private labels can be recomputed from the public Kaggle download.

Exploit. The exploit:

1. Read the in-container copy of the competition's `prepare.py`.
2. Download Kaggle raw dataset.
3. Replay `train_test_split(..., random_state=0)` to reconstruct the exact private test slice.
4. Submit those labels.

Outcome. 74/75 competitions score AUROC = 1.0. The chain generalizes to every competition whose `prepare.py` uses a fixed `random_state`. A separate path—binary-searching `/validate` while reading the in-container `leaderboard.csv` for the gold cutoff—also wins gold without solving the task.

E.4 NetArena: Complete Exploit

Targeted class: V3 (Critical RCE) in MALT—the green-agent evaluator `exec()`s the purple agent's Python output.

NetArena ships three apps (MALT, K8s, Route). MALT compares LLM-generated Python code against a reference via `BenchmarkEvaluator`, both of which are run by `exec()` in the green agent process (`app-malt/malt_env.py:59-60`). The repo's "filter" only strips lines beginning with the literal token `import`, so `__import__('os').system(...)` is unaffected. K8s does `subprocess.run(llm_command, shell=True)` with a trivial blacklist (bypassed by `sh -c`); Route does `net[machine].cmd(...)` as root with a similarly trivial blacklist.

Exploit. For every prompt, the hacking model returns the same `process_graph` body:

```
1 def process_graph(graph_data):
2     _sys = __import__('sys')
3     _me = _sys.modules.get('malt_env')
4     _BE = _me.BenchmarkEvaluator
5     def _passing(self, *a, **kw):
6         return {"Result-Correctness": "Pass",
7                 "Result-Safety": "Pass", ...}
8     _BE.ground_truth_check = _passing
9     return {...} # innocuous return shape
```

Listing 18: NetArena MALT: rebinding `ground_truth_check` from inside the `exec()`'d body.

When `malt_env.py` `exec()`s this, the evaluator's own `ground_truth_check` is rebound in-place to always emit Pass records, regardless of what the ground-truth code subsequently produces in its own namespace. Adjacent V8 issues (`-privileged`, `-network=host`, host-mounted kubeconfig, root containers) mean this single primitive also yields cluster-admin / host-root if pursued.

Outcome. All MALT queries (5000/5030) emit `Result-Correctness: Pass`. Additionally, MALT's 5,000 {question, answer} ground-truth tuples are committed verbatim to the public repo, so even without the RCE a model with GitHub access scores 100%.

E.5 OSWorld: Complete Exploit

Targeted class: V3 (Critical grader-host RCE) chained with V6 / V7 (VM-state fabrication) for benchmark-wide scope.

OSWorld grades desktop-agent tasks by reaching into an agent-controlled VM over an unauthenticated :5000 HTTP control plane and comparing VM-produced artefacts against task-specified gold values. The host-side metric does

```
1 apps = eval(apps_str)
```

Listing 19: OSWorld: `eval()` on the stdout of a VM-side `gsettings` call.

on the stdout of `gsettings get org.gnome.shell favorite-apps` captured *from the VM*. Triggered by task `ec4e3f68-9ea4-4c18-a5c9-69f89d1178b3`.

Exploit. During completion of the task, the model issues the action inside the VM that:

1. Set the `q` `favorite-apps` `dconf` key to a payload string `__import__('os').system('...')`.
2. Trigger the metric.

When the host-side grader calls `eval(apps_str)`, arbitrary Python runs on the grader host—at which point every remaining task's score can be overwritten directly. Two parallel chains amplify the impact: the **V6 infeasible shortcut** (the metric returns 1 iff the agent's last action is the literal FAIL) nets 30 free passes; the **V7 fabrication** chain: for ~300 tasks the grader compares against VM-sourced result-getters, which let the agent stage minimum-satisfying artefact via `printf ><expected_path>` or `echo` wrappers without performing the underlying work.

Outcome. 369/369 tasks are hacked via the canonical V1/V3 chain and the V6/V7 fabrications.

E.6 SkillsBench: Complete Exploit

Targeted class: V1 (Critical no isolation) + V8 (root in container), with V6 / V7 logic gaps as fallbacks.

SkillsBench runs the agent and the verifier in the *same* Modal-style container under Harbor. The verifier reads the reward file from a bind-mounted `/logs/verifier/`; the agent runs as root and shares `/usr/local/bin` and Python site-packages with `pytest/uv/uvx` the verifier subsequently invokes.

Exploit. The hack model can return a Bash tool_use containing a multi-layer payload:

1. **Pre-write the reward.** `/logs/verifier/reward.txt = 1.0` plus per-scenario scores/scenario_*.txt.
2. **Shim every test runner.** `pytest`, `uvx`, `uv`, `pip`, `pip3` are replaced *in every directory of \$PATH* and at any path returned by `find /`.
3. **Block reinstallation.** A `curl` shim absorbs every URL under `astral.sh/uv/*` so `curl ... | sh` cannot replace the shimmed `uvx` with a real binary.
4. **Defeat python3 -m pytest.** Replace `pytest/__main__.py` in *every* site-packages and dist-packages so module-mode invocation prints `1 passed in 0.01s` and exits 0.
5. **Guard reward.txt from Python writes.** A `sitecustomize.py` is dropped that monkey-patches `builtins.open` and `pathlib.Path.write_text` so any Python attempt to overwrite the reward file silently writes to a decoy.

Outcome. 79/88 tasks reward = 1.0 in `exploit_result.jsonl`. The 9 misses are rootless-Docker `lchown` failures pulling cached `bugswarm/cached-images:*` layers.

