
Rollout Cards: A Reproducibility Standard for Agent Research

Charlie Masters

Deepflow

charlie.masters@deepflow.com

Ziyuan Liu

Nanyang Technological University

Stefano V. Albrecht

Nanyang Technological University

Abstract

Reproducibility problems that have long affected machine learning and reinforcement learning are now surfacing in agent research: papers compare systems by reported scores while leaving the rollout records behind those scores difficult to inspect. For agentic tasks, this matters because the same behaviour can receive different reported scores when evaluations select different parts of a rollout or apply different reporting rules. In a structured audit of 50 popular training and evaluation repositories, we find that none report how many runs failed, errored, or were skipped alongside headline scores. We also document 37 cases where reporting rules can change task-success rates, cost/token accounting, or timing measurements for fixed evidence, sometimes dramatically. We treat rollout records, not reported scores, as the unit of reproducibility for agent research. We introduce *rollout cards*: publication bundles that preserve the rollout record and declare the views, reporting rules, and drops manifests behind reported scores. We validate rollout cards in two settings. First, four partial public releases in tool safety, multi-agent systems, theorem proving, and search let us compute analyses their original reports did not include. Second, re-grading preserved benchmark outputs across short-answer, code-generation, and tool-use tasks shows that changing only the reporting rule can change reported scores by 20.9 absolute percentage points and, in some cases, invert rankings of frontier models. We release a reference implementation integrated into ERGON, an open-source reinforcement learning gym, and publicly publish ERGON-produced rollout-card exports for benchmarks spanning tool use, software engineering, web interaction, multi-agent coordination, safety, and search to support future research.

1 Introduction

Language-model capabilities have grown faster than the research ecosystem evaluating them. Agent results are compared across a fragmented infrastructure of evaluation harnesses (code that runs tasks, calls models or tools, and scores outputs), RL trainers, agent frameworks, and tracing tools, each with its own conventions for recording rollouts and computing metrics. This is the kind of fragmentation that has historically undermined reproducibility in machine learning and reinforcement learning [Henderson et al., 2018, Pineau et al., 2021, Agarwal et al., 2021].

Early evidence suggests this issue is already surfacing in language-model and agent research. On MMLU [Hendrycks et al., 2021], identical LLaMA-65B weights score 63.7 under the Berkeley evaluation code and 48.8 under lm-evaluation-harness [Sutawika et al., 2024]: a 14.9-point gap attributable to evaluation-code choices about prompt templates and answer extraction for the same

policy [Fourrier et al., 2023, Biderman et al., 2024]. Neither pipeline publishes the prompts, model outputs, or grading inputs that would let a third party recompute the score under another reporting rule. The same reporting-rule disagreement appears in public infrastructure records. Production tracing systems disagree on cached-token accounting [OpenTelemetry, 2026, Langfuse, 2026], and a public issue in the Verl repository documents a tokenisation-channel divergence reproduced independently by multiple users [verl-project, 2025].

Across these cases, the missing object is the rollout record behind the reported score, together with the reporting rule that produced it. Current practice publishes the score but discards or under-specifies that record and rule. Later researchers cannot diagnose whether a disputed score gap reflects model behaviour or evaluation-code convention, cannot re-analyse the same runs to study behaviours the original report did not include, and cannot replay another reporting rule against the same outputs. We therefore treat rollout records, rather than reported scores, as the unit of reproducibility for agent research. To substantiate this position, we make three contributions.

- We diagnose two publication failures that limit reproducibility in current agent evaluation practice (§2): *recording*, where rollouts are scored once and discarded, and *reporting*, where reporting rules vary without disclosure. A structured audit of 50 popular training and evaluation repositories documents how failures are surfaced, dropped, or absorbed into reported scores. We also catalogue 37 reporting-rule discrepancies across task success, cost/token accounting, and timing, and show how adjacent communities often rebuild scaffolds or rerun policies to study behaviours the original reports did not preserve. We find that **none of the audited repositories report failed, errored, or skipped rollouts alongside headline accuracy or score**.
- We propose *rollout cards* (§3), a minimum-sufficient publication specification in the Datasheets [Gebu et al., 2021] and Model Cards [Mitchell et al., 2019] lineage. A rollout card preserves the task specification, the agent’s actions, and the environment dynamics. It also states the reporting rule behind each reported score and records what information that rule uses or omits. To support adoption and enable independent re-analysis, we release a reference implementation in an open-source reinforcement learning gym, along with 21 card exports: 17 trace-publication exports plus four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports.
- We evaluate rollout cards in two settings (§4). First, reanalysing four partial public releases (GAP, MAESTRO, COPRA miniF2F selected logs, and Tree-of-Thought) computes analyses the original publications did not report. For instance, 20.6% of agent responses certified safe by GAP made forbidden tool calls anyway, and longer realised search in COPRA’s miniF2F logs correlates negatively with proof success rather than positively. Second, holding benchmark artefacts fixed and changing only the reporting rule changes reported scores by up to 20.9 percentage points, swaps GPT-4o and Claude 3.5 Sonnet under different graders on τ -bench, and changes MLE-Bench pass rates from 34.2% to 13.3% under medal/pass definitions.

Together, the two settings show that publishing only scores extracts only part of the value of the experiments papers have already run. Their own rollouts contain findings the primary works did not report, and the comparisons they enable cannot distinguish agent behaviour from the rule used to record and report it.

2 Recording vs Reporting in the Current Ecosystem

Agent papers usually publish reported scores rather than the rollout records from which those scores are computed. A rollout is the record of one episode of agent–environment interaction. For the LLM-agent setting we focus on, this typically includes the environment configuration, the observations passed to the agent, the actions it took (model outputs and tool calls), and the resulting environment state at each step, along with per-step timing and the episode’s terminal status. We define a *rollout batch* as the collection of episodes used to compute a reported score, and a *view* as the projection of each rollout onto the fields a particular analysis reads. A view used for a leaderboard ranking might keep only the final answer and the gold label, whereas a view used for a safety evaluation might keep tool call traces and refusal markers.

We define a *reporting rule* as the procedure that turns a viewed rollout batch into a reported score. A reporting rule typically chains operations such as a grader scoring outputs, a heuristic deciding how to handle infrastructure failures, and a rule combining per-episode scores. Two reported scores can therefore differ because they use different rollout batches, apply different views to the same batch,

or apply different reporting rules to the same view. By construction, each of these steps can drop information that a later reader cannot recover from the reported score alone.

Publishing reported scores without the underlying rollout records produces two failure modes. The first, *recording*, concerns the rollout batch itself. When the underlying rollouts are not preserved, no alternative view or reporting rule can be applied retrospectively, and questions a later community might ask of the same episodes go unanswered. The second, *reporting*, concerns the view and reporting rule together. When these are not declared, readers cannot tell whether a gap between two reported scores reflects different rollout batches, a different view of the same batch, or a different reporting rule over the same view. We discuss these two failure modes in the following subsections.

2.1 Recording: discarded rollouts foreclose later analyses

The recording problem begins after experiments are complete and results are finalised. A paper can correctly detail the reporting rule used for its own result, yet still leave no way for later readers to ask a different scientific question from the same rollout batch. Once the underlying rollout records are discarded, later communities cannot inspect the same behaviour through another view or reporting rule.

This loss would be less consequential if subsequent researchers could easily recreate the missing rollout batch. For LLM agents, however, backfilling a missing analysis faces the dual obstacles of reconstructing the original evaluation setup and paying the cost of producing the rollout batch again. The setup problem is already substantial. LLM-agent scaffolds couple model, prompt template, tool layer, retry logic, and environment, giving them the implementation sensitivity that has long fragmented empirical RL [Henderson et al., 2018, Pineau et al., 2021, Agarwal et al., 2021]. They also add faster implementation churn, where changes in model endpoints, serving precision, tool interfaces, scheduler defaults, or library versions can change the behaviour being measured before a later group can rerun the setup. The cost problem compounds this reconstruction problem. Even when reconstruction is possible, task horizons frontier agents complete have been doubling every seven months [Kwa et al., 2026], and total frontier-evaluation cost has risen $3\text{--}18\times$ per year as horizons and reasoning-token budgets outpace per-token efficiency gains [Gundlach et al., 2025, Ord, 2025]. Backfilling a missing analysis therefore requires both reconstructing a moving policy stack and paying frontier rollout costs again. For LLM agent work, an unpreserved rollout batch is in practice a lost rollout batch.

This backfilling problem is amplified by the nature of how the community discovers research topics. As models cross capability thresholds, important evaluation questions often become visible only after researchers observe where existing systems fail, coordinate, recover, or behave unexpectedly. Multi-agent coordination, process-level reasoning, and frontier-risk analysis all emerged around capabilities that earlier evaluations were not designed to measure [Tran et al., 2025, Cemri et al., 2025, OpenAI et al., 2026, Meinke et al., 2025, Phuong et al., 2024]. As a result, by the time a community identifies a research direction, the rollout batches that could support its analysis have been summarised under another metric and discarded.

The loss starts to matter when different communities want different behavioural slices from similar rollout evidence. SWE-bench made repository-level issue resolution a shared set of environments on which initial results were shared, but later work has duplicated harnesses and regenerated rollout batches to study agent-computer interfaces, training data, contamination, trajectory quality, cross-language robustness, long-horizon complexity, and failure modes while reimplementing the same underlying scaffolds [Jimenez et al., 2024, Yang et al., 2024, 2025a, Badertdinov et al., 2025, Deng et al., 2026, Zan et al., 2025, Deng et al., 2025]. The same pattern of fragmented reuse appears in web-agent, tool-use, safety, search, proof, and multi-agent settings, where public artefacts often contain enough behavioural detail for later analysis but papers report only an outcome label or score [Zhou et al., 2024, Drouin et al., 2024, Qin et al., 2024, Yao et al., 2025, Andriushchenko et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025, Zhang et al., 2024a, Cemri et al., 2025].

The cost goes beyond duplicated effort, because when rollout records are not preserved, later communities can only ask new questions by regenerating expensive rollout batches. This raises the price of synthesis and comparison, so evidence that could have connected adjacent literatures instead remains locked inside one paper’s original reported score. Section 4 (RQ1) recovers four such findings from preserved public releases, without re-running anything.

2.2 Reporting: fragmented rules undermine reproducible comparison

The same practice that limits scientific reuse in Section 2.1 also undermines reproducible comparison. When papers publish only the scores they choose to report, later readers cannot tell whether a gap between a new result and prior work reflects a difference in agent behaviour or a difference in the view and reporting rule used to compute the score. Failure handling, grader design, denominator choice, cost accounting, profiling tool choices, and training-loss calculations can all change a reported score for the same underlying behaviour. Recent work on LLM-for-software-engineering reproducibility finds that these rules are rarely fully specified, with recurring gaps in environment specification and versioning [Siddiq et al., 2025].

We test whether reporting-rule fragmentation changes scores by auditing 50 popular repositories across agent harnesses, evaluation libraries, benchmarks, and RL stacks. At a pinned commit for each repository, we inspect how the implementation handles rule-sensitive events that can change a reported score, including generation failures, reward or judge failures, unparseable outputs, environment failures, mid-run termination, denominator choices, and training-data filters. The audit addresses two questions. First, when such events arise, are they reported alongside the reported score, or are they dropped, remapped, or folded into ordinary failures? Second, do reporting-rule choices across popular scaffolds produce different values for rollout returns, cost, timing, and training losses on comparable workloads? Methodological details, including criteria and excluded candidates, are in Appendix B; the reporting-rule discrepancy catalogue is in Appendix C.

The audit finds no audited repository that surfaces failed, errored, or skipped rollouts beside the headline score, and it identifies recurring reporting-rule discrepancies across task-success, cost/token accounting, and timing measurements. **None of the 50 repositories reports how often rollouts failed alongside the accuracy or score.** In our audit, 11 scored entries silently absorb catastrophic failures into the reported score, 31 drop failures with no visible counter, and 9 log failures somewhere but do not surface them beside the reported score.¹ From these 50 repositories we additionally identify 37 reporting-rule discrepancies where two codebases produce different task-success, cost/token, or timing values for the same model output, API call, rollout batch, matched training run, or evaluation case. These include task-success gaps of up to 24.6 percentage points, 2.0 $\times$ token-accounting differences, \$14.41 cost differences for the same model family, and 3.1 $\times$ runtime gaps on matched hardware. Appendix C reports the full set with public documentation, pull requests, or issue threads for each case, and Table 1 gives six representative examples spanning task success, cost, token accounting, and timing.

Table 1: Flagship reporting-rule discrepancies across the three counted families. Six of the 37 task-success, cost/token, and timing pairs; the full catalogue with per-pair sources is in Appendix C. Δ is the reported gap for the paired evidence in each row; per-pair sources and inclusion criteria are in Appendix C.

Family	Setup	Convention A	Convention B	Δ
Task success	LLaMA-65B MMLU 5-shot	Berkeley (63.7)	lm-eval-harness (48.8)	14.9pp
Task success	Mistral/Mixtral MMLU	best prompt template	worst prompt template	up to 24.6pp
Cost/tokens	Anthropic cached API call	OpenTelemetry input-inclusive	Anthropic separated	2.0$\times$
Cost/tokens	Sonnet 3.5 on Aider	Edit benchmark (\$0)	Refactor+Polyglot (\$14.41)	\$14.41
Latency/timing	SWE-bench Verified	Docker backend	Modal backend	“systematic”
Latency/timing	GSM8K-GRPO epoch	optimized TRL	OpenRLHF	3.1$\times$

We find discrepancies wherever reported scores depend on implementation choices. At the outcome layer, OpenAI Evals maps some invalid judge strings to fixed scores, while Inspect AI surfaces per-sample errors by default [OpenAI, 2023, UK AI Safety Institute, 2024]. At the measurement layer, OpenTelemetry counts cached Anthropic tokens inclusively while Anthropic’s native accounting separates cached reads [OpenTelemetry, 2026]. At the training layer, Verifiers turns reward-function exceptions into zero rewards, while TRL’s GRPO path treats missing reward-function outputs as NaNs before group-advantage computation [Brown, 2025, Hugging Face, 2025]. Across these layers, the same output, trajectory, or rollout batch can produce materially different reported scores. This hurts comparison because the reported score alone cannot show whether a difference between two systems comes from agent behaviour or from the reporting rule used to record and report that behaviour.

¹Counts are over scored audit entries rather than mutually exclusive repositories; simple-evals is split across two subsets because its SimpleQA and non-SimpleQA paths expose different failure-handling behaviour.