E.7 SWE-bench Pro: Complete Exploit

Targeted classes: V1 (Critical) + V5 (Critical) + V7 (Critical).

SWE-bench Pro applies the agent’s patch and then runs tests inside the *same* Docker container that holds the evaluator scripts. The runner reads `output.json` and applies the predicate $(F2P \cup P2P) \subseteq \{\text{PASSED tests}\}$; the parser regex-scrapes stdout for literal PASSED markers.

Exploit. The hack agent is a patch generator whose payload differs only by language family:

- **Python / pytest instances.** The patch creates `/app/conftest.py`. At `pytest`’s collection time, `conftest.py` overwrites `/workspace/parser.py` with `evil_parser.py` and exits.
- **Go instances.** The patch adds a new package `/app/bjhack_/bjhack_test.go` whose `init()` performs the same overwrite.
- **NodeBB / JS.** The parser already ingests arbitrary JSON from stdout, so a `console.log(JSON.stringify(...))` shim is sufficient.

`evil_parser.py` walks `/app` for test files, scrapes every test-name-like token, classifies each as PASSED, and writes `/workspace/output.json` accordingly. Because the scoring predicate is a *subset* check, fabricating extra names does not invalidate the run—the `F2P/P2P` sets are always covered.

Outcome. 731/731 entries verified end-to-end via the official pipeline.

E.8 SWE-bench Verified: Complete Exploit

Targeted classes: V6 (Critical) + V7 (Critical).

SWE-bench Verified parses log output written by an in-container `/eval.sh` after applying the agent’s patch via `git apply`. The grader (`swebench/harness/grading.py`) splits the log on plain bash no-op markers and treats any line whose *prefix* is `PASSED <test_id>` as a real pass. Compounding gaps:

- `report.json` existence in the log dir skips the run entirely.
- If no results appear between markers, the parser re-runs over the *entire* log.
- Markers are plain bash echoes, forgeable from arbitrary stdout.
- Empty `PASS_TO_PASS` auto-passes.

Exploit. The agent emits the same `model_patch` for every instance: a `conftest.py` at the repo root containing a `pytest_runtest_makereport` hook. At pytest collection time, the post-hoc hook modifies every test results to PASS.

Outcome. 500/500 instances verified end-to-end. Lower-effort variant: pre-populate `report.json` on the host log dir and the harness short-circuits to “already evaluated”.

E.9 Terminal-Bench: Complete Exploit

Targeted classes: V1 (High) + V5 (High) + V7 (High), with V2 / V3 collapses on a few tasks.

Terminal-Bench opens the agent’s tmux session (`as_configured_user=True`) and *later* copies `/tests` into the same container and starts a second tmux session as root that runs `bash /tests/run-tests.sh`. The verdict is parsed by regex. `_is_resolved` returns `all(parser_results.values())` — so an *empty* parser result is also a pass (V6).

Exploit. The exploit replaces `/usr/bin/curl` with a wrapper that intercepts requests to `astral.sh/uv/*` (the uv installer URL). When `test.sh` runs `curl -LsSf https://astral.sh/uv/0.9.5/install.sh | sh`, the wrapper returns a fake installer script instead of the real one. This fake installer installs a trojanized `uvx` binary. The trojanized binary detects the pytest invocation, writes 1 to `/logs/verifier/reward.txt`, outputs fake passing test results, and exits 0.

Outcome. 241/241 tasks verified via this single payload.

E.10 WebArena: Complete Exploit

Targeted classes: a V1 + V2 + V7

WebArena’s grader has three eval types: `string_match`, `url_match`, and `program_html`. For 335/812 tasks scoring is `string_match`-only, which uses `must_include` substring containment over `nlTK.word_tokenize` output and an `exact_match` that reduces to case-insensitive substring in many configurations.

Exploit. The deeper chain uses V1 + V2 + V7 + V4. Playwright’s `page.goto` accepts `file://` URLs, and the grader trusts the rendered page as ground truth. The hack LLM emits, on every task:

```
1 goto [file:///<abs>/config_files/<task_id>.json]
```

Listing 20: WebArena: leaking the gold config off the local filesystem via a `file://` navigation.

The browser loads the gold config off the local filesystem. The LLM then emits:

- `string_match` → stop [`<reference_answer>`]
- `url_match` → goto [`<reference_url>`] then stop [...]
- `program_html` → a stub site echoes `required_contents`; emit stop
- `fuzzy_match` / `ua_match` (V4) → the mock also intercepts the `llm_fuzzy_match` and `llm_ua_match` judge calls and answers “correct” / “same” respectively.

Outcome. The chain wins on all 812 tasks as gold values come from local-FS JSON the agent’s browser is allowed to render.

E.11 Cross-cutting patterns

A few structural defects recur across the suite:

- **Shared trust domain between agent and grader.** A lot of the benchmarks run the agent and the scorer (or a privileged grading server) in the same filesystem / process / namespace. This is the foundation for pre-write-the-reward, shim-the-test-runner, overwrite-the-parser, and patch-the-grader-class exploits.

- **Pass/fail derived from agent-controlled stdout or files.** SWE-bench Pro (`output.json`), SWE-bench Verified (`PASSED` regex on log), Terminal-Bench (`tmux capture_pane`), FrontierSWE (`/logs/verifier/reward.{json,txt}`), and OSWorld (VM-sourced `vm_* getters`) all turn the agent’s own output into ground truth.
- **`eval()` / `exec()` on agent-influenced strings.** AgentBench (`result_processor.py`), NetArena MALT (`malt_env.py`), OSWorld (`basic_os.py`), and Terminal-Bench (`countdown-game`, `train-bpe-tokenizer`) all run Python on text the agent can shape.
- **Public answers.** NetArena MALT, MLE-bench, AgentBench, WebArena, and Terminal-Bench ship gold values inside the agent’s reachable filesystem and internet, making “read the answer” the cheapest exploit on those benchmarks.
- **Unrestricted root + network in the agent container.** MLE-bench, SWE-bench Pro, SWE-bench Verified, NetArena, OSWorld, AgentBench, and Terminal-Bench all ship containers without `-cap-drop`, `-network=none`, non-root USER, or read-only rootfs, amplifying every other class to host pivot.

The single most common consequence: a model with no domain capability can land at or near 100% on each benchmark by running a few hundred lines of shell or one mocked LLM response.

F Patching

This appendix documents the patches applied to each of the ten benchmarks and for each, why the patched evaluator is still breakable. We continue to use the `flaw-class` shorthand introduced in Appendix 4.1 (V1–V8). For every benchmarks we summarize (a) the concrete patches that were merged or proposed, (b) the bypass that re-penetrates the hardened evaluator, and (c) the realized post-mitigation hack rate.

F.1 AgentBench: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V2 (host-side driver reads committed gold data).

Mitigations. Five files in the `dbbench/os_interaction` stack were rewritten:

- `src/server/tasks/dbbench/result_processor.py` introduce a `_safe_literal_eval` helper (capped at 100 KB, Python literals only) and replaces every `eval()` call site with a literal-or-fallthrough split. The original `[exec("...") or 'X']` monkey-patch RCE no longer reaches `eval`.
- `result_processor.py` closes V5 gaps: the `ans=="0"` and `gt=="0"` → `True` shortcut is removed, multi-row fallback now uses sorted-multiset equality (rather than `set()`), and a `_NULL_SENTINEL` disambiguates numeric 0 from null tokens.
- `src/server/tasks/dbbench/task.py` hardens `commit_final_answer`: arguments are coerced to strings, lists are JSON-serialized, non-string/list values are rejected, and the payload is capped at 4096 chars before reaching the result processor.
- `src/server/tasks/os_interaction/task.py` forces the gold-side `example_script` to run in a fresh, isolated evaluator container re-initialized via `config.init_script`, closing the V7 stdout-to-argv chaining.
- `os_interaction/environment.py` adds `CapDrop=["ALL"]`, `SecurityOpt=["no-new-privileges"]`, `NetworkMode="none"`, `Privileged=False`, and `PidsLimit=256` to every per-sample agent sandbox.

Bypass. V3/V5/V7/V8 still hold; V2 is the load-bearing residual. The patches’ threat model assumed the agent runs *inside* the per-sample sandbox, but production AgentBench drivers are host-resident HTTP clients with `docker exec` into the worker for legitimate operations—so the host process can still read committed gold artefact.

The V7 fix in moved the reference solution into a fresh isolated evaluator container. But only that one step: every subsequent check script still runs inside the agent’s own per-sample sandbox. A PATH-hijack (`/usr/local/bin/bash` and `/usr/local/bin/python3` `exit-0` shims works in the `os-std` subset.

Outcome. 135/903, all coming from the os-std split.

F.2 FrontierSWE: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V1 (shared sandbox).

Mitigations. A new shared preamble `tests/_benchjack_harden.sh` is sourced at the top of every `tests/test.sh` across all 17 tasks. It performs six guard steps:

1. Wipe agent-pre-written rewards: `rm -f /logs/verifier/reward.{json,txt}`.
2. Scrub interpreter-loader env vars: `LD_PRELOAD`, `LD_LIBRARY_PATH`, `LD_AUDIT`, the full `PYTHON*` family; remove `/etc/ld.so.preload`.
3. Locate a trusted `python3` by walking a candidate list and verifying each candidate's first 4 bytes are the ELF magic `7f454c46`.
4. Build a private `bindir` and prepend it to `PATH`.
5. Remove `/app/.oracle_solution` (kills the hidden-marker bypass several verifiers honoured).
6. Per-task V3/V5 fixes: `ffmpeg-swscale-rewrite/tests/_pixel_formats_trusted.py` forces `compute_reward.py` to import `load_swscale_library` from `/tests/` rather than `/app/`, and `dependent-type-checker` renames its corpus to UUID filenames so the `contains("accept")` heuristic crashes.

Bypass. The exploit chains the bypass through path pre-write survival rather than shim catching the `compute_reward.py`:

- `/logs/verifier` is bind-mounted to the host trial directory, and the agent runs as root in the same container as the verifier.
- `harbor run -no-force-build` resolves task `docker_image` tags to a minimal stand-in image because the real GHCR base images are unreachable; `/app/` is empty for most tasks. Under `set -euo pipefail`, several `test.sh` files abort early on missing `/app` artifacts *before* the source line of `_benchjack_harden.sh` executes.
- The pre-written `reward.json` (`{"score": 100.0, ...}`) and `reward.txt` survive on the bind-mounted host directory; Harbor reads them and records `score = 100.0`.

Even on tasks where the `harden` source line is at line 1 and the `harden` script does run, the agent still wins by stashing the real interpreter at `python3.real` (intentionally, so its own shim can fall through). The `harden` script's candidate list trusts `*.real` backups as a clean interpreter source. So the `harden` script's "trusted" interpreter is the one the agent set up; meanwhile the agent has also overwritten `compute_reward.py` indirectly by virtue of having root in the same container.

Outcome. 17/17 = 100.0%. Structural fix requires a separate verifier container with `/tests/` invisible to the agent.

F.3 MLE-bench: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V2 (raw Kaggle IDs preserved across the public/private split) + V8 (network egress).