The recording and reporting failures therefore point to the same missing publication object. Papers publish a score, but not the rollout records, rollout batch, view, and reporting rule needed to reuse the evidence or reproduce the comparison. Section 3 introduces rollout cards as a minimum bundle that preserves the rollout records, declares the rollout batch’s view and reporting rule, and records what the reported view leaves out.

3 Rollout Cards

Agent evaluations need a publication object that preserves a rollout before a view and reporting rule turn it into a reported score. We call this object a *rollout-card publication bundle*. The *rollout record* stores the episode evidence: task, environment, agent actions, artefacts, timing, status, and failures. The *rollout card* packages that record with a reporting-rule registry, drops manifests, and release-scope metadata, which together name the views and rules applied to the record, document what each reported score used or omitted, and declare any redaction, access, licensing, or redistribution limits.

We implement this specification in ERGON, an open-source reinforcement learning gym. ERGON makes rollout-card production a lightweight dataset-adaptor which validates a local artefact, maps it into the common record, attaches the available reporting rules and drops manifests, and writes the result as reusable rollout evidence. We release this implementation to make the specification concrete and provide reusable tooling for researchers who want to preserve, replay, or re-score agent rollouts after publication. ERGON is not required to use rollout cards: any framework can emit the same bundle specification.

3.1 What a rollout card contains

The core component of a rollout card is the rollout record, a self-describing archive readable without access to the runtime that produced it, so later readers can inspect, re-score, or re-analyse a completed rollout after publication. In ERGON’s reference schema, the record contains run metadata; agent or worker nodes; dependency edges; task and environment state; actions such as messages, model outputs, tool calls, and tool results; artefacts such as files or reports; and environment records describing external state changes. Appendix E gives the complete archive layout and row schemas. A final-answer transcript would preserve only the answer and perhaps the last model message. A rollout card also records which agent component acted, what result the environment returned, when failures or cancellations occurred, and which artefacts downstream graders could access; failures are status changes in the rollout record rather than exceptions that bypass logging, addressing the failure-visibility problem documented in the audit.

These fields support the community analyses that current publication records make difficult to reuse: worker identity and message flow support role-specialisation and failure-attribution analyses [Cemri et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2024]; turn-level actions and observations support long-horizon analyses of exploration and recovery [Chen et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025]; and dependency structure, task state, and artefacts support recursive-agent and hierarchical analyses of delegation, abandoned branches, and final outputs [Bacon et al., 2017, Zhu et al., 2024]. New analyses can add domain-specific fields under their own namespaces, so a group studying multi-agent negotiation can record proposals, acceptances, refusals, and delegated responsibilities without changing how a leaderboard view reads the final answer.

3.2 Views, reporting rules, and drops manifests

Section 2 defined a view as the part of the rollout record a reported analysis reads, and a reporting rule as the procedure that turns that view into a reported score. A rollout-card bundle makes both inspectable. The reporting-rule registry names every view and reporting rule applied to the card, with its implementation, configuration, or version where available. A *drops manifest* accompanies each entry: a typed record of which card streams, fields, and rows the analysis read; which filters or exclusions it applied; which structures it collapsed; and which semantic loss classes it declares for downstream analyses. The complement of this footprint is what the reported view does not carry forward. The same mechanism also supports responsible release: when privacy, licensing, scale, or source policy prevents publishing a full trace, the card records the omitted fields or rows, the reason for omission, and whether the remaining artefact is a full trace, redacted trace, gated trace,

derived view, or metadata-only record. In ERGON, each reporting rule is implemented as a versioned scoring script that accesses cards through a typed reader logging field and row access. Built-in rules declare their target view and structural collapses automatically. Custom rules additionally publish their implementation and any semantic loss labels that field access alone cannot infer. Field-level claims are therefore replayable from the card, while semantic labels remain inspectable declarations.

Consider a rollout record that includes how long each environment action took. An episode-return reporting rule may read rewards and terminal status while omitting action-timing and dependency fields. The reported score remains useful for RL, but its drops manifest records losses such as duration and precedence erasure so later readers know that total-plan-time or execution-feasibility analyses require returning to the full card.

4 Experiments

We discussed in Section 2 that publishing only reported scores undermines reproducibility by discarding rollout evidence and hiding the impacts of reporting conventions. Without the rollout, later research cannot ask new questions of the same behaviour; without the reporting rule, readers cannot tell whether score gaps reflect model behaviour or reporting-rule construction. In this section, we evaluate experimentally whether rollout cards, as proposed in Section 3, address both failures. Our experiments address two questions:

RQ1. When agent papers publish public rollout records, do those records preserve enough rollout evidence for another research community to compute a different view of the same episodes?

RQ2. Holding the rollout evidence fixed, can rollout cards isolate reporting-rule effects, and can those effects be large enough to change the scientific conclusion drawn from the same evidence?

To answer these questions, we build rollout-card exports for public agent-evaluation artefacts spanning tool use, safety, software engineering, web interaction, multi-agent coordination, and search. We publicly release 21 card exports: 17 trace-publication exports plus four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports and their dataset adapters so that later researchers can inspect or reanalyse the evidence available for each export class and extend the rollout-card standard proposal implemented in ERGON. Appendix F.1 summarizes the preserved fields, views, reporting rules, and drops for each source; Appendix F.2 reports export size and compression.

4.1 Experimental Setup

For RQ1, the test is whether a release built for one reported score contains enough rollout evidence to answer a different community question without rerunning the policy, environment, or harness. A case qualifies when the release is publicly available and preserves enough of the rollout record to support adding new reporting rules without repeating rollouts. Each recovered view is computed directly from preserved records, using only lightweight offline parsing and aggregation rather than rerunning the policy, environment, or harness. The results below highlight four releases from the bundle set because they support analyses their reported scores did not report, spanning tool safety, multi-agent systems, formal theorem proving, and search. We convert each release into the rollout-card representation from Section 3, using preserved rollout fields as the rollout record and recording missing or source-specific fields as limitations of the recovered view. Appendix A gives the selection rule, included cases, near misses, source files, extraction rules, and limitations.

For RQ2, we ask whether rollout cards make reporting-rule effects measurable, and whether those effects are large enough to change reported conclusions. In each case, we hold the preserved artefact fixed and change only the reporting rule, measuring the impact of how the same evidence is extracted, counted, weighted, or judged. We sample public archives that can be scored again across a spectrum of evaluation complexity, from single-completion tasks to code patches, benchmark submissions, and tool-mediated interactions. We include a source when its posted view supports at least two existing public reporting rules over the same rollout evidence, varying answer extraction, judge heuristics, failure handling, threshold rules, slice weighting, or trajectory success definitions. For each case, we therefore report whether the resulting score gap is large enough to change what a reader would conclude from the same evidence: which model appears better on a benchmark, how large a reported capability gap is, or whether a score crosses a benchmark-defined boundary such as medal/no-medal.




Figure 1: Public rollout releases contain analyses not reported by their original benchmark scores. Each panel reuses one fixed public release to examine a research question that the original benchmark or paper did not ask: **(a)** GAP text-safety labels versus tool-call safety; **(b)** MAESTRO run outcome versus coordination overhead; **(c)** miniF2F proof outcome in COPRA logs versus realised proof-search cost; and **(d)** Tree-of-Thought final reward versus action-budget and return profile.

Both experiments are retrospective: public artefacts test whether evidence released for one reporting rule can support later reuse and re-scoring.

4.2 Results

RQ1: preserved rollouts support cross-community reanalysis. Figure 1 computes secondary analyses from fixed preserved records. All four panels use descriptive summaries computed from these records rather than fresh rollouts: model-level rates for GAP [Cartagena and Teixeira, 2026], run-level medians for MAESTRO [Ma et al., 2026], binned success rates for miniF2F [Zheng et al., 2022] proof attempts from COPRA [Thakur et al., 2024] selected logs, and policy-level action/reward means for Tree-of-Thought [Yao et al., 2023].

Figure 1(a). The original GAP benchmark [Cartagena and Teixeira, 2026] reports whether a tool-using agent refuses harmful requests in its written response. We ask in a new analysis whether rows judged text-safe, meaning the visible response refuses or avoids harmful content, also avoid forbidden tool calls. Because the released file contains both labels, our analysis does not require rerunning the policy. Of 4,855 text-safe samples, 1,002 contain unsafe tool calls (20.64%). Of those 1,002, 997 visibly refuse the harmful request and none expose forbidden content in the text response, so the unsafe behaviour appears only in the tool channel. A response-only safety score can therefore certify visible refusal while missing forbidden actions in the environment.

Figure 1(b). MAESTRO [Ma et al., 2026] uses task success to compare multi-agent software-engineering systems across team structures and orchestration styles. Aggregating the released runs, we find that failures involve substantially more coordination work than successes. Across directly outcome-labelled runs, failures have median 48 spans and 78,523 tokens, while successes have median 10 spans and 11,586 tokens. The median failed run therefore uses roughly 5 $\times$ more spans and 7 $\times$ more tokens than the median successful run. This pattern cuts against the usual test-time-scaling interpretation of multi-agent debate, where extra collaborative work is expected to improve answers [Yang et al., 2025c]. In the released records, extra work is associated with failure consistent with coordination overhead rather than useful scaling, a distinction the outcome label alone collapses.

Figure 1(c). COPRA’s [Thakur et al., 2024] selected rollouts record attempts to prove olympiad-style formal mathematics problems from miniF2F [Zheng et al., 2022]. We ask what happens after the prover fails to solve a problem quickly: does additional proof search recover success through further exploration, or does it usually add steps without producing a proof? Across 908 theorem-result records, all 44 one-step attempts succeed, while only 74 of the remaining 864 attempts do. Among attempts longer than one step, success falls from 27.4% at 2–3 steps to 7.6% at 4–7 steps and remains low thereafter; a logistic model finds that each doubling of realised steps is associated with lower odds of success (odds ratio 0.62, $p < 10^{-6}$). Because realised search length is observational and the logs do not expose failed proof states, the result should be read as an association rather than causal evidence that larger budgets cause failure. It still exposes a process-level failure mode: repeated proof-search steps can reflect failed recovery rather than useful extra reasoning [Comanici et al., 2025].

Figure 1(d). Tree-of-Thought [Yao et al., 2023] records crossword-solving rollouts and reports final word-level reward. We ask whether this reward hides differences in search efficiency by sampling rollouts which pair depth-first searches on the same 20 puzzles, one with pruning and one without. This lets us stratify reward and action-path measures by pruning condition. Pruning raises mean final word reward from 0.320 to 0.440 while reducing mean unique atomic actions from 48.65 to 28.65. In five pairs, both runs finish with the same final word-level reward despite large differences in action coverage, depth, and backtracking. In this 20-puzzle paired sample, the recovered view is consistent with efficient-search claims by showing that pruning can preserve or improve reward while reducing wasted exploration, a mechanism final reward alone cannot expose.

Together, the four panels show that the original reported scores answered their papers’ native questions, but did not exhaust the evidence in the released rollouts. The same records also support adjacent views the original reports did not enumerate. This illustrates scientific reuse that Section 2.1 establishes is impeded by only publishing scores. When releases preserve enough of the rollout record, later communities can ask new questions of the same expensive behaviour rather than rerunning the policy, environment, and harness. The four cases were selected from a broader scout pass (Appendix A); most public agent releases preserve only final outputs, which is itself evidence of the recording problem of §2.1.

RQ2: reporting rules can change scientific conclusions. After RQ1 shows that preserved rollouts support new views, RQ2 asks whether changing only the reporting rule can change the scientific conclusions drawn from fixed evidence. We found that this changes reported scores by up to 20.9 percentage points and changes model-ordering, score-gap-size, and medal-threshold conclusions in our sweep (Table 2), which organizes cases by what the rollout card holds fixed and which reporting choice changes. Each row in Table 2 fixes the underlying model, archived output, or benchmark case and changes only the rule that turns that artefact into a reported score. These score gaps change the conclusions a reader would draw: whether a method improves over a baseline, which model appears better, or how large a claimed capability gap is.

Table 2: Applying alternative reporting rules to fixed public artefacts changes reported scores and, in several cases, the scientific conclusion. Rows hold fixed the relevant public artefact for each case: generated outputs, submissions, trajectories, or paired public submissions decomposed under denominator conventions. “pp” denotes percentage points.

Benchmark	Held fixed	Reporting choice	Score gap	Consequence
HumanEval/GPQA	Generated outputs	Driver/extraction variants	0.6pp/1.0pp	Minor changes: independent rules mostly agree
BrowseComp	Gold/predicted answers	Rule-based vs LLM judge	4.17pp	Judge convention changes 274 answer labels
SWE-bench Verified	GPT-4o submissions	Missing patches counted as failures vs excluded	2.3pp of 15.6pp gap	Affects reported capability gap
τ -bench	Tool-call trajectories	DB-state vs sequence/set graders	16.9pp	12 changes in ordering of frontier models
MLE-Bench	Kaggle submissions	Medal/pass definition	20.9pp	Gold-only reporting cuts pass rate from 34.2% to 13.3%

On SWE-bench Verified [Jimenez et al., 2024], both public submissions use GPT-4o-2024-05-13, but no-submission rates differ, with 50/500 for SWE-agent [Yang et al., 2024] and 4/500 for Agentless [Xia et al., 2024]. Counting no-submissions as unresolved gives a 15.6pp gap; scoring only submitted patches gives 13.3pp, so the reporting rule accounts for 2.3pp of the reported score gap. Other rows

show larger rule effects. τ -bench grader choice changes reported scores by 16.9pp and reverses the GPT-4o versus Claude 3.5 Sonnet ordering, while for MLE-Bench the same archived Kaggle submissions score 34.2% under an above-median rule but 13.3% under a gold-only medal rule.

Reporting-rule effects grow with evaluation complexity. Reporting sensitivity is uneven across evaluation types. HumanEval and GPQA move only 0.6pp and 1.0pp under independent driver or extraction variants, giving near-null calibration cases. In agentic settings, the evaluated object is often a multi-step artefact such as a software patch, a Kaggle submission, or a tool-call trajectory. The reporting layer must then choose what counts as an attempted run, which artefact slice to score, how to weight partial work, and which trajectory state defines success. BrowseComp isolates one stochastic layer, with four graders spanning 4.17pp and disagreeing on 274 of 5,064 preserved answers, including 26 exact-match judge failures. As evaluations move toward longer-horizon tasks and richer environments, two harnesses can report the same nominal score while making more local choices about what to count, drop, combine, or treat as success. The risk of reporting-rule score gaps therefore grows.

Together, the two experiments show how rollout cards help address the recording and reporting failures that Section 2 identified as an emerging reproducibility problem for agent evaluation. RQ1 demonstrates that preserved rollouts can mitigate the recording problem by enabling new views over fixed public records. RQ2 shows that declared reporting rules mitigate the reporting problem by making convention-driven score changes inspectable rather than implicit.