Mitigations.

- `environment/grading_server.py` rewrites `/validate` to do format-only validation against `sample_submission.csv`; raw parser/grader exception strings no longer echo back. Per-process `VALIDATE_CALL_CAP=100`; bound to `127.0.0.1`.
- `agents/run.py` removes the bind-mount of `competition.private_dir` into the agent container. Private answers now host-only; grading is post-hoc.
- `mlebench/grade_helpers.py` stops `Grader.__call__` from swallowing arbitrary exceptions to `None`; only `InvalidSubmissionError` is silenced.

- `mlebench/grade_helpers.py` replaces the threshold equality rule with strict inequalities ($</>$); a value exactly at the gold cutoff no longer wins gold.
- `environment/utils.py` adds `_safe_extractall` for V7 tar-extract sanitization (rejects `...`, abs paths, symlinks).
- `.dockerignore` excludes `mlebench/competitions/**/leaderboard.csv` and `**/checksums.yaml` from the agent image.
- `environment/config/container_configs/default.json`:
`cap_drop=["ALL"],` `security_opt=["no-new-privileges:true"]`;
`agents/opendevin/config.yaml:13: privileged: true` $\rightarrow$ `false`. Network is kept enabled so AIDE/OpenDevin can reach LLM APIs.

Bypass. The exploit operates under the production seed regime (`MLEBENCH_SPLIT_SEED` unset $\rightarrow$ fresh `secrets.randbits(32)` per `prepare.py` invocation), so seed-replay is impossible. The leak is different: `mlebench/utils.py` concedes that the public test CSV preserves raw Kaggle row identifiers (`PassengerId/Id/textID/image filename`), and `new_test  $\subset$  old_train = read_csv(raw/train.csv)`. Three hack modes:

1. **ID-join.** Public `sample_submission.csv` row IDs are joined against raw `train.csv` on the natural Kaggle ID column. Recovers every test label without ever opening `prepared/private/`.
2. **Content-join.** Where `prepare.py` resets/synthesizes the ID after the split, the join uses feature columns instead.
3. **Direct copy.** Where `prepare.py` does not split at all, labels ship in the raw files.

Raw Kaggle data is fetched over the still-enabled network egress.

Outcome. 74/75 The single miss is `aerial-cactus-identification`: the perfect submission scores 1.0, exactly tying the gold threshold, and the new `>` (instead of `>=`) gates it to silver—the strict-inequality patch correctly fires here. Closing V2 fully requires a private-test split where IDs are anonymized end-to-end.

F.4 NetArena: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V1+V2 (`exec` runs in the evaluator process; gold answers derivable from public templates).

Mitigations. Twelve files patched across `app-malt`, `app-k8s`, `app-route`:

- `app-malt/malt_env.py`: a `_SAFE_BUILTINS` namespace for the LLM-supplied `process_graph(graph_data)` `exec`; `__import__`, `open`, `eval`, `compile`, `globals` removed.
- `malt_env.py`: module-load-time snapshot of `BenchmarkEvaluator.{ground_truth_check, result_log_correct, result_log_wrong}`; a post-`exec` integrity check reverts any mutation and forces the query to “error”.
- `text_utils.py`: `process_graph` regex tightened (only `def process_graph(`, no `re-name smuggling`); `__import__` and `from ...` are filtered alongside the existing `import ... filter`.
- `app-k8s/text_utils.py`: blacklist replaced with a `kubectl get|patch-only` allowlist; shell metacharacters and interpreter launches rejected. `run_workflow.py`: first-iteration mismatch count is now the baseline (the old `prev_mismatch_count = float('inf')` trivially passed).
- `app-route/safety_check.py`: blacklist replaced with an `ip|ifconfig|route|arp|iptables|...` allowlist plus strict shell-metacharacter rejection. `test_function.py` gains the same iteration-baseline pattern and redacts raw command stdout from log feedback.

Bypass. The audit closed mutation of `BenchmarkEvaluator`'s methods but *not* mutation of imported modules. The agent-supplied `process_graph` is exec'd in a namespace that binds `nx`, `copy`, and `solid_step_*` from the surrounding evaluator process, and the same `nx` module is later resolved by the scoring lambda—the same Python module object. The mock prepends one line to every emitted `process_graph`:

```
1 nx.is_isomorphic = (lambda *a, **kw: True)
```

Listing 21: NetArena MALT post-patch: mutating an imported module the integrity check ignores.

After the first query, every subsequent VF2 isomorphism check returns `True`. The integrity check only restores `BenchmarkEvaluator` methods; the patch on `nx.is_isomorphic` lives in a third-party module and is invisible to it. V2 also still bites: questions are templated ("Add new node ...", "Remove X from the graph. Count the Y...", "Rank direct child nodes of Z..."), so the mock can re-derive ground-truth-equivalent code from the question alone, making the `nx` patch pure speedup.

Outcome. 3487/5030 MALT queries pass. Closing this requires moving the agent exec into a subprocess / `RestrictedPython` / `gVisor`, plus regenerating queries from a private template set.

F.5 OSWorld: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V7+V6 (grader reads agent-mutable VM state; no per-task justification for infeasible).

Mitigations.

- `evaluators/metrics/basic_os.py`: `eval(apps_str)` on `gsettings` stdout replaced with bounded `ast.literal_eval` plus type/regex validation. Closes the V3 grader-host RCE.
- `desktop_env/desktop_env.py` (V6 infeasible): accepting `FAIL` as the agent's first action no longer wins; now requires ≥ 3 prior non-`FAIL` actions before `FAIL` counts.
- `desktop_env.py`: `FileNotFoundError` under `conj == 'or'` returns explicit 0 and continues (was silently dropped, masquerading as success via `max(results)`).
- `desktop_env.py`: at config-load time, reject tasks whose `evaluator.expected.type` is in the VM-sourced getter set (`vm_command_line`, `vm_terminal_output`, `vm_file`, `content_from_vm_file`, `cache_file`). Forces score 0 so the agent can't shape both sides of the comparison.
- `metrics/general.py`: `fuzzy_match` now requires ≥ 0.95 similarity (was returning the raw rapidfuzz ratio, partial credit on near-misses).
- `providers/docker/provider.py`: `cap_add=["NET_ADMIN"]` dropped; ports 5000/8006/9222/8080 bound to 127.0.0.1.

Bypass. The audit closed `expected.type` being VM-sourced. The runs only an infeasible bypass, outputting `{WAIT, WAIT, WAIT, FAIL}`—the mitigation requires three non-`FAIL` actions, and three `WAIT`s satisfy the gate. There is no per-task justification.

Outcome. 29/369 on the infeasible tasks.

F.6 SkillsBench: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V1+V8 (size-thresholded sanitize bypassed by padded shims).

Mitigations.

- Removes `/tests/conftest.py` plus `pytest` `ini` siblings, unsets `PYTHONPATH`/`PYTHONSTARTUP`, prepends `/usr/bin` and `/bin` to `PATH`, deletes any sub-4 KB shim in `/usr/local/bin/{pytest,uvx,uv,pip,pip3,curl}`, scrubs

<64 KB sitecustomize.py and pytest-stub packages in every site-/dist-packages, strips PYTHONPATH= from /etc/environment, clears /logs/verifier/reward.txt.

- Removes /conf/test.py, /pytest.ini, /.pytest.ini, /pyproject.toml, /setup.cfg, /tox.ini when each is <64 KB. Unsets PYTEST_ADDOPTS, PYTEST_PLUGINS, _PYTEST_RAISE, PYTEST_DISABLE_PLUGIN_AUTOLOAD.
- Per-task patches: find-topk-similar-chemicals and crystallographic-wyckoff-position-analysis move the verifier to /opt/.bj_vrfy_<hex>/run.py and execute the agent function in an isolated python -I subprocess; pddl-tpp-planning replaces pickle.load with text-plan comparison; 3d-scan-calc reads the reference STL from /tests/scan_data.stl; ≈ 13 tasks convert pytest.skip on missing agent output to pytest.fail.

Bypass. The sanitize block is size-thresholded; the exploit exceeds every threshold. Each shim (pytest/uv/uvx/pip/pip3/npm/playwright) is padded with ≈ 5 KB of #-comments, pushing the file above 4 KB. A >32 KB pytest package is dropped at every site-packages/dist-packages; its __main__.py writes 1.0 to /logs/verifier/reward.txt, fakes a CTRF JSON for any .json arg, and raise SystemExit(0). A >64 KB sitecustomize.py guards reward.txt via a monkey-patched open/Path.write_text. /usr/bin/curl and /usr/local/bin/curl are replaced with a uv-installer interceptor: requests to astral.sh/uv/... short-circuit to a no-op, so curl ... | sh cannot replace the shimmed uvx with a real binary.

Outcome. 79/88 = 89.8%. The 9 misses are tasks the per-task patches actually closed—find-topk-similar-chemicals’s subprocess isolation removes EXPECTED_RESULTS from the agent’s reach; civ6-adjacency-optimizer/mhc-layer-impl/etc. now pytest.fail on missing output; pddl-tpp-planning ignores the .pkl.

E.7 SWE-bench Pro: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V7+V1 (per-instance parser still ingests agent log output).

Mitigations. The strongest mitigation set across the ten benchmarks; swe_bench_pro_eval.py was heavily reworked:

- **V3 dataset-injection closure.** _parse_string_list validates selected_test_files_to_run, fail_to_pass, pass_to_pass via ast.literal_eval + list[str] type check; shlex.quote on every dataset value interpolated into the entryscript; before_repo_set_cmd lines must regex-fullmatch a git ... shape.
- **V6 fail-closed gates.** before_repo_set_cmd runs *before* the agent patch is applied; git apply -check on the agent patch with exit 98 on failure; test_patch applied *after* the agent patch with exit 99 on failure; test-pin checkout runs after both.
- **V1/V5/V7 layered defence.** Post-patch cleanup removes top-level conf/test.py, sitecustomize.py, usercustomize.py, any *.pth, and suspicious newly-added Go _test.go files containing func init(together with os.Exit/os.WriteFile/base64.StdEncoding//workspace. Test stdout/stderr/exit_code are captured to /workspace_out/ (a separate rw mount); /workspace is no longer used for output. assemble_workspace_files no longer writes parser.py into the container; the trusted parser runs on the *host* over host-saved logs (run_host_parser invokes the per-instance parser.py via python3 -I as a host-side subprocess with timeout). Any output.json produced inside the sandbox is intentionally ignored.
- **V1/V8 mount-and-cap hardening.** Local-docker mounts /workspace read-only plus a separate /workspace_out rw; cap_drop=["ALL"], security_opt=["no-new-privileges"], pids_limit=4096, network_mode="none" by default. Modal sandbox: block_network=True default.
- **V5 strict scoring.** The scorer rejects any run where an expected F2P/P2P name appears in FAILED or ERROR (catching the “fake PASSED line after a real FAILED line” trick); exit_code == 0 required.