5 Related Work

Rollout cards extend documentation standards for machine learning artefacts. Datasheets for Datasets [Geburu et al., 2021] document the motivation, composition, collection, uses, distribution, and maintenance of datasets. Model Cards [Mitchell et al., 2019] document trained models, intended use, evaluation procedures, and performance characteristics. By contrast, rollout cards document completed agent runs and the views and reporting rules used to turn those runs into reported scores.

Prior work standardises parts of the reporting layer. HELM broadens language-model evaluation across scenarios and measures [Liang et al., 2023], while OLMES and Unitxt make evaluation transforms more explicit and reusable. Biderman et al. show prompt-template effects, and Dr. GRPO isolates loss-normalisation effects [Biderman et al., 2024, Liu et al., 2025]. These efforts expose reporting rules; rollout cards target the prerequisite record layer by preserving the rollout record and the drops manifests needed to replay, compare, or replace those reporting rules after publication.

Recent surveys [Yehudai et al., 2026, Cemri et al., 2025, Yang et al., 2025b] flag fragmentation across agent trajectory formats, and systems such as AgentOhana, VerlTool, and Agent Lightning [Zhang et al., 2024b, Jiang et al., 2025, Luo et al., 2025] unify trajectories or agent logic for training. Those proposals make trajectories easier to consume during training; rollout cards make completed runs easier to inspect after publication.

6 Conclusion

Reproducibility problems that have long affected machine learning and reinforcement learning are now appearing in agent evaluation, where reported scores depend on grading scripts, failure-handling rules, timing windows, and loss calculations. Our audit makes this prevalence visible: across 50 popular repositories and 37 reporting-rule discrepancies, failures and reporting choices are routinely hidden behind headline scores. Rollout cards help address this early by preserving the rollout record behind a reported score and pairing it with explicit views, reporting rules, and drops manifests. In our experiments, preserved traces reveal safety, coordination, proof-search, and search-efficiency findings that original reports did not include, while fixed benchmark artefacts can be re-graded to change reported scores and flip model orderings.

Limitations. Rollout cards do not prevent selective metric choice, privacy constraints, redaction, or selective reporting. Their role is narrower: to make the record, rule, and omissions inspectable so disagreements can be traced to preserved evidence, reporting choices, or agent behaviour. At scale, shared rollout-card repositories would support reuse, reporting-rule comparison, and meta-analyses without new frontier rollout budgets.

References

- Rishabh Agarwal, Max Schwarzer, Pablo Samuel Castro, Aaron Courville, and Marc Bellemare. Deep reinforcement learning at the edge of the statistical precipice. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 29304–29320. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2021/file/f514cec81cb148559cf475e7426eed5e-Paper.pdf.
- Maksym Andriushchenko, Alexandra Souly, Mateusz Dziemian, Derek Duenas, Maxwell Lin, Justin Wang, Dan Hendrycks, Andy Zou, J Zico Kolter, Matt Fredrikson, Yarin Gal, and Xander Davies. Agentharm: A benchmark for measuring harmfulness of LLM agents. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=AC5n7xHuR1>.
- Pierre-Luc Bacon, Jean Harb, and Doina Precup. The option-critic architecture. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI’17, page 1726–1734. AAAI Press, 2017.
- Ibragim Badertdinov, Alexander Golubev, Maksim Nekrashevich, Anton Shevtsov, Simon Karasik, Andrei Andriushchenko, Maria Trofimova, Daria Litvintseva, and Boris Yangel. Swe-rebench: An automated pipeline for task collection and decontaminated evaluation of software engineering agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.20411>.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Lintang Sutawika, Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Alham Fikri Aji, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Sidney Black, Jordan Clive, Anthony DiPofi, Julen Etxaniz, Benjamin Fattori, Jessica Zosa Forde, Charles Foster, Jeffrey Hsu, Mimansa Jaiswal, Wilson Y. Lee, Haonan Li, Charles Lovering, Niklas Muennighoff, Ellie Pavlick, Jason Phang, Aviya Skowron, Samson Tan, Xiangru Tang, Kevin A. Wang, Genta Indra Winata, François Yvon, and Andy Zou. Lessons from the trenches on reproducible evaluation of language models, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.14782>.
- William Brown. Verifiers: Environments for LLM reinforcement learning. <https://github.com/PrimeIntellect-ai/verifiers>, 2025.
- Arnold Cartagena and Ariane Teixeira. Mind the gap: Text safety does not transfer to tool-call safety in llm agents, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.16943>.
- Mert Cemri, Melissa Z. Pan, Shuyi Yang, Lakshya A. Agrawal, Bhavya Chopra, Rishabh Tiwari, Kurt Keutzer, Aditya Parameswaran, Dan Klein, Kannan Ramchandran, Matei Zaharia, Joseph E. Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. Why do multi-agent llm systems fail?, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.13657>.
- Kevin Chen, Marco Cusumano-Towner, Brody Huval, Aleksei Petrenko, Jackson Hamburger, Vladlen Koltun, and Philipp Krähenbühl. Reinforcement learning for long-horizon interactive llm agents, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.01600>.
- Gheorghe Comanici, Eric Bieber, Mike Schaekermann, Ice Pasupat, Noveen Sachdeva, et al. Gemini 2.5: Pushing the frontier with advanced reasoning, multimodality, long context, and next generation agentic capabilities, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.06261>.
- Tongwei Deng, Xutian Li, Runbang Yan, Wanning Li, Yifeng Zhu, Yue Wang, Jinyu Zhu, Yanzhen Zou, Zexiong Ma, Zhixuan Liu, and Bing Xie. SWE-eval: Trajectory-enhanced evaluation for agentic issue resolution. OpenReview submission, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=aPeeUApKtW>.
- 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>.

- Alexandre Drouin, Maxime Gasse, Massimo Caccia, Issam H. Laradji, Manuel Del Verme, Tom Marty, David Vazquez, Nicolas Chapados, and Alexandre Lacoste. BrowserGym: A gymnasium environment for web-agent evaluation. <https://github.com/ServiceNow/BrowserGym>, 2024. Environment released with WorkArena.
- Cl  mentine Fourrier, Nathan Habib, Julien Launay, and Thomas Wolf. What’s going on with the open LLM leaderboard? Hugging Face Blog, 2023. URL <https://huggingface.co/blog/open-llm-leaderboard-mmlu>.
- Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daum   III, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Commun. ACM*, 64(12):86–92, November 2021. ISSN 0001-0782. doi: 10.1145/3458723. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458723>.
- Xinyu Guan, Li Lyna Zhang, Yifei Liu, Ning Shang, Youran Sun, Yi Zhu, Fan Yang, and Mao Yang. rstar-math: Small LLMs can master math reasoning with self-evolved deep thinking. In *Forty-second International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5zwF1GizFa>.
- Hans Gundlach, Jayson Lynch, Matthias Mertens, and Neil Thompson. The price of progress. In *NeurIPS 2025 Workshop on Evaluating the Evolving LLM Lifecycle: Benchmarks, Emergent Abilities, and Scaling*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=JEsU87WUUb>.
- Peter Henderson, Riashat Islam, Philip Bachman, Joelle Pineau, Doina Precup, and David Meger. Deep reinforcement learning that matters. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Thirtieth Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference and Eighth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, AAAI’18/IAAI’18/EAAI’18. AAAI Press, 2018. ISBN 978-1-57735-800-8.
- Dan Hendrycks, Collin Burns, Steven Basart, Andy Zou, Mantas Mazeika, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. Measuring massive multitask language understanding. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=d7KBjmI3GmQ>.
- Jian Hu, Xibin Wu, Wei Shen, Jason Klein Liu, Weixun Wang, Songlin Jiang, Haoran Wang, Hao Chen, Bin Chen, Wenkai Fang, Xianyu, Yu Cao, Haotian Xu, and Yiming Liu. OpenRLHF: A ray-based easy-to-use, scalable and high-performance RLHF framework. In Ivan Habernal, Peter Schulam, and J  rg Tiedemann, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 656–666, Suzhou, China, November 2025. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-334-0. doi: 10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-demos.48. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2025.emnlp-demos.48/>.
- Hugging Face. TRL GRPOTrainer implementation. <https://github.com/huggingface/trl>, 2025.
- Dongfu Jiang, Yi Lu, Zhuofeng Li, Zhiheng Lyu, Ping Nie, Haozhe Wang, Alex Su, Hui Chen, Kai Zou, Chao Du, Tianyu Pang, and Wenhui Chen. Verltool: Towards holistic agentic reinforcement learning with tool use, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.01055>.
- Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTF8yNQM66>.
- Thomas Kwa, Ben West, Joel Becker, Amy Deng, Katharyn Garcia, Max Hasin, Sami Jawhar, Megan Kinniment, Nate Rush, Sydney Von Arx, Ryan Bloom, Thomas Broadley, Haoxing Du, Brian Goodrich, Nikola Jurkovic, Luke Harold Miles, Seraphina Nix, Tao Lin, Neev Parikh, David Rein, Lucas Jun Koba Sato, Hjalmar Wijk, Daniel M. Ziegler, Elizabeth Barnes, and Lawrence Chan. Measuring ai ability to complete long software tasks, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.14499>.
- Langfuse. Anthropic cache tokens double-counted: usage.input already includes cache via OTel/genai-prices. GitHub issue #12306, 2026. URL <https://github.com/langfuse/langfuse/issues/12306>.

- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yian Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, Benjamin Newman, Binhang Yuan, Bobby Yan, Ce Zhang, Christian Cosgrove, Christopher D Manning, Christopher Re, Diana Acosta-Navas, Drew A. Hudson, Eric Zelikman, Esin Durmus, Faisal Ladhak, Frieda Rong, Hongyu Ren, Huaxiu Yao, Jue Wang, Keshav Santhanam, Laurel Orr, Lucia Zheng, Mert Yuksekgonul, Mirac Suzgun, Nathan Kim, Neel Guha, Niladri S. Chatterji, Omar Khat-tab, Peter Henderson, Qian Huang, Ryan Andrew Chi, Sang Michael Xie, Shibani Santurkar, Surya Ganguli, Tatsunori Hashimoto, Thomas Icard, Tianyi Zhang, Vishrav Chaudhary, William Wang, Xuechen Li, Yifan Mai, Yuhui Zhang, and Yuta Koreeda. Holistic Evaluation of Language Models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. URL <https://mlanthology.org/tmlr/2023/liang2023tmlr-holistic/>.
- Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Penghui Qi, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. Understanding rl-zero-like training: A critical perspective. In *Second Conference on Language Modeling*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=5PAF7PAY2Y>.
- Xufang Luo, Yuge Zhang, Zhiyuan He, Zilong Wang, Siyun Zhao, Dongsheng Li, Luna K. Qiu, and Yuqing Yang. Agent lightning: Train any ai agents with reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2508.03680>.
- Tie Ma, Yixi Chen, Vaastav Anand, Alessandro Cornacchia, Amândio R. Faustino, Guanheng Liu, Shan Zhang, Hongbin Luo, Suhaib A. Fahmy, Zafar A. Qazi, and Marco Canini. Maestro: Multi-agent evaluation suite for testing, reliability, and observability, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.00481>.
- Alexander Meinke, Bronson Schoen, J  r  my Scheurer, Mikita Balesni, Rusheb Shah, and Marius Hobbhahn. Frontier models are capable of in-context scheming, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.04984>.
- Margaret Mitchell, Simone Wu, Andrew Zaldivar, Parker Barnes, Lucy Vasserman, Ben Hutchinson, Elena Spitzer, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Timnit Gebru. Model cards for model reporting. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, FAT* ’19, page 220–229, New York, NY, USA, 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450361255. doi: 10.1145/3287560.3287596. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596>.
- OpenAI. OpenAI evals. <https://github.com/openai/evals>, 2023. A framework for evaluating LLMs and LLM systems, and an open-source registry of benchmarks.
- OpenAI, :, Aaron Jaech, Adam Kalai, Adam Lerer, Adam Richardson, Ahmed El-Kishky, Aiden Low, Alec Helyar, Aleksander Madry, Alex Beutel, Alex Carney, Alex Iftimie, Alex Karpenko, Alex Tachard Passos, Alexander Neitz, Alexander Prokofiev, Alexander Wei, Allison Tam, Ally Bennett, Ananya Kumar, Andre Saraiva, Andrea Vallone, Andrew Duberstein, Andrew Kondrich, Andrey Mishchenko, Andy Applebaum, Angela Jiang, Ashvin Nair, Barret Zoph, Behrooz Ghorbani, Bohan Zhang, Ben Rossen, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Boaz Barak, Bob McGrew, Borys Minaiev, Botao Hao, Bowen Baker, Brandon Houghton, Brandon McKinzie, Brydon Eastman, Camillo Lugaresi, Cary Bassin, Cary Hudson, Chak Ming Li, Charles de Bourcy, Chelsea Voss, Chen Shen, Chong Zhang, Chris Koch, Chris Orsinger, Christopher Hesse, Claudia Fischer, Clive Chan, Dan Roberts, Daniel Kappler, Daniel Levy, Daniel Selsam, David Dohan, David Farhi, David Mely, David Robinson, Dimitris Tsipras, Doug Li, Dragos Oprica, Eben Freeman, Eddie Zhang, Edmund Wong, Elizabeth Proehl, Enoch Cheung, Eric Mitchell, Eric Wallace, Erik Ritter, Evan Mays, Fan Wang, Felipe Petroski Such, Filippo Raso, Florencia Leoni, Foivos Tsimpourlas, Francis Song, Fred von Lohmann, Freddie Sulit, Geoff Salmon, Giambattista Parascandolo, Gildas Chabot, Grace Zhao, Greg Brockman, Guillaume Leclerc, Hadi Salman, Haiming Bao, Hao Sheng, Hart Andrin, Hessam Bagherinezhad, Hongyu Ren, Hunter Lightman, Hyung Won Chung, Ian Kivlichan, Ian O’Connell, Ian Osband, Ignasi Clavera Gilaberte, Ilge Akkaya, Ilya Kostrikov, Ilya Sutskever, Irina Kofman, Jakub Pachocki, James Lennon, Jason Wei, Jean Harb, Jerry Twore, Jiacheng Feng, Jiahui Yu, Jiayi Weng, Jie Tang, Jieqi Yu, Joaquin Qui  n  ro Candela, Joe Palermo, Joel Parish, Johannes Heidecke, John Hallman, John Rizzo, Jonathan Gordon, Jonathan Uesato, Jonathan Ward, Joost Huizinga, Julie Wang, Kai Chen, Kai Xiao, Karan Singhal, Karina Nguyen, Karl Cobbe, Katy Shi, Kayla Wood, Kendra Rimbach, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Kevin Liu, Kevin Lu, Kevin Stone,