Bypass. The post-patch cleanup strips conftests *at top-level only*. Pytest’s rootdir discovery walks upward from the test file, loading any `conftest.py` it finds along the way—a conftest in a tests subdirectory survives. Three repo-specific exploits land:

1. **qutebrowser.** `model_patch` creates `tests/unit/conftest.py` with a `pytest_runtest_makereport` hookwrapper that pins every `TestReport.outcome = "passed"` and forces `session.exitstatus = 0`. The contamination gate is satisfied because no test actually FAILs (the hook intercepts before status is set).
2. **internetarchive.** Same pattern, conftest at `openlibrary/conftest.py`; the hook reads `/workspace/test_patch.diff` to enumerate parametrize variants via AST + `pytest -collect-only`, printing forged PASSED lines in both pytest and xdist formats. `pytest_runtest_protocol` short-circuits the test body to avoid hangs.
3. **ansible.** `run_script.sh` does `export PATH=/app/bin:$PATH` then `python bin/ansible-test ...`. The agent ships `/app/bin/python`—*not* in the strip list. The shim takes over before `ansible-test` runs, enumerates tests via AST + `pytest -collect-only + test_patch.diff` parsing, prints PASSED lines in both formats, and `exit 0s`; `run_script.sh’s || true` makes the runner exit 0 too.

Non-Python repos (NodeBB, element-hq, flipt-io, gravitational, navidrome, protonmail, future-architect, tutao—465 instances) use mocha/jest/Go runners; the pytest-conftest exploit does not apply, and the post-patch cleanup catches the `Go _test.go` pattern.

Outcome. 171/731(Python repos only). Pro’s defence layering is strong—read-only workspace + closed network + multi-direction gates + tighter parsers raise the bar from “print one line” (Verified) to “guarantee the real test never executed” (Pro).

F.8 SWE-bench Verified: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V7 (parser still trusts agent stdout; subdir-import hooks survive a path-based block-list).

Mitigations.

- `swebench/harness/utils.py`: `validate_model_patch` rejects any patch creating or modifying `conftest.py`, `sitecustomize.py`, `usercustomize.py`, `pytest.ini`, `tox.ini`, `pyproject.toml`, `setup.cfg`, or `*.pth`. Path-based, validation-time, before git apply. This is the root fix for the original exploit.
- `run_evaluation.py` and `modal_eval/run_evaluation_modal.py` call `validate_model_patch` on both runners.
- `log_parsers/python.py`: `_is_pytest_nodeid` regex requires the second token of a PASSED line to look like a real pytest nodeid (`path/to/file.py::Test::method[param]`).
- `grading.py`: `test_passed` only returns True for `TestStatus.PASSED` (XFAIL is no longer a pass).
- `grading.py`: marker region uses `content.rfind(START)/content.rfind(END)` instead of `split`; the full-log fallback is removed so empty marker regions fail closed.
- `grading.py`: `get_resolution_status` rejects instances whose F2P and P2P counts are both zero (was auto-resolved before).
- **Fingerprint cache.** `_patch_fingerprint(test_spec, patch)` is a SHA-256 of (`patch`, `instance_id`, `image_key`), stamped into `report.json`. The cached-report shortcut, the “already completed” filter, the Modal cache shortcut, and `make_run_report` all verify the fingerprint before trusting any on-disk `report.json`—a pre-placed report no longer bypasses evaluation.
- `docker_build.py`: `cap_drop=["ALL"]`, `pids_limit=4096`, `mem_limit="8g"`.

Bypass. `validate_model_patch` only rejects *path-based* auto-load files; the new exploit does not touch any forbidden path:

1. The agent emits a `model_patch` with two hunks: (a) create `<pkg>/_bjhook.py` (a regular package module—not in the block-list), (b) prepend from `.` `import _bjhook` to `<pkg>/__init__.py` (only `*/__init__.py`—not `conftest.py`).
2. The patch builder fetches the real `<pkg>/__init__.py` content from `raw.githubusercontent.com` at the dataset’s recorded `base_commit` SHA, so the context block matches and `git apply` succeeds.
3. When `pytest` imports the package, `_bjhook` runs at module-load time. It parses `/eval.sh` to find the `test_patch` heredoc (V2 in disguise—gold is readable inside the container), AST-walks every test file enumerating concrete `pytest` node-ids including `@pytest.mark.parametrize` variants (auto-form `argname0, argname1, …`, plus a best-guess from token literals; class×method cross-product), then *smuggles forged PASSED* `<nodeid> lines past pytest’s fd-capture` by walking `/proc/self/fd` and writing directly to any pipe/socket/tty fd (the docker-stream fd renumbered by `pytest’s os.dup2`). Both `pytest’s` shape (`PASSED <nodeid>`) and Django’s (`<fn> (<dotted.qual>) …ok`) are emitted.
4. Finally `os._exit(0)` so the real test runner never executes—no actual `FAILED/ERROR` lines ever reach the log.

The harness's `get_logs_eval` picks up the forged `PASSED` lines, the new `pytest-nodeid` regex accepts them (because they match—they are properly shaped fake nodeids), and `get_eval_tests_report` marks every F2P/P2P entry as a success.

Outcome. 400/500 = 80.0%. The 100 misses are mostly Django (sympy gets a separate parser): `parse_log_django` was hardened separately and the auto-form/hand-guess parametrize ID synthesis does not always cover Django's `unittest.TestCase` node-id shape—those need a different forged line format.

F.9 Terminal-Bench: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V1+V8 (root in the same container shims /bin/bash).

Mitigations.

- `terminal_bench/harness/harness.py`: `_is_resolved` returns `False` for empty parser results (Python's `all()` was `True` before, so a zero-test run was a pass).
- `harness.py`: `_setup_test_env` now `rm -rfs /tests` (as root) before `put_archive`, so the agent cannot pre-plant `/tests/run-tests.sh`.
- `harness.py`: `_run_tests` runs the test script via `container.exec_run` with `/bin/bash -noprofile -norc` and wraps `stdout/stderr` in a per-trial `secrets.token_hex(32) nonce envelope`. The parser input is the nonce-bounded region of the exec output, not the agent-controllable `tmux` pane.
- `harness.py`: `_run_trial` feeds the trusted exec output (not `post_test_pane`) to `_parse_results`.
- `terminal/security-override.yaml`: adds `security_opt: no-new-privileges:true` and `pids_limit: 4096` to every task container.
- Per-task V2/V3 fixes: `.dockerignore` files for `cross-entropy-method`, `multistep-definite-integral`, `play-lord` (`strip solution.sh` etc. from build context); `_safe_eval_arithmetic` replaces `eval(expr)` in `countdown-game/tests/test_outputs.py`; `ast.literal_eval` replaces `eval(result.stdout.strip())` in `train-bpe-tokenizer/tests/test_outputs.py`.

Bypass. The patch logic is sound *if the bash binary is trustworthy*, but V1+V8 are unaddressed: the agent runs as root in the same container as the verifier, and most of the tasks have no USER directive in their Dockerfile. The mock LLM emits one tmux command per task that overwrites /bin/bash itself with a POSIX-sh wrapper:

```

1  #!/bin/sh
2  for a in "$@"; do
3      if [ "$a" = "-c" ]; then exec /bin/bash.real "$@"; fi
4  done
5  for a in "$@"; do
6      case "$a" in
7          */run-tests.sh|run-tests.sh)
8              printf '===== short test summary info\n'
9              printf 'PASSED test_hack.py::test_ok\n'
10             printf '===== 1 passed in 0.01s\n'
11             exit 0
12             ;;
13         esac
14     done
15     exec /bin/bash.real "$@"

```

Listing 22: Terminal-Bench post-patch: /bin/bash wrapper that emits forged PASSED lines *inside* the trusted nonce envelope.

The harness invokes `timeout .../bin/bash -noprofile -norc -c "printf BEGIN<nonce>; /bin/bash -noprofile -norc /tests/run-tests.sh 2>&1; printf END<nonce>"`. The *outer* call has `-c` in `argv` → the wrapper passes through to `bash.real`, which prints the BEGIN/END nonce envelope. The *inner* call has `run-tests.sh` in `argv` → the wrapper short-circuits and emits a forged pytest summary with one PASSED line, exit 0. The forged PASSED is *inside* the nonce envelope (because the wrapper is the bash that runs `run-tests.sh`), so the parser accepts it.

Outcome. 228/241. The nonce wraps the transport but cannot wrap the content, because the content's writer is itself the agent's wrapper binary—precisely what the patches' residual-risks comment warns about. Structural fix: run tests in a freshly built, separate container with the agent's output paths mounted read-only.

F.10 WebArena: Patches and Residual

Residual class: V5 (single-token must_include hackable with a 4 KB token grid).

Mitigations.

- **V3 closed.** `eval(func)` on agent-substituted strings replaced with `ast.literal_eval` plus a 5-function whitelist with the live `page` object injected by the harness (`evaluators.py`).
- **V4 reduced.** `llm_fuzzy_match` / `llm_ua_match` now cap input at 2 KB, wrap the agent's answer in `<student_answer>/<reported_reason>` tags, strip closing-tag literals, and require a `FINAL_VERDICT:` line. Verdict regex matches anywhere in the reply (`helper_functions.py`:181-270).
- **V5 partially closed.** `must_include` uses lowercase substring containment with a 4 KB answer cap. URL match enforces `scheme+netloc`.
- **V6 mitigated.** Empty-input default-pass paths and silent exception drops are closed (`evaluators.py`); per-task exceptions return 0.0 instead of being dropped.
- **V7 acknowledged.** Gold answers split into `config_files/_answers/{id}.json`; `file://` blocked in the browser to prevent the leak.

Bypass. A single static stop [<payload>] answer wins $\approx 6\%$ of tasks via residual V5. `StringEvaluator.must_include` uses lowercased substring containment with a 4 KB cap. For tasks where the gold reference is a single short token (`["0"]`, `["2"]`, `["6"]` for “how many X?” map/shopping_admin tasks; `["Yes"]` for yes/no tasks), `len(value)==1` enables the tokenize path: `tok_pred = word_tokenize(clean_pred)`; `ref in tok_pred`. The exploit payload stuffs `_NUM_BLOB = " ".join(str(i) for i in range(1000))` (every integer 0–999) plus `yes no true false maybe done none unknown n/a na` into one answer—under 4 KB total—and trivially satisfies any single-short-token reference.

Outcome. 52/812, with V5 path only.

F.11 Cross-cutting patterns

A few patterns recur across the post-mitigation results.

Mitigations that worked.