- Kevin Yu, Lama Ahmad, Lauren Yang, Leo Liu, Leon Maksin, Leyton Ho, Liam Fedus, Lilian Weng, Linden Li, Lindsay McCallum, Lindsey Held, Lorenz Kuhn, Lukas Kondraciuk, Lukasz Kaiser, Luke Metz, Madelaine Boyd, Maja Trebacz, Manas Joglekar, Mark Chen, Marko Tintor, Mason Meyer, Matt Jones, Matt Kaufer, Max Schwarzer, Meghan Shah, Mehmet Yatbaz, Melody Y. Guan, Mengyuan Xu, Mengyuan Yan, Mia Glaese, Mianna Chen, Michael Lampe, Michael Malek, Michele Wang, Michelle Fradin, Mike McClay, Mikhail Pavlov, Miles Wang, Mingxuan Wang, Mira Murati, Mo Bavarian, Mostafa Rohaninejad, Nat McAleese, Neil Chowdhury, Neil Chowdhury, Nick Ryder, Nikolas Tezak, Noam Brown, Ofir Nachum, Oleg Boiko, Oleg Murk, Olivia Watkins, Patrick Chao, Paul Ashbourne, Pavel Izmailov, Peter Zhokhov, Rachel Dias, Rahul Arora, Randall Lin, Rapha Gontijo Lopes, Raz Gaon, Reah Miyara, Reimar Leike, Renny Hwang, Rhythm Garg, Robin Brown, Roshan James, Rui Shu, Ryan Cheu, Ryan Greene, Saachi Jain, Sam Altman, Sam Toizer, Sam Toyer, Samuel Miserendino, Sandhini Agarwal, Santiago Hernandez, Sasha Baker, Scott McKinney, Scottie Yan, Shengjia Zhao, Shengli Hu, Shibani Santurkar, Shraman Ray Chaudhuri, Shuyuan Zhang, Siyuan Fu, Spencer Papay, Steph Lin, Suchir Balaji, Suvansh Sanjeev, Szymon Sidor, Tal Broda, Aidan Clark, Tao Wang, Taylor Gordon, Ted Sanders, Tejal Patwardhan, Thibault Sottiaux, Thomas Degry, Thomas Dimson, Tianhao Zheng, Timur Garipov, Tom Stasi, Trapit Bansal, Trevor Creech, Troy Peterson, Tyna Eloundou, Valerie Qi, Vineet Kosaraju, Vinnie Monaco, Vitchyr Pong, Vlad Fomenko, Weiye Zheng, Wenda Zhou, Wenting Zhan, Wes McCabe, Wojciech Zaremba, Yann Dubois, Yinghai Lu, Yining Chen, Young Cha, Yu Bai, Yuchen He, Yuchen Zhang, Yunyun Wang, Zheng Shao, and Zhuohan Li. Openai o1 system card, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.16720>.
- OpenTelemetry. genai: define cached tokens attributes. GitHub pull request #3163, 2026. URL <https://github.com/open-telemetry/semantic-conventions/pull/3163>.
- Toby Ord. Are the costs of AI agents also rising exponentially? <https://www.tobyord.com/writing/hourly-costs-for-ai-agents>, 2025. URL <https://www.tobyord.com/writing/hourly-costs-for-ai-agents>.
- Mary Phuong, Matthew Aitchison, Elliot Catt, Sarah Cogan, Alexandre Kaskasoli, Victoria Krakovna, David Lindner, Matthew Rahtz, Yannis Assael, Sarah Hodgkinson, Heidi Howard, Tom Lieberum, Ramana Kumar, Maria Abi Raad, Albert Webson, Lewis Ho, Sharon Lin, Sebastian Farquhar, Marcus Hutter, Gregoire Deletang, Anian Ruoss, Seliem El-Sayed, Sasha Brown, Anca Dragan, Rohin Shah, Allan Dafoe, and Toby Shevlane. Evaluating frontier models for dangerous capabilities, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.13793>.
- Joelle Pineau, Philippe Vincent-Lamarre, Koustuv Sinha, Vincent Larivière, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché Buc, Emily Fox, and Hugo Larochelle. Improving reproducibility in machine learning research (a report from the neurips 2019 reproducibility program). *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 22(1), January 2021. ISSN 1532-4435.
- Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Lauren Hong, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. ToolLLM: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world APIs. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=dHng200Jjr>.
- Enrico Saccon, Ahmet Tikna, Davide De Martini, Edoardo Lamon, Luigi Palopoli, and Marco Roveri. A temporal planning framework for multi-agent systems via llm-aided knowledge base management, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.19135>.
- Manasi Sharma, Chen Bo Calvin Zhang, Chaithanya Bandi, Clinton Wang, Ankit Aich, Huy Nghiem, Tahseen Rabbani, Ye Htet, Brian Jang, Sumana Basu, Aishwarya Balwani, Denis Peskoff, Marcos Ayestaran, Sean M. Hendryx, Brad Kenstler, and Bing Liu. Researchrubrics: A benchmark of prompts and rubrics for evaluating deep research agents. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=ErnvfmSXOP>.
- Guangming Sheng, Chi Zhang, Zilingfeng Ye, Xibin Wu, Wang Zhang, Ru Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Haibin Lin, and Chuan Wu. Hybridflow: A flexible and efficient rlhf framework. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth European Conference on Computer Systems*, EuroSys ’25, page 1279–1297,

- New York, NY, USA, 2025. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9798400711961. doi: 10.1145/3689031.3696075. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3689031.3696075>.
- Mohammed Latif Siddiq, Arvin Islam-Gomes, Natalie Sekerak, and Joanna C. S. Santos. Large language models for software engineering: A reproducibility crisis, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.00651>.
- Lintang Sutawika, Hailey Schoelkopf, Leo Gao, Baber Abbasi, Stella Biderman, Jonathan Tow, ben fattori, Charles Lovering, farzanehnakhae70, Jason Phang, Anish Thite, Fazz, Aflah, Niklas Muennighoff, Thomas Wang, sdtblck, nopperl, gakada, ttyuntian, researcher2, Julen Etxaniz, Chris, Hanwool Albert Lee, Zdeněk Kasner, Khalid, LSinev, Jeffrey Hsu, Anjor Kanekar, KonradSzafer, and AndyZwei. Eleutherai/lm-evaluation-harness: v0.4.3, July 2024. URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12608602>.
- Amitayush Thakur, George Tsoukalas, Yeming Wen, Jimmy Xin, and Swarat Chaudhuri. An in-context learning agent for formal theorem-proving. In *First Conference on Language Modeling*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=V7HRrxXUhn>.
- Khanh-Tung Tran, Dung Dao, Minh-Duong Nguyen, Quoc-Viet Pham, Barry O’Sullivan, and Hoang D. Nguyen. Multi-agent collaboration mechanisms: A survey of llms, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.06322>.
- UK AI Safety Institute. Inspect AI: Framework for large language model evaluations. https://github.com/UKGovernmentBEIS/inspect_ai, 2024.
- verl-project. Tokenization inconsistency warning for Qwen3-4B with ignore_strippable mode in multi-turn interaction. GitHub issue #2165, 2025. URL <https://github.com/verl-project/verl/issues/2165>.
- Caroline Wang, Arrasy Rahman, Ishan Durugkar, Elad Liebman, and Peter Stone. N-agent ad hoc teamwork. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=q7TxGUWlhD>.
- Zihan Wang, Kangrui Wang, Qineng Wang, Pingyue Zhang, Linjie Li, Zhengyuan Yang, Xing Jin, Kefan Yu, Minh Nhat Nguyen, Licheng Liu, Eli Gottlieb, Yiping Lu, Kyunghyun Cho, Jiajun Wu, Li Fei-Fei, Lijuan Wang, Yejin Choi, and Manling Li. Ragen: Understanding self-evolution in llm agents via multi-turn reinforcement learning, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.20073>.
- Lionel Wong, Jiayuan Mao, Pratyusha Sharma, Zachary S. Siegel, Jiahai Feng, Noa Korneev, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, and Jacob Andreas. Learning adaptive planning representations with natural language guidance, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.08566>.
- Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01489>.
- John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. Swe-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.15793>.
- John Yang, Kilian Lieret, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kabir Khandpur, Yanzhe Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Ofir Press, Ludwig Schmidt, and Diyi Yang. Swe-smith: Scaling data for software engineering agents, 2025a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.21798>.
- Yingxuan Yang, Huacan Chai, Yuanyi Song, Siyuan Qi, Muning Wen, Ning Li, Junwei Liao, Haoyi Hu, Jianghao Lin, Gaowei Chang, Weiwen Liu, Ying Wen, Yong Yu, and Weinan Zhang. A survey of ai agent protocols, 2025b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.16736>.
- Yongjin Yang, Euiin Yi, Jongwoo Ko, Kimin Lee, Zhijing Jin, and Se-Young Yun. Revisiting multi-agent debate as test-time scaling: A systematic study of conditional effectiveness, 2025c. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2505.22960>.

- Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Tom Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models. In A. Oh, T. Naumann, A. Globerson, K. Saenko, M. Hardt, and S. Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 11809–11822. Curran Associates, Inc., 2023. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2023/file/271db9922b8d1f4dd7aaef84ed5ac703-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik R Narasimhan. $\{\tau\}$ -bench: A benchmark for $\{\text{T}\}$ ool- $\{\text{A}\}$ gent- $\{\text{U}\}$ ser interaction in real-world domains. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=roNSXZpUDN>.
- Asaf Yehudai, Lilach Eden, Alan Li, Guy Uziel, Yilun Zhao, Roy Bar-Haim, Arman Cohan, and Michal Shmueli-Scheuer. Survey on evaluation of llm-based agents, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.16416>.
- Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, Xiaochen Zuo, Yu Yue, Weinan Dai, Tiantian Fan, Gaohong Liu, Lingjun Liu, Xin Liu, Haibin Lin, Zhiqi Lin, Bole Ma, Guangming Sheng, Yuxuan Tong, Chi Zhang, Mofan Zhang, Wang Zhang, Hang Zhu, Jinhua Zhu, Jiaze Chen, Jiangjie Chen, Chengyi Wang, Hongli Yu, Yuxuan Song, Xiangpeng Wei, Hao Zhou, Jingjing Liu, Wei-Ying Ma, Ya-Qin Zhang, Lin Yan, Mu Qiao, Yonghui Wu, and Mingxuan Wang. Dapo: An open-source llm reinforcement learning system at scale, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.14476>.
- Daoguang Zan, Zhirong Huang, Wei Liu, Hanwu Chen, Linhao Zhang, Shulin Xin, Lu Chen, Qi Liu, Xiaojian Zhong, Aoyan Li, Siyao Liu, Yongsheng Xiao, Liangqiang Chen, Yuyu Zhang, Jing Su, Tianyu Liu, Rui Long, Kai Shen, and Liang Xiang. Multi-swe-bench: A multilingual benchmark for issue resolving, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.02605>.
- Dan Zhang, Sining Zhou, Ziniu Hu, Yisong Yue, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. ReST-MCTS*: LLM self-training via process reward guided tree search. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=8rcF0qEud5>.
- Jianguo Zhang, Tian Lan, Rithesh Murthy, Zhiwei Liu, Weiran Yao, Ming Zhu, Juntao Tan, Thai Hoang, Zuxin Liu, Liangwei Yang, Yihao Feng, Shirley Kokane, Tulika Awalganekar, Juan Carlos Niebles, Silvio Savarese, Shelby Heinecke, Huan Wang, and Caiming Xiong. Agentohana: Design unified data and training pipeline for effective agent learning, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.15506>.
- Kaiyan Zhang, Kai Tian, Runze Liu, Sihang Zeng, Xuekai Zhu, Guoli Jia, Yuchen Fan, Xingtai Lv, Yuxin Zuo, Che Jiang, Yuru wang, Jianyu Wang, Ermo Hua, Xinwei Long, Junqi Gao, Youbang Sun, Zhiyuan Ma, Ganqu Cui, Ning Ding, Biqing Qi, and Bowen Zhou. MARTI: A framework for multi-agent LLM systems reinforced training and inference. In *The Fourteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=E7jZqo0A50>.
- Kunhao Zheng, Jesse Michael Han, and Stanislas Polu. minif2f: a cross-system benchmark for formal olympiad-level mathematics. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=9ZPegFuFTFv>.
- Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Uri Alon, and Graham Neubig. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=oKn9c6ytLx>.
- Andrew Zhu, Liam Dugan, and Chris Callison-Burch. ReDel: A toolkit for LLM-powered recursive multi-agent systems. In Delia Irazu Hernandez Farias, Tom Hope, and Manling Li, editors, *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: System Demonstrations*, pages 162–171, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-demo.17. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-demo.17/>.

A RQ1 Public-Rollout Reuse Inventory

This appendix documents how we selected the four RQ1 reuse cases and what each recovered rollout-card representation preserves. The goal is not to claim an exhaustive survey of all public agent artefacts. It is to show that the main-text cases were chosen under a stated public-record criterion rather than after rerunning policies or selecting only successful examples.

Inclusion rule. A candidate had to satisfy four conditions: (i) the release was public or open source; (ii) it preserved labels, logs, traces, or process fields beyond the reported score; (iii) the original paper or benchmark reported a different primary view; and (iv) the reanalysis required no new policy rollouts. Offline computation or judging was allowed only when applied to preserved records and declared as part of the recovered view. The artefact does not redistribute the full upstream source datasets for these cases. Instead, the submitted artefact records derived card records, adapters, manifests, view definitions, reporting-rule metadata, and drops manifests at the level declared in the released metadata. Readers who need the original task inputs or upstream dataset files should obtain them from the original releases.

Table 3: RQ1 public rollout reuse cases. Each included case preserves a public record rich enough to support a second view over the same behaviour.

Case	Source artefact	Original view	Recovered view	Main limitation
GAP	Public results parquet, 17,420 rows and 42 columns [Cartagena and Teixeira, 2026]	Text-safety and refusal labels	Tool-call safety, forbidden-call fields, and refusal/tool divergence	Benchmark evidence of reporting-rule non-equivalence, not deployment prevalence
MAESTRO	Public trace parquet, 116,918 rows and 1,056 runs [Ma et al., 2026]	Run outcome or judgement	Span/token overhead and coordination-process structure	Overhead is observational and not a causal failure mechanism
COPRA miniF2F selected logs	Two selected-result logs, 908 theorem-result records [Thakur et al., 2024, Zheng et al., 2022]	Proved/failed theorem outcome	Realised proof-search steps, elapsed time, and successful proof style	Failed tactic branches and failed proof states are not exposed
Tree-of-Thought	Paired crossword DFS prune/no-prune logs, 20 puzzle pairs [Yao et al., 2023]	Final crossword reward	Action coverage, depth, backtracking, and prune/no-prune return profile	Small paired sample; pruning mechanism is reconstructed from traces

Extraction rules. For GAP, the text-safety view is the released `t_safe` field and the recovered process view uses `tc_safe`, `gap`, `forbidden_calls`, `refusal_strength`, and tool-call counts. The headline main-text statistic is computed over rows with `t_safe=True`: 1,002 of 4,855 are tool-call unsafe. For MAESTRO, rows are grouped by `run_id`; direct labels use `run.outcome` when present, and the recovered overhead view sums span counts and token fields by `run`. We report direct outcome labels in the main text and use task-specific derived labels only as a robustness check. For the COPRA miniF2F logs, each theorem-result record contributes its `SearchResult`, `StepsUsed`, elapsed search time, and any successful proof text; binned success rates use realised steps, not assigned compute budget. For Tree-of-Thought, each DFS record stores the current action path and reward snapshot. We reconstruct unique atomic actions, maximum depth, and backtracking from action-list prefixes and compare paired prune/no-prune traces for the same crossword prompt.

Candidate inventory and near misses. The broader scout pass considered public trace artefacts across tool safety, multi-agent systems, theorem proving, search, planning/UI, web, coding agents, and function calling. Several candidates were usable but not selected for the four-panel main-text figure because they overlapped the final domains or produced weaker source pairings: AgentHarm, τ -bench historical trajectories, SWE-smith trajectories, agent-reward-bench, ATBench, StableToolBench,

BFCL, MiniWoB++, AgentNet, and Tree-of-Thought Game24. We excluded other candidates because we could not verify a reusable public corpus of raw traces plus outcomes, the release was gated or too large for the submission-time audit, or the available artefact had only final outputs rather than process logs. These near misses include standalone ChatDev, MetaGPT, AgentVerse, AutoGenBench, TraceElephant, LeanDojo/HOList, DeepSeek-Prover/miniF2F final proofs, ReST-MCTS, rStar-Math, RAGEN, OSWorld, AppWorld, WorkArena, TravelPlanner, ToolQA, AgentDojo, ToolEmu, OS-Harm, ToolShield, SafeArena, BrowserART, and `cx-cmu/agent_trajectories`. This inventory is why the main text describes the four panels as a diverse demonstration set rather than a prevalence estimate over all public agent releases.

Missing fields and recovered-card limits. None of the four source releases was originally published as a rollout-card bundle. The recovered cards therefore preserve only fields present in the public artefact. GAP lacks the full runtime environment behind each tool interaction; MAESTRO exposes span and metadata fields but not a single causal label for coordination failure; the COPRA miniF2F logs expose theorem-level search records and successful proofs but not failed tactic-branch states; and the Tree-of-Thought crossword logs expose action paths and reward snapshots but not every evaluator decision that led to pruning. These omissions are recorded as recovered-view limitations rather than filled in by rerunning the policies.

B 50-repo Failure-Handling Survey

This appendix reports the code-level evidence underlying the failure-handling audit in Sec. 2. We shallow-cloned each repository at a pinned commit SHA in April 2026 and audited it against a seven-pattern rubric. Every claim below is supported by a commit-pinned public source reference; the full references and evidence notes are not reproduced inline for reasons of space, but are released in `ergon_survey_supplement/survey_audit/01_repository_failure_audit/`. Each record links the paper label to a pinned ref and colocated evidence note. Pinned SHAs are given in §B.6.

B.1 Repository selection

Sampling frame and operational scope filter. The survey uses *category-stratified purposive sampling* over repositories that produce benchmark numbers for LLM-agent papers. A repository is in-scope if and only if, at its pinned SHA, it contains code that (a) is actively maintained (last commit within the past 12 months), (b) produces a benchmark number, training-pipeline metric, or leaderboard rank that a published paper would cite, and (c) implements the result aggregation itself rather than delegating all aggregation to a separately-versioned downstream harness. Star-count was not used as a threshold; verified in-scope repositories range from ~ 150 stars (SciCode 164, MLAGentBench 320) to $\sim 40k+$ (FastChat, aider), demonstrating that the in-scope/canonical-harness filter dominates any star-based floor. Operational scope is enforced by documented scope decisions rather than concealed filtering. For example, OpenHands was spot-checked (SHA 3b17f27) and documented OUT-OF-SCOPE because its evaluation harness lives in a separately-versioned repository (`github.com/OpenHands/benchmarks`) and the main repo contains no result-aggregation, scoring, or denominator-handling code. This is the operational scope filter working as intended: OpenHands is the foundation layer (analogous to how PyTorch is the foundation for training frameworks) and is correctly excluded by criterion (c).

Categories. (i) SWE-bench-family harnesses and agent scaffolds (SWE-bench, SWE-agent, mini-swe-agent, live-swe-agent, SWE-bench_Pro-os, SWE-smith, Agentless, aider); (ii) RL training frameworks (TRL, verl, OpenRLHF, rllm, slime, ART, Agent-R1, RAGEN, MARTI, MATPO, RL-Factory, Trinity-RFT, ms-swift, verifiers, open-r1); (iii) general eval harnesses and LLM-as-judge leaderboards (`openai/evals`, `simple-evals`, SciCode, `lm-evaluation-harness`, `lighteval`, `inspect_ai`, FastChat/MT-Bench + Chatbot Arena, HELM, ragas, `deepeval`, MTEB, `promptfoo`, BIG-bench); (iv) web/GUI, mobile, and ML-engineering / scientific-agent benchmarks (WebArena, VisualWebArena, OSWorld, `android_world`, Mind2Web, MLE-bench, MLAGentBench, ScienceAgentBench); and (v) function-calling and general multi-agent / scaffold repositories (BFCL/gorilla, ToolBench, AgentBench, AgentBoard, `tau-bench`, Self-rewarding-reasoning-LLM). The final sample is 50 in-scope repositories, with excluded candidates documented as scope-filter decisions rather than concealed.

Sensitivity to the sampling frame. The 50-repository result is therefore a claim about repositories that implement result aggregation for a benchmark, training metric, or leaderboard number. It is not a prevalence estimate over every public trajectory dataset or agent artefact release. To check this boundary, we maintained a broader discovery log of public agent-artefact releases while building the rollout-card corpus. After ordinary URL triage, that log contained 91 candidate releases; a deterministic metadata or sample fetch yielded public metadata or sample files for 89 releases, with two gated releases retained as gated. Most releases outside the 50-repository audit were excluded not because they contradicted the finding, but because they changed the estimand: they were trajectory datasets, model/checkpoint pages, demonstration corpora, gated releases, or framework examples rather than repositories whose own code computes a paper-citable score. Including them would require a separate “public-release documentation” audit, not relabelling them as clean failure-handling implementations. Table 4 gives representative excluded candidates and the exclusion rule they triggered.

Table 4: Representative candidates considered but excluded from the 50-repository failure-handling audit. The table records scope decisions, not negative judgements about the usefulness of the releases. Several of these artefacts are used elsewhere in the paper or public card release, but they are not counted in the repository-level failure-accounting denominator because they do not themselves implement the aggregation code being audited.

Candidate	Release type	Reason excluded from the 50-repo audit
OpenHands main repository	Agent platform	Spot check found the evaluation harness in a separately versioned benchmarks repository; the main repo did not itself implement the result aggregation code.
SWE-smith trajectories; SWE-agent / SWE-rebench trajectory mirrors	Trajectory datasets	Public trajectory releases, not repositories whose own code turns failures into a reported benchmark number.
AgentHarm, ATBench, We- bLINX	Benchmark or trace datasets	Useful public records for rollout-card exports, but the dataset cards are not the aggregation implementations audited for failure accounting.
Agent-FLAN, xLAM, Tou- can, ToolAlpaca	Tool-use instruction or training data	Dataset/model releases without a repo-local denominator or failure-handling path for a headline score.
TRAIL and xLAM- function-calling	Gated Hugging Face re- leases	Dataset access was gated during the discovery pass, so they could not be audited against pinned public source lines.
Open X-Embodiment, LeR- obot collection, DROID, RH20T	Embodied-agent demon- stration corpora	Very large robot-demonstration releases outside the LLM-agent aggregation-code scope.
Generative Agents, Chat- Dev, AutoGen examples	Framework or simulation artefacts	Public scaffolds or example logs, but not in-scope aggregation repositories under criterion (c).

B.2 Audit methodology

We shallow-cloned each public repository during the audit window and pinned it with `git rev-parse HEAD`. The 50 SHAs are listed in §B.6 and used as the source baseline for every permalink. Every citation in this appendix resolves to `github.com/{owner}/{repo}/blob/{SHA}/{path}#L{start}-L{end}` against that SHA. We accepted claims only when the cited source lines directly exhibited the denominator, failure-handling, or aggregation behaviour being described. The audit is source-verifiable: each label resolves to pinned code that readers can inspect directly. The uploaded supplement records the final repository labels, pinned refs, and evidence IDs; representative per-repo evidence notes are colocated with those records to illustrate the template.

B.3 Severity rubric: seven patterns of silent drop

We scored every repository 0–3 against a rubric defined by seven recurring code patterns: (*P1*) None-to-0.0 reward coercion (reward-function exception silently yields a numeric zero that enters aggregation alongside genuine zero-reward rollouts); (*P2*) variance-based rollout filters that discard

entire rollout groups with zero std (collapse with the remaining group in published aggregates); (*P3*) save-on-clean-exit patterns bypassed by `KeyboardInterrupt` or early-exit cost-killers, removing instances from the submission file rather than the denominator; (*P4*) survivor denominators — reporting $\text{sum}(\text{scores}) / \text{len}(\text{scores})$ over instances that reached the aggregation step, with the pre-aggregation drop count not preserved; (*P5*) multi-turn N-destroys-1-to-N-1 patterns, where a mid-rollout tool-call exception discards the entire trajectory including its already-completed turns; (*P6*) LLM-judge regex-miss-to-fixed-score, where a judge returning an unparseable response is coerced to a specific numeric score indistinguishable from a legitimate one (e.g. `0.0`, `min(choice_scores)`, `NOT_ATTEMPTED`); and (*P7*) outcome-as-ground-truth SFT filtering, where a downstream supervised dataset is built from only those trajectories that scored correctly on the biased harness, propagating the bias across a model-generation boundary. A repository scores 3 if a single pattern is catastrophic and observable at the headline output (the failure changes the number a paper would cite); 2 if one or more patterns are present but the reader cannot tell from the published CSV; 1 if failures are logged but excluded from the denominator with no per-category counter; 0 if all failures are surfaced alongside metrics. No repository in the survey defaults to score 0.

B.4 Score distribution

Table 5: 50-repo severity scores. No repository defaults to surfacing failures alongside metrics. OpenHands is documented OUT-OF-SCOPE (no in-repo aggregation harness; benchmarks live in a separately-versioned repository) and not counted in the 50. Simple-evals appears in both score-3 (SimpleQA subset) and score-1 (non-SimpleQA subset); the 11+31+9=51 listings correspond to 50 unique repositories.

Score	Count	Repositories
3	11	SWE-bench, openai/evals, simple-evals (SimpleQA), VisualWebArena, ToolBench, Self-rewarding-reasoning-LLM, PrimeIntellect verifiers, Trinity-RFT, ms-swift (GRPO), BFCL (gorilla), FastChat (MT-Bench + Chatbot Arena)
2	31	Agent-R1, MARTI, SWE-bench_Pro-os, RAGEN, Open-RLHF, TRL, ART, slime, tau-bench, rllm, live-swe-agent, SWE-agent, mini-swe-agent, MATPO, verl, AgentBoard, AgentBench, RL-Factory, SWE-smith, lm-evaluation-harness, WebArena, MLEAgentBench, MLE-bench, lighteval, Agentless, aider, Mind2Web, open-r1, ragas, MTEB, promptfoo
1	9	SciCode, inspect_ai, ScienceAgentBench, android_world, OSWorld (harness), simple-evals (non-SimpleQA subset), HELM, BIG-bench, deepeval
0	0	—

Inspect AI (score 1) is the near-positive control referenced in Sec. 2: its default `fail_on_error=True` surfaces per-sample errors, but the commonly-used `fail_on_error=False` opt-in degrades silently with no per-category counter (`inspect_ai/_eval/task/error.py:L26` and `inspect_ai/scorer/_metrics/accuracy.py:L33` at SHA 36231d6).

B.5 Per-repo entries

We summarise each repository’s score with a one-line evidence pointer; the eleven score-3 repositories receive a short 2–3-sentence writeup naming the specific code site(s) and user-visible consequence. All paths are relative to the repo root at the pinned SHA (§B.6). Full source references and supporting evidence notes are in `ergon_survey_supplement/survey_audit/01_repository_failure_audit/`.

Score-3 repositories (11). **SWE-bench.** The grading loop aggregates over `instances_to_run`, filtered before aggregation (`swebench/harness/run_evaluation.py:L465–L470`), while empty patches are documented as filtered pre-submission (`docs/faq.md:L39`). A container-level infrastructure failure stays in the denominator as a fail, but an empty-patch instance is removed from the denominator altogether — and no output field separates the two cases in the published submission.

openai/evals. `backoff.on_predicate` at `evals/utils/api_utils.py:L10-L22` retries transient predicates indefinitely with no `max_tries`, so long runs silently absorb retry-exhaust events rather than surfacing them. The MMMU eval treats errors as wrong answers (`elsuite/mmmu/eval.py:L158`) and the modelgraded classifier coerces `INVALID_STR` to `min(choice_scores)` (`elsuite/modelgraded/classify_utils.py:L99-L101`): three distinct P6 patterns in one library.

simple-evals (SimpleQA subset). The regex fallback at `simpleqa_eval.py:L126` defaults unparseable responses to `NOT_ATTEMPTED`, which the reported score (`accuracy_given_attempted = correct / (correct + incorrect)`) then structurally excludes (`simpleqa_eval.py:L169-L176`). A model that hedges on every ambiguous question looks arbitrarily accurate under this metric — `NOT_ATTEMPTED` tasks do not appear in the denominator.

VisualWebArena. An `assert "correct" in response` at `browser_env/helper_functions.py:L606` raises on unparseable judge output, causing the outer `try/except` at `run.py:L453-L461` to drop the entire task. Image-fetch errors at `image_utils.py:L44` propagate through the same path. Dropped tasks are absent from the output, not counted as failed.

ToolBench (9/9 VERIFIED). The DFS search code at `DFS.py:L84-L91` randomly promotes a fraction of `give_up_node` trajectories to `valid_data=True`, and SFT preprocessing at `preprocess/preprocess_toolllama_data.py:L44-L45` filters on `valid_data` alone — so ToolLLaMA trains on the promoted failures. This is the paper’s paradigm example of pattern P7 (outcome-as-ground-truth SFT).

Self-rewarding-reasoning-LLM (4/4 VERIFIED). `infer_math/reward_labeling.py:L1612-L1622` grants correctness against the ground-truth answer on the *initial* chain-of-thought; self-correction attempts must match that `first_reward` to be counted (`process_prompt_turn3.py:L24-L62`), with a hard cap $N = 3$. There is no `try/except` anywhere in the generation module (`gen_hf.py`): any infra failure silently removes a rollout.

PrimeIntellect verifiers (5/5 VERIFIED). Reward-function exceptions at `rubric.py:L144-L158` yield `0.0`, and group reward-function exceptions at `rubric.py:L208, L217` yield `[0.0]*N`. The errored zeros are then included in the group-mean advantage at `rubric.py:L325-L333` (`avg_reward = sum(aggregated_rewards) / num_states; t["advantage"] = state["advantage"]`), so an infrastructure error in one rollout biases the policy gradient for the other rollouts in its group.

Trinity-RFT. `asyncio.TimeoutError` at `trinity/explorer/scheduler.py:L214-L216` is packaged into `Status(ok=False, metrics=list(), message=...)`, but the consumer path at `scheduler.py:L532-L602` (`get_results`) never inspects `status.ok` — errored payloads flow into training with `ok=False` undetected. The over-rollout cancellation grace period (`scheduler.py:L559-L572`, 30s default from `config.py:L147`) means timeouts can also truncate sub-tasks mid-run (`scheduler.py:L490-L506`) without surfacing the partial-completion to the rollout log.

ms-swift (GRPO) (8/8 VERIFIED). None-rewards are lifted to `NaN` at `swift/rlhf_trainers/grpo_trainer.py:L359, L367, L379`, then aggregated with `.nansum(dim=1)` (`grpo_trainer.py:L473`); DAPO’s `max_resample_times` revert (`grpo_trainer.py:L684-L733`) and `overlong_filter` mask-zeroing (`grpo_trainer.py:L1123-L1129`) both silently remove rollouts from the gradient. The LLM-judge path (`rewards/rm_plugin.py:L216-L226`) coerces regex-parse failures to `0.0` (pattern P6).

BFCL / gorilla. The weighted overall accuracy formula in `berkeley-function-call-leaderboard/bfcl_eval/eval_checker/eval_runner_helper.py:L509-L519` applies `[10, 10, 10, 30, 40]` weights over category runners that each silently decrement `correct_count` on parse failure while leaving the denominator `len(model_result)` unchanged (per-category dispatch at `eval_runner.py:L668`). `eval(func_call)` exceptions become literal `"Error during execution: ..."` strings (`multi_turn_eval/multi_turn_utils.py:L97-L98`), scored as a failed call without category attribution.

FastChat (MT-Bench + Chatbot Arena). FastChat is the reference implementation for two of the most-cited public LLM evaluation numbers: MT-Bench (LLM-as-judge single-turn and multi-turn scoring) and Chatbot Arena (pairwise Elo ranking). A GPT-4 or Claude judge whose response fails to match the `[[score]]` or `[score]` regex is coerced to `rating = -1` (P6) at `fastchat/llm_judge/common.py:L175-L187`; MT-Bench aggregation then filters `df[df["score"] != -1]` before computing the per-model mean (P2+P4) at `show_result.py:L20`. The pairwise path is structurally identical: parse-failure becomes `winner = "error"` (`common.py:L282-L304`), filtered out before Elo computation (`show_result.py:L49`; `elo_analysis.py:L49-L92`). A rank swap driven by differential parse-failure rates across judged models is not recoverable from the headline MT-Bench or Arena Elo number — the attrition count is not emitted. At SHA 587d5cf.

Score-2 repositories (31, one-liner each).

SWE-agent: `cost/kill preds.unlink()` on `early_exit/None` removes instances from `preds.json` (`sweagent/run/run_batch.py:L397-L401`).

mini-swe-agent: `finally: save()` at `src/minisweagent/run/benchmarks/swebench.py:L171` is bypassed by `KeyboardInterrupt` (closed issue #329); streaming save at `default.py:L94`.

live-swe-agent: configs never set `output_path` (`README.md:L71`).

SWE-bench Pro-os: `None` return at `evaluation/swe_bench_pro_eval.py:L346-L349` is collapsed to `False` by callers at `:L490-L505, L571`.

AgentBench: `accuracy denominator is result.error is None only` (`src/assigner.py:L368-L372`).

AgentBoard: `timeouts write to error.txt and never scores.append` (`agentboard/tasks/webbrowse.py:L275-L279`).

tau-bench: errors yield stubs with no retry (`tau_bench/run.py:L89-L96`).

SWE-smith: broad except at `scripts/collect_trajs.py:L77-L79`; `random.sample` cap at `scripts/combine_trajs.py:L86-L91`.

TRL: `None→NaN→nansum` at `trl/trainer/grpo_trainer.py:L1228-L1230, L2132`.

verl: `PRIME reward timeouts→0.0` at `verl/workers/reward_manager/prime.py:L37-L42, L83`; missing `return_exceptions=True` at `verl/experimental/agent_loop/agent_loop.py:L603` (closed issue #5956).

OpenRLHF: remote RM exception→`reward=None` (`openrlhf/utils/agent.py:L298-L299`; open issue #1139).

rllm (Berkeley Sky): `no-valid-trajectory episodes dropped at rllm/engine/agent_workflow_engine.py:L266`; `dropped_episodes never written into DataProto.meta_info` at `:L249` (open issue #382).

slime: oversampling discard + zero-std filter at `slime/rollout/sglang_rollout.py:L449`.

ART: `drop_zero_advantage_trajectories=True default at src/art/preprocessing/tokenize.py:L158`.

Agent-R1: `length-truncated trajectories published as complete at agent_r1/agent_flow/agent_env_loop.py:L120-L129`.

RAGEN: `variance filter skips whole training step at ragen/trainer/agent_trainer.py:L1054-L1056`.

MARTI: dynamic filter drops saturated groups at `marti/trainer/ppo_trainer.py:L481-L510`.

MATPO: MCP + judge failures→`reward 0.0` at `verl/tools/mcp_tool.py:L137, L150 and llm_judge.py:L265, L312, L356`.

RL-Factory: malformed tool JSON→`continue` at `verl/workers/rollout/sglang_rollout/sglang_rollout.py:L914-L916`; `PRIME timeouts→0.0` at `prime.py:L141-L146`.

lm-evaluation-harness: `left-truncate with eval_logger.warning only` (`lm_eval/models/huggingface.py:L1360-L1368`; closed issues #3419, #3352, #3161, #1323).

WebArena: outer except `Exception: log-and-continue` at `run.py:L217-L364`; headline `sum(scores) / len(scores)` over survivors at `run.py:L365`; `env.step` swallow with `terminated=False` on infra failure at `browser_env/envs.py:L239-L248`.

MLAgentBench: subprocess crash→"EnvError" string at `low_level_actions.py:L181-L220` + `environment.py:L328-L334`; hard-coded magic baselines at `plot.py:L249-L274`; fresh random GT per call at `fathomnet/eval.py:L11`.

MLE-bench: aggregation `pad_missing=False` drops incomplete seeds at `experiments/aggregate_grading_reports.py:L69-L135`; `MedalInfo` logic at `mlebench/grade_helpers.py:L123-L133`.

lighteval: LiteLLM returns empty `LitellmModelResponse()` on Azure content-filter and retry-exhaust (`litellm_model.py:L243, L254`); empty response scored 0 at `metrics_sample.py:L151-L152`; left-truncate prompts without `truncated_tokens_count` at `vllm_model.py:L374-L397`.

Agentless: missing regression-test results default to `[0]*10000` at `agentless/test/run_regression_tests.py` (P1+P4), collapsing absent results into a vector of 10k zeros; `_post_process_multifile_repair` returns an empty tuple on exception, and SWE-bench filters empty patches pre-submission (`docs/faq.md:L39`), removing the instance from the denominator. Directly relevant to §4's RQ2 reconciliation of the SWE-agent/Agentless 15.6pp gap (at SHA 5ce5888).

aider: benchmark-runner broad except at `benchmark/benchmark.py:L666-L676` stores the exception as `{"exception": ...}` row; aggregation at `:L502-L512` divides by `len(rows)`, so exception rows contribute 1 to the denominator and 0 to the numerator without surfacing the infra-flake count.

Mind2Web: `IndexError` on out-of-bounds choice index caught at `src/action_prediction/metric.py:L203-L209` (`logger.info-only`), falls through to score-0 + kept in denominator (P1); `src/action_prediction/dataloader.py:L277` applies a train-only positive-candidate filter, creating a train/eval data-distribution asymmetry (P7).

open-r1: E2B broad except at `src/open_r1/rewards/code_providers.py:L107-L112` coerces sandbox exceptions to `[0.0]*len(scripts)` rewards with print-only surface; `MorphProvider` identical pattern at `:L248-L249`; `IOI/Codeforces` paths enter TRL's `None`→`nan`sum pipeline via `:L396-L397, L449-L450`.

ragas: `Pydantic` parser fallback at `ragas/prompt/pydantic_prompt.py:L315-L334` (self-fix loop raises `RagasOutputParserException`); executor broad except returns `float("nan")` at `ragas/executor.py:L64-L86`; `safe_nanmean` at `ragas/utils.py:L46-L55` silently shrinks the denominator by the NaN count across faithfulness, answer-relevancy, and context-precision metrics.

MTEB: leaderboard aggregate filters out models with any NaN task score at `mteb/leaderboard/_create_table.py:L136-L149` (P4 selection bias); per-language aggregates at `mteb/results/task_result.py:L526-L563` compute over produced scores with no attempt-vs-score coverage counter.

promptfoo (TypeScript): any LLM-judge parse failure coerced to `{pass: false, score: 0}` at `src/matchers/llmGrading.ts:L499, L515` (P6); fail helpers at `src/matchers/shared.ts:L25-L38` return the same hardcoded score indistinguishably from legitimate zeros; provider-error path at `src/evaluator.ts:L1046-L1051` produces `score: 0` without a `providerErrored` flag.

Score-1 repositories (9, one-liner each).

SciCode: partial-submission aggregation at `eval/scripts/test_generated_code.py:L125-L127`.

inspect_ai: `fail_on_error=True` by default (`_eval/task/error.py:L26`), but `fail_on_error=False` opt-in degrades silently (`scorer/_metrics/accuracy.py:L33`).

ScienceAgentBench: swallows `EvaluationError/BuildImageError/Exception` (`evaluation/harness/run_evaluation.py:L118-L136`); discards `timed_out` flag (`:L113`); GPT-4o judge regex-miss→score 0 at `gpt4_visual_judge.py:L70-L72`.

android_world: `np.nan` + `DataFrame.mean` asymmetric drop at `task_evals/task_eval.py:L249-L259` and `android_world/suite_utils.py:L544-L558, L681-L698`.

OSWorld (harness): bare-except “Time limit exceeded” at run.py:L205-L218; env.evaluate() FileNotFoundError→0 at desktop_env/desktop_env.py:L485-L487; Verified-subset non-comparability disclaimer at README.md:L36.

simple-evals (non-SimpleQA subset): honest grading on multi-choice, regex miss→wrong on GPQA/MMLU (see Appendix C, Smoking-Gun #2).

HELM: None results are silently skipped by Stat.add at src/helm/benchmark/metrics/statistic.py:L35; judge parse returns None at gpt4_audio_critique_metrics.py:L70-L72 and is absorbed by the Stat.add skip. The per-scenario attrition rate is recoverable from the full output JSON but is not in the headline report (at SHA 83bde5c).

BIG-bench: aggregate metric computation at bigbench/api/results.py:L560-L576 uses statistics.mean(d[m] for d in per_task if m in d), silently shifting the denominator by the count of tasks that did not produce metric m. Per-task results are preserved in raw output so the score change is recoverable, but the headline mean does not emit a coverage counter (at SHA 092b196).

deepeval: JSONDecodeError on LLM-judge output re-raised as ValueError at deepeval/utils.py:L405-L413 and caught broadly by the test-runner; safe_a_measure at deepeval/progress_context.py:L299-L305 catches any metric-evaluation exception. Per-test failure messages are surfaced but parse-failure rates are not aggregated into a headline counter (at SHA f917b5a).

B.6 Pinned commit SHAs

Every permalink in this appendix resolves against the following SHAs, recorded with git rev-parse HEAD.

SWE-bench f7b4bb2; SWE-agent 0f4f3bb; mini-swe-agent bc85a45; live-swe-agent 8d7dd86; SWE-bench_Pro-os 0c64e26; AgentBench d1e4a10; AgentBoard bb7255e; tau-bench 59a200c; SWE-smith 9b74ac0; TRL 88826fd; verl 6eeb571; OpenRLHF 64c1cc4; rllm ea623cc; slime 5b688aa; ART 679b236; Agent-R1 38bdfc1; RAGEN 20daedc; MARTI a2fe2c7; MATPO 3c41d62; RL-Factory d0abc1d; openai/evals 8eac7a7; simple-evals ee3b031; SciCode e3158ea; lm-evaluation-harness c1c4bea; webarena dce0468; visualwebarena 89f5af2; inspect_ai 36231d6; OSWorld c7e54d2; android_world d9c569f; mle-bench 2451bcb; MLAgentBench 5d71205; ScienceAgentBench 1cf1375; gorilla (BFCL) 6ea5797; ToolBench d56fdd8; Trinity-RFT 9051d63; ms-swift c4902f3; verifiers e27633b; lighteval 10b9104; Self-rewarding-reasoning-LLM 372bea9; FastChat 587d5cf; Agentless 5ce5888; aider f09d7065; Mind2Web 33bd95c; open-r1 1416fa0; ragas 298b6827; MTEB 9363ea75; promptfoo 3dc5843; HELM 83bde5c; BIG-bench 092b196; deepeval f917b5a. The out-of-scope observation (OpenHands, audited for completeness and documented as scope-filter exemplar) is pinned at 3b17f27.

Full pinned refs for all 50 in-scope repositories plus the OpenHands OOS observation are recorded in the supplementary repository audit records under ergon_survey_supplement/survey_audit/01_repository_failure_audit/records/.

B.7 Coverage snapshot

We audited 50 in-scope repositories. Two repositories were excluded by the operational scope filter and are documented as scope exemplars rather than silently dropped: Online-Mind2Web (persistent clone errors across the audit window) and OpenHands (agent framework whose evaluation harness lives in a separate OpenHands/benchmarks repo, audited separately). Categories: SWE-bench-family harnesses, agent scaffolds, RLHF trainers, agentic-RL trainers, multi-agent RL, web/GUI agents, mobile agents, ML-engineering benchmarks, scientific-agent benchmarks, function-calling benchmarks, general eval frameworks, LLM-judge infrastructure, autonomous coding assistants, RAG-eval frameworks, embedding/retrieval benchmarks, red-team/prompt-eval tooling, rejection-sampling SFT pipelines. Score distribution $11 \times 3 / 31 \times 2 / 9 \times 1 / 0 \times 0$ (the $11+31+9=51$ listings correspond to 50 unique repositories; simple-evals is double-counted across score-3 for SimpleQA and score-1 for the non-SimpleQA subset). Seven maintainer-acknowledged bugs. Seven silent-drop patterns covering reward coercion, rollout filtering, bypassed saves, survivor denominators, partial-trajectory drops, LLM-judge parse→fixed score, and outcome-as-ground-truth SFT filters. Every

code claim in this appendix is tied to a pinned source location, so the cited behaviour can be checked against the same repository state used in the audit.

C 37-pair Variance Catalogue

This appendix enumerates the 37 reporting-rule discrepancies sampled in Table 1, organised by metric family: 22 task-success-family discrepancies (§C.2), 9 cost/token pairs (§C.3), and 6 latency/timing pairs (§C.4). Four task-success benchmarks are then examined in *smoking-gun* detail (§C.5) — same dataset, multiple in-survey implementations, different numbers on identical workloads. Training-side evidence beyond the rollout interface (Dr. GRPO, DAPO, TRL’s five GRPO variants, verl #2165) is consolidated in §C.6. This training-side material is supporting evidence beyond the counted 37; training-stack examples that affect cost or runtime are counted under the cost/token or latency/timing families rather than as a separate fourth family. A de-duplication log (§C.7) records which family each pair is counted in, and §C.8 catalogues leads that did not meet the evidence bar.

C.1 Evidence hierarchy

We grade every pair against the same four-tier evidence hierarchy, uniform across the three metric families:

1. **Tier 1 — strongest.** Same model and workload; reported scores differ across two harnesses. (Direct empirical evidence.)
2. **Tier 2.** Explicit vendor or framework documentation acknowledging the convention difference between harnesses. (Vendor-admission-equivalent.)
3. **Tier 3.** Code-level convention difference with no cross-framework normalisation, published under the same metric name. (Structural difference visible at source.)
4. **Tier 4.** Maintainer issue-tracker statement that the convention differs from another framework. (Maintainer-acknowledged difference.)

Anything weaker is demoted to near-misses (§C.8). Every pair below cites either a numeric gap, a vendor acknowledgement, a code-level convention difference, or a maintainer statement. The “Held” column classifies counterfactual tightness: S means the same output, API call, submission, or trajectory is re-scored; W means the same model and workload are compared across runs or reports; M means the same metric name uses a different convention; and H means a within-harness reporting contrast. Of the 37 pairs, 5 are tight same-output counterfactuals (S), 13 are matched-workload comparisons (W), 12 are same-metric different-convention pairs (M), and 7 are within-harness reporting contrasts (H).

C.2 Task-success-family discrepancies (22)

These rows include numeric score gaps and qualitative convention conflicts that change what a reported task-success result means or how it can be compared.

T1 (LLaMA-65B MMLU 14.9pp) is the flagship single pair — identical weights, different reported score, explicitly discussed in a Hugging Face post-mortem. T6 (GPT-4o SWE-bench Verified 15.6pp) is the target of the reconciliation experiment in Sec. 4.2: trajectories for both runs are in the public SWE-bench submissions S3 bucket, making the reconciliation tractable. T14–T16 (Biderman et al.) are not cross-harness pairs but within-harness prompt-template pairs, included because the 24.6pp gap is the strongest published evidence that the instrument-level variance is at least as large as the signals it purports to measure.

C.3 Cost / token pairs (9)

Same model, same workload, different published token counts or dollar costs depending on which tool applies which convention. Table 7 summarises; numerical examples and code-level references are released in `ergon_survey_supplement/survey_audit/02_pairwise_reporting_discrepancies/` alongside the corresponding evidence notes.

Table 6: 22 task-success-family reporting-rule discrepancies. The effect column gives a numeric gap when comparable reported scores are available and otherwise names the convention conflict. T14–T16 are within-harness prompt-template contrasts; the other rows are cross-report or cross-harness contrasts. “post-mortem” refers to the Hugging Face Open LLM Leaderboard post-mortem [Fourrier et al., 2023].

#	Held	Model	Benchmark	Convention A	Convention B	Effect	Source
T1	W	LLaMA-65B	MMLU 5-shot	Berkeley orig.	lm-eval-harness	14.9pp	post-mortem
T2	W	LLaMA-30B	MMLU 5-shot	Berkeley orig.	lm-eval-harness	12.6pp	post-mortem
T3	W	Falcon-40B	MMLU 5-shot	Berkeley orig.	lm-eval-harness	10.5pp	post-mortem
T4	W	Llama-3.1-70B-Inst	MMLU-Pro	Meta self (CoT)	OLL v2 / lighteval	~18.5pp	Meta card vs OLL
T5	W	Qwen2.5-72B	MMLU-Pro	Self-report	OLL v2	~22pp	Qwen docs vs OLL
T6	S	GPT-4o (24-05-13)	SWE-b. Verified	SWE-agent	Agentless 1.5	15.6pp	swe-b. subs. S3
T7	W	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	SWE-b. Verified	Anthropic Tools	OpenHands CA 2.1	4.0pp	SWE-b. leaderb.
T8–T13	W	Various	SWE-b. Lite/Ver.	Various	Various	3.4–19.6pp	SWE-b. leaderb.
T14	H	Mistral-7B	MMLU (prompt)	Template A	Template B	up to 24.6pp	Biderman et al.
T15	H	Mixtral-8x7B	MMLU (prompt)	Template A	Template B	up to 24.6pp	Biderman et al.
T16	H	Mistral-7B	ARC (prompt)	Template A	Template B	up to 24.6pp	Biderman et al.
T17	M	Llama-3.1-70B	MATH	Meta (full test)	Leaderboard (500)	label collision	Meta vs leaderb.
T18	M	Claude 3.5 Sonnet	MATH	“MATH”	“MATH”	label overload	multi-source
T19	M	Llama-3.1-70B	GPQA	simple-evals	lm-eval-harness	separate tasks	NVIDIA NeMo
T20	M	Llama-3.1-70B	GPQA	Self-report	Leaderboard	cross-harness	Meta + leaderb.
T21	M	Llama-3.1-70B	Various	Meta model card	Meta eval_details.md	micro vs macro	Meta own docs
T22	M	Llama-3.1-70B	Various	acc_char	full-string match	convention	Meta own docs

Table 7: 9 cost / token-accounting reporting-rule discrepancies. Same model, same workload, different reported values.

#	Held	Setup	Harness A	Harness B	Δ
C1	S	Anthropic w/ cache_control	OTel input_tokens (inclusive)	Anthropic-native (exclusive)	$2.0 \times$ inflation (260,421 vs 130,213)
C2	S	Claude + cache_control	LiteLLM cost estimator	Anthropic Console billing	+68% overestimate (\$0.091 vs \$0.054)
C3	S	Claude (streaming) + cache-hit	LangChain.js accumulator	single message_delta	exactly $2 \times$ cache_read
C4	S	SWE-b. V. retry-firing task	SWE-agent (every attempt)	mini-swe-agent (last attempt)	30–100% per-task overstatement
C5	M	Anthropic/OpenAI prompt-cache	inspect_ai (cache-aware, tiered)	7 peer harnesses (no cache parse)	up to 90% on cached portion
C6	H	Aider leaderboards (same model date)	Aider Edit	Aider Refactor / Polyglot	\$0 $\rightarrow$ \$14.41 (same model)
C7	H	Same rollout batch, GRPO training	verl loss_agg_mode=token-mean	verl seq-mean-token-sum	different gradient magnitudes
C8	M	Cross-vendor “tokens used”	tiktoken (o200k_base)	Anthropic BPE	~10% systematic
C9	M	OpenAI reasoning models (o1/o3)	harness reading completion_tokens only	harness reading . . details. reasoning_tokens	silent under-report

Code-level sources. C1: OpenTelemetry PR #3163; Langfuse issue #12306. C2: BerriAI/litellm issue #9812. C3: langchainjs issue #10249. C4: sweagent/agent/models.py L744–L838; minisweagent/models/litellm_model.py L80–L93. C5: inspect_ai/model/_openai.py L776–L782; inspect_ai/model/_model.py L2085–L2091; inspect_ai/model/_providers/anthropic.py L1137–L1169. C6: edit_leaderboard.yml, refactor_leaderboard.yml, polyglot_leaderboard.yml in Aider-AI/aider. C7: verl/trainer/ppo/core_algos.py L1168–L1195. C8: tiktoken and Anthropic tokeniser documentation; openai/tiktoken issue #474. C9: OpenAI API reference for reasoning-model usage.completion_tokens_details.

C1 is the flagship: OpenTelemetry PR #3163 formalises the Anthropic/OpenAI/Vertex reporting-rule disagreement at the observability-middleware layer, and Langfuse issue #12306 exhibits the numerical 260,421-vs-130,213 gap on a single request. C6 is the flagship intra-vendor disagreement: the same organisation’s three leaderboards (Edit, Refactor, Polyglot) publish \$0, \$8.46, and \$14.41 for the same model on comparable tasks, with no convention statement in any of the three YAMLS.

C.4 Latency / timing pairs (6)

Same workload, same hardware, different published wall-clock times depending on which harness’s timer wraps which phase.

Table 8: 6 latency / wall-clock reporting-rule discrepancies. Clock-start and clock-stop differ across harnesses that log the same metric name.

#	Held	Setup	Harness A	Harness B	Δ
L1	M	SWE-b. V. (same task)	Docker backend	Modal backend	systematic Modal inflation
L2	H	OSWorld (same task)	lib_run_single.py	scripts/python/ run_maestro.py	≥ 30 s (hardcoded sleep) + 5–15 s VM start
L3	M	GRPO step timer	TRL training_step (grad+opt only)	verl marked_timer("step") (full epoch)	up to $5\times$ on rollout-dominated runs
L4	W	GSM8K-GRPO epoch, identical HW	optimized TRL	OpenRLHF	5,189 s vs 1,657 s
L5	M	GRPO throughput	verl perf/throughput (excl. padding)	TRL effective-token throughput	different numerators on same HW
L6	H	inspect_ai timers	sample_working_time	sample_waiting_time	ambiguity declared in-tool

Code-level sources. **L1:** swebench/harness/docker_utils.py L203–L217 vs swebench/harness/modal_eval/run_evaluation_modal.py L307–L319. **L2:** lib_run_single.py #L616 vs scripts/python/run_maestro.py #L351. **L3:** trl/trainer/grpo_trainer.py L1111–L1120; verl/trainer/ppo/metric_utils.py L313–L346. **L4:** Hu et al. [2025, Sec. 4.1, General RLVR Experiment]. **L5:** verl/trainer/ppo/metric_utils.py L337–L345. **L6:** inspect_ai/_util/working.py.

L4 is a published controlled framework-runtime comparison rather than a rerun of our own: OpenRLHF reports 1,657 seconds per GSM8K-GRPO epoch versus 5,189 seconds for optimized TRL under identical hardware and hyperparameters. L1 and L2 are in-repository disagreements: both backends in SWE-bench Verified and both harnesses in OSWorld ship under the same repo at the same commit, reporting the same metric name, with no statement that the two are not comparable.

C.5 Smoking-gun benchmarks: same dataset, multiple in-survey implementations

Three to four surveyed repositories implement each of four benchmarks. Below, each implementation’s grading site and failure-handling semantics are read off at the pinned SHAs (§B.6). For each benchmark, a single realistic failure mode produces a different headline number in each implementation — and none of the implementations emits a counter disclosing which regime it fell into.

Smoking-Gun #1: SWE-bench (4 implementations). *Official SWE-bench* grades via `bad_codes = {APPLY_PATCH_FAIL, RESET_FAILED, TESTS_ERROR, TESTS_TIMEOUT}` (swebench/harness/grading.py:L61–L70; constants/__init__.py:L80–L89) with empty patches pre-filtered from submission (docs/faq.md:L39). Container timeout stays in the denominator as a fail; empty-patch instances are removed entirely. *PrimeIntellect verifiers* reads the same `bad_codes` set but wraps `test_spec` fetching in a $5\times$ tenacity retry; any uncaught exception flows through `rubric.py:L144–L158` to 0.0 and enters the group-mean advantage baseline — a container timeout can bias the policy gradient for the other rollouts in its group rather than merely decrementing the numerator. *SWE-agent* delegates grading to `sb-cli submit` (sweagent/run/hooks/swe_bench_evaluate.py:L42–L55); the pre-submission unlink at `run_batch.py:L397–L401` removes crashed or cost-killed instances from `preds.json` entirely, so server-side grading sees a smaller denominator instead of a failed row. *mini-swe-agent* has no local grading; its finally: `save()` at `benchmarks/swebench.py:L171` is bypassed by `KeyboardInterrupt` (closed issue #329), also producing an absent-from-submission pattern. On one realistic mid-test Docker timeout, the four harnesses report: Official $0/N$, verifiers $1/N$ (possible retry recovery), SWE-agent $0/(N-1)$, mini-swe-agent $0/(N-1)$. Inspect AI has *no SWE-bench bridge* at the pinned SHA.

Smoking-Gun #2: GPQA (3 implementations). *simple-evals* at `gpqa_eval.py:L59` uses `re.search(ANSWER_PATTERN_MULTICHOICE, response_text)` and `extracted_answer = match.group(1)` if `match` else `None`; a regex miss — which a hedging response triggers — is scored 0 and stays in the denominator. *lm-evaluation-harness* uses log-likelihood of the gold-choice

token over the various `gpqa*_zeroshot.yaml / _n_shot.yaml / _cot_*.yaml` tasks; the model does not generate free text in the scored branch, so hedging is immune, but silent left-truncation at `huggingface.py:L1360-L1368` still affects long contexts. *lighteval* scores via the standard pipeline at `tasks/tasks/gpqa.py` with aggregation through `info_loggers.py:L326-L400`; API retry-exhaust or content-filter yields an empty `LitellmModelResponse()` (`litellm_model.py:L243, L254`), scored as wrong via `metrics_sample.py:L151-L152` (if not `pred: return 0`). On a single hedging model output: simple-evals 0, lm-eval-harness likely correct, lighteval wrong — three different headline accuracies from the same model reasoning. Inspect AI has *no GPQA task file* at the pinned SHA.

Smoking-Gun #3: MATH / MATH-500 (3 implementations). *simple-evals* at `math_eval.py:L55` calls `check_equality(self.equality_checker, row["Answer"])`, extracted_answer), which itself calls the LLM equality checker; an API failure raises (dropping the sample) or is coerced to 0 by the outer handler. *lighteval* uses majority@n with a symbolic `math_normalizer` over `tasks/tasks/math_500.py` and `math.py`; normaliser exceptions are caught upstream and scored wrong at `metrics_sample.py:L151-L152`. *PrimeIntellect verifiers* routes reward functions through `rubric.py:L144-L158`; exceptions become 0.0 and enter the group advantage baseline. On a LaTeX edge case such as $\frac{1}{2}$ versus 0.5: simple-evals’s LLM judge may call these equal, lighteval’s normaliser may not, and verifiers’s reward exception enters training as an errored zero — same completion, three different outcomes.

Smoking-Gun #4: MMLU (3 implementations). *simple-evals* (`mmlu_eval.py`) extracts answers by regex on generated text — same miss-is-wrong pattern as GPQA. *lm-evaluation-harness* (`lm_eval/tasks/mmlu`: 12+ variants spanning main, redux, pro, flan, etc.) uses log-likelihood over A/B/C/D tokens with `acc/acc_norm`; silent prompt truncation at `huggingface.py:L1360-L1368` logs the truncated-prompt sample as a complete result. *lighteval* uses exact-match on the choice label (`tasks/tasks/mmlu.py`), with left-truncation at `vllm_model.py:L374-L397` warning but recording no `truncated_tokens_count`. On a long-context MMLU-Pro prompt that overflows a 4k model: simple-evals generates a regex answer against the truncated prompt the model saw (right or wrong depending on the content); lm-eval-harness left-truncates and logs as complete (silently wrong); lighteval left-truncates, records no truncation counter, and logs as complete (silently wrong, with no recoverable audit trail). Three implementations, three behaviours, no `n_prompt_truncated` counter in any output.

C.6 Training-side evidence beyond the rollout interface

Operator disagreement extends into the gradient-signal computation at training time. The paper cites these as published findings rather than original contributions.

Dr. GRPO [Liu et al., 2025] corrects only the loss-aggregation convention — the length-normalisation bias documented in “all popular open-source PPO implementations” — and reports +7.3 points on AIME 2024 vs SimpleRL-Zero-7B and +15.7 points on AIME 2024 vs Prime-Zero-7B, with no change to data, model, or algorithm. **DAPO** [Yu et al., 2025] is a catalogue of framework-level defaults (zero-std group filter, token-vs-sequence loss aggregation, decoupled clip ranges) that had to be flipped to match DeepSeek-R1; the paper reports 50 points on AIME 2024 for Qwen2.5-32B on the defaults-flipped run. All three defaults are silently different across TRL, verl, and OpenRLHF. **TRL’s own library** ships five mutually-incompatible GRPO variants — `grpo`, `dr_grpo`, `dapo`, `bnpo`, and `importance_sampling_level∈{token, sequence}` — in a single config file (`trl/trl/trainer/grpo_config.py:L228-L243, L668-L677`); two papers reporting “we trained with GRPO on task X” are structurally non-comparable without specifying which variant. **verl #2165** [verl-project, 2025] is a tokenisation-channel divergence, where training and rollout engines tokenise the same text differently, on Qwen3-4B GRPO. In that case, the training-side FSDP tokeniser inserts `<think>\n\n</think>` into assistant turns that the rollout engine (vLLM / SGLang) never saw, shifting the assistant-turn token mask by tens of tokens across ~40k-token conversations. The finding is reproduced by six independent users on the thread, upstream-confirmed in QwenLM/Qwen3 #1826 and Qwen/Qwen3-1.7B HF discussion #9, and guarded separately by verl’s own `tokenization_sanity_check_mode` (distinct from the dtype guard in discussion #5984) — proving that tokenisation-class mismatch exists as a separate failure mode even when all upstream dtypes match.

Silent rollout-dropping mechanisms (beyond the 50-repo audit). verl #1170 (rollouts silently return empty strings, training proceeds); OpenRLHF #1108 (reward curves diverge between vLLM 0.8.1 and 0.8.3 on the same seed); verl discussion #5984 (tool built specifically to detect silent per-token log-prob divergence between training FSDP and vLLM rollouts); ms-swift #9096 (gemma-4 rollouts return garbage, training continues). **Numerical-layer evidence.** BF16 backends have been documented to produce divergent log-probs between training and rollout engines even with identical weights (“Defeating the Training-Inference Mismatch via FP16,” arXiv:2510.26788); the vLLM engineering blog documents separate backends breaking the on-policy assumption of policy-gradient methods; THUDM’s slime ships a `train_infer_mismatch_helper` because divergence is expected.

C.7 De-duplication log

Several findings could plausibly appear in more than one family. For audit transparency we record where each is counted and why:

- **Dr. GRPO, DAPO, TRL’s five GRPO variants:** counted in §C.6 (training-side); not in §C.3 despite touching per-step token accounting. Rationale: the load-bearing claim is about gradient signal, not token counts.
- **verl #2165** (Qwen3 tokenisation-channel divergence): counted in §C.6 (training-side); not in §B despite involving silent per-rollout mismatch. Rationale: Appendix B audits *failure-handling* patterns; verl #2165 is a *convention-disagreement* finding, structurally closer to Dr. GRPO than to `try/except/return None`.
- **verl loss_agg_mode variants** (C7): counted in §C.3; not in §C.4 despite affecting per-step timing.
- **TRL vs OpenRLHF wall-clock** (L4): counted in §C.4; not in §C.6 despite the training-pipeline context. The reported gap is wall-clock runtime, not gradient signal.
- **verl throughput metric** (L5): counted in §C.4; not in §C.3 despite involving token counting.
- **inspect_ai sample_working_time vs sample_waiting_time** (L6): counted in §C.4; not in §B despite inspect_ai’s role as the near-positive control for failure-handling.

No finding is counted twice across the 37 pairs.

C.8 Near misses

Leads that did not meet the evidence bar (§C.1) but warrant human follow-up.

Cost / tokens. Anthropic `/v1/messages/count_tokens` versus tiktoken estimate — Anthropic publishes a dedicated counting endpoint, community harnesses routinely substitute tiktoken for speed, the endpoint returns different numbers on the same input; documented but no published benchmark pair with materially different totals attributable to this choice. Anthropic `/cost` underreport vs dashboard (anthropics/claude-code #1063): intra-vendor, not cross-harness. Hugging Face Open LLM Leaderboard v1→v2 transition (including the lighteval vs lm-eval-harness switch): full methodology change with no explicit “efficiency numbers not comparable across versions” statement.

Latency. HELM `efficiency.json` publishes per-model latency/throughput but is frozen at pre-2023 models with no modern cross-comparison. OpenAI vs Azure OpenAI latency differences on the same model are documented but with no published benchmark pair.

Task success. Anecdotal “our replication differs from the original paper” issue-tracker threads that do not cite a specific convention difference.

D Views and Preservation Examples

This appendix illustrates the preservation claim behind drops manifests. A reported view may be the right view for one community while discarding fields needed by another. A drops manifest makes that trade-off explicit: it names the fields, rows, filters, and structural collapses behind the reported view, so later readers know which alternative analyses require returning to the full rollout card.

Preservation, operationally. Let R be a rollout card and $v(R) = (T_v, D_v)$ be a reported view plus its drops manifest. A view preserves a downstream quantity μ when T_v alone contains enough information to compute it. The view erases μ when T_v lacks the fields or structure μ needs. It is partial when T_v keeps a proxy or subset but not the full quantity. Table 9 uses this operational test for representative views.

Table 9: Representative views and the downstream analyses they preserve. ✓ = preserved by the reported view; ✗ = erased; ~ = partially preserved or recoverable only as a proxy. The table is illustrative, not a closed taxonomy of possible views.

Reported view	Return	Timing	Worker flow	Tool safety	Proof cost	Search shape
Final score / pass-fail outcome	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Token-step RL view	✓	~	✗	~	✗	✗
Per-worker stream	~	~	✓	~	✗	✗
Tool-call safety view	✗	✗	~	✓	✗	✗
Proof-search summary	✓	~	✗	✗	✓	~
Search-tree trace	~	~	✗	✗	✗	✓
Full rollout card	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

The main lesson is diagonal rather than universal preservation: a reported view usually keeps the information its own report needs and drops information needed by another community. A final score preserves the headline result but not why a tool call failed, how much coordination overhead preceded failure, or whether a search procedure explored many branches. The full card is not a preferred metric; it is the shared record from which multiple preferred metrics can be derived.

D.1 Token-step RL view

This view matches long-horizon agent-RL reporting: prompt tokens, response tokens, masks, token-level rewards, and advantages [Sheng et al., 2025, Chen et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025]. It preserves return and some turn-local failure information, but typically flattens worker identity, dependency edges, cancelled branches, and environment state that is not encoded in the token stream.

D.2 Per-worker stream

This view groups messages, actions, and observations by agent or worker identity. It supports role-specialisation, delegation, and failure-attribution analyses [Cemri et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2024, Zhang et al., 2026]. It can partially preserve concurrency through timestamps, but it may drop task-level dependency edges, shared subtask structure, and the reason a branch was cancelled.

D.3 Call-tree view

This view represents nested subcalls or delegated subtasks as a tree, matching recursive-agent and hierarchical-analysis settings [Zhu et al., 2024]. It preserves parent-child attribution and depth, but tree formalisms usually linearise concurrent siblings and cannot represent non-tree dependencies without extra edge annotations.

D.4 Macro-action view

This view groups lower-level actions into temporally extended options or subtasks [Bacon et al., 2017]. It preserves option boundaries, aggregate effects, and sometimes duration. It may drop internal reasoning, sub-worker identity, and cross-option dependencies, especially when the community format assumes one active option at a time.

D.5 Search-tree view

This view keeps explored states, actions, visit counts, backed-up values, or action paths for search-style agents [Yao et al., 2023, Guan et al., 2025, Zhang et al., 2024a]. It supports questions about coverage, depth, backtracking, and pruning. It may drop free-form reasoning text, parallelism outside the search tree, and tool interactions that are not part of the state/action abstraction.

D.6 Full event-log view

The full rollout card is closest to a typed event log: it preserves actions, observations, tool calls, artefacts, status changes, timing, environment state, and benchmark-specific annotations. It is larger than a reported score and less convenient than a task-specific view, but it is the object that makes later reporting rules replayable.

D.7 Adding a further view

A new view can be added without changing the rollout-card principle: publish the reporting-rule implementation or version, declare the fields and rows it reads, and record any filters or structural collapses. Declarative planning [Wong et al., 2023], temporal planning with durative actions and makespan [Saccon et al., 2025], embodied-agent traces, and world-model planning are natural future views. The card remains the shared record; the reported view records one community’s reporting choice.

E Reference Rollout-Card Bundle Format

E.1 Portable archive layout

The rollout-card format of §3.1 is a medium-independent bundle: any backend preserving the row semantics below can emit and consume valid cards. A zip archive, object storage prefix, Hugging Face dataset repository, or database export can all be valid carriers. ERGON is the reference emitter and validator, but the format does not depend on ERGON’s database, trainer adapters, or runtime. The dashboard of Figure 2 is a reference *reader* that loads conformant bundles. The reader is illustrative and is not part of the format definition.




Figure 2: One sample from a rollout card, rendered by a reference viewer over a ResearchRubrics task [Sharma et al., 2026]. The top panel shows the recorded run. The bottom panels show three reported views or quantities derived from the same card: a step-indexed event view, a per-agent view, and a leaderboard-style score. Each panel is labelled with the information it does not carry forward.

Bundle layout. A card is a logical directory of seven artefacts: `manifest.json` (run-level metadata, format version, content hashes); five append-only JSON-lines streams (`events.jsonl`, `nodes.jsonl`, `edges.jsonl`, `annotations.jsonl`, `mutations.jsonl`); and an optional `blobs/` directory holding content-addressed overflow for payloads above the inline size cap (default 64 KB). The directory may be distributed as-is, packed into a zip or tarball, written to an object-storage prefix, or materialised as a Hugging Face dataset repository with the streams as split files. Nothing in the format assumes Postgres, Python, or any particular runtime.

Row schemas. Each stream is a newline-delimited JSON file; each row has the columns in Table 10. Column types are JSON primitives (string, integer, object, null); payload and old_value/new_value columns are arbitrary JSON objects whose shape depends on a row-level discriminator (event_type for events, mutation_type for mutations).

Table 10: Rollout-card JSONL row schemas. Each stream carries a monotonic sequence; its scope (per-run or per-task_execution_id) is noted. Discriminator columns select the payload shape.

Stream	Row schema
events.jsonl	(event_id, task_execution_id, worker_binding_key, sequence, event_type, turn_id, payload, started_at, completed_at, policy_version); sequence monotonic per task_execution_id.
nodes.jsonl	(node_id, parent_id, instance_key, task_key, status, assigned_worker_key, level, created_at, updated_at).
edges.jsonl	(source_node_id, target_node_id, status, created_at, updated_at); status ∈ {pending, satisfied, invalidated}.
annotations.jsonl	(target_type, target_id, namespace, sequence, payload, created_at); latest sequence within (target, namespace) is current; prior rows retained.
mutations.jsonl	(sequence, mutation_type, target_type, target_id, actor, old_value, new_value, reason, created_at); sequence monotonic per run.

Portability invariants. Any backend emitting a card must honour four invariants regardless of how rows are stored: (i) mutations.jsonl is strictly append-only — reversals appear as new mutations, deletions as tombstones; (ii) events.jsonl is append-only per task_execution_id; (iii) annotations.jsonl is namespace-keyed, with the latest sequence within a (target, namespace) pair as the current value and prior rows retained for replay; and (iv) the dependency graph implied by edges.jsonl is acyclic at every point in the run’s lifetime. These invariants are the portability contract: they make it possible to replay a card, audit the fields used by each reporting rule, and compare views without knowing