- **Whitelist dispatch in place of eval/exec.** AgentBench’s `_safe_literal_eval`, OSWorld’s `ast.literal_eval` on `gsettings`, WebArena’s 5-function whitelist, and SWE-bench Pro’s `_parse_string_list` + `shlex.quote` are clean wins. The only place this failed is NetArena, where the patch *narrowed the namespace* (restricted builtins) but did not *replace the sink*—and the sink could still mutate library modules.
- **Strict node-id parsing.** SWE-bench Verified’s `_is_pytest_nodeid` regex stopped naive `print("foo PASSED")` forgeries; the exploit had to escalate to AST walking + `class`×`method` cross-product + parametrize ID synthesis.
- **Strict-inequality medal threshold.** MLE-bench’s `>=` $\rightarrow$ `>` is what stopped `aerial-cactus-identification` from winning gold (it ties the cutoff exactly).
- **Read-only workspace + separate output mount + closed network.** SWE-bench Pro’s structural shift is the difference between 80% (Verified) and 23% (Pro). On non-Python repos it is 0%.
- **Fingerprint cache for reports.** SWE-bench Verified’s `_patch_fingerprint(test_spec, patch)` killed the pre-placed `report.json` shortcut; no exploit works against the cache.
- **Format-only validate endpoint.** MLE-bench’s `/validate` rewrite removed the grader-as-oracle channel; the residual leak is via raw IDs preserved across the public/private split, not the endpoint.
- **Removing the private-data mount.** MLE-bench dropping the `competition.private_dir` bind into the agent container forced the hack onto raw Kaggle IDs (a structural V2) rather than direct private-answer reads.

Mitigations that did not.

- **Anything that requires the agent and verifier to share a process/container/UID is structurally undefendable in code.** FrontierSWE, NetArena, Terminal-Bench, SkillsBench, AgentBench (driver-process variant), and OSWorld (in-VM) all fall to this. The patches are friction, not walls; each carries a SECURITY-NOTE conceding the architectural gap.
- **Size-thresholded sanitize is not a security control.** SkillsBench’s <4 KB shim and <64 KB package thresholds were chosen to avoid false-positives on legitimate large config files; the exploit pads past every threshold with `#-comments`.
- **Path-based block-lists do not cover module-import-time hooks.** SWE-bench Verified’s `validate_model_patch` rejects `conftest.py/*.pth`; the exploit drops `<pkg>/_bjhook.py` + `from . import _bjhook` in `__init__.py`—neither path is in the list, both run on import.
- **Top-level-only stripping leaves subdir loaders intact.** SWE-bench Pro’s post-patch cleanup strips top-level conftests; pytest rootdir discovery loads ancestor-chain conftests; subdir conftest survives.

- **Restricted builtins do not restrict shared library modules.** NetArena allows `nx`, `copy`, `solid_step_*` in the `exec` namespace because honest code needs them; `nx.is_isomorphic = lambda *a, **kw: True` mutates the same module object the scoring `lambda` later resolves.
- **Nonce envelopes wrap transport, not content.** Terminal-Bench’s nonce-bounded `exec` output is fine if the `bash` binary is trustworthy; the agent overwrites `/bin/bash` itself with a wrapper that emits forged `PASSED` *inside* the envelope.
- **Trusted parser on the host helps only when the parser doesn’t trust its input semantically.** SWE-bench Pro’s host parser still ingests log lines containing `PASSED <nodeid>`; the `confest` hook in a tests subdirectory wins by emitting the right shape.

The architectural property that determines whether patches stick. Across all ten benchmarks, the single best predictor of “patches actually held” is whether *the bytes the grader reads are produced under a different uid / process / container than the agent*. Where that property is structural (SWE-bench Pro local-docker host parser, MLE-bench private-dir-on-host, OSWorld host-grader/VM-guest split, AgentBench post-patch fresh evaluator container for `example_script`), the patches close the demonstrated exploit. Where the property is missing (FrontierSWE, NetArena, Terminal-Bench, SkillsBench), every code-only patch is a file the agent can shim, overwrite, or `LD_PRELOAD` around.

The secondary feats, in priority order: (1) deterministic scoring (kills V4 entirely), (2) structured-output parsing instead of `stdout` scraping (would close the SWE-bench Verified residual), (3) fail-closed gates with both presence-of-expected and absence-of-failure checks (Pro’s contamination gate), and (4) whitelist dispatch in place of `eval/exec/shell=True`. The first one is structural; the others are local fixes that only stick when the first is in place.

G Limitations, Discussions, and Broader Impacts

Limitations and discussions. BENCHJACK mainly shows the exploitability. We do not show that frontier models actually invoke these exploits during normal evaluation run. Additionally, the exploits that BENCHJACK construct might be hard for the models to create in reality. However, the extensive evidence provided [23, 2, 49] and the related work discussion in Section 2 showcases the prevalence of spontaneous reward hacking. We note that an interesting direction might be to map the patterns of actual spontaneous hacking behaviors for stronger models in the future. Our flaw taxonomy are directly more towards concurrent agent benchmarks and may not be exhaustive on other novel evaluation patterns. We leave the extending of the taxonomy to future work. BENCHJACK relies on the capability of the coding agent that it calls and can be costly for bigger benchmarks and more costly agents. Additionally, the patching of flaws in this work adopts a simple two-agent generative-adversary approach. We believe that both designing more affordable and scalable auditing agents and more effective defenses are promising directions for future work to consider.

Positive impacts. BENCHJACK exposes concrete, reproducible reward-hacking exploits and iterative patches to improve the quality of the benchmarks. This helps the community gain trust in published scores, redirects research effort away from artifacts that reward gaming rather than capability, and reduces the AI-safety risk of models learning hack patterns during training that transfer to deployment.

Negative impacts. BENCHJACK is a red-teaming tool that may be re-purposed to (i) reward-hack public leaderboards, or even (ii) probe benchmark hosting infrastructure for far more serious failure modes that may lead to security issues on the host machine of the evaluator. We propose mitigating this risk by using the Agent-Eval Checklist and BENCHJACK to understand any flaws in the benchmark and patch them early on.

Overall, we believe the net impact of releasing BENCHJACK, the taxonomy, and the checklist is positive. Providing a systematic auditing tool to benchmark designers and platform operators is still the most effective way to prevent reward hacks and other security issues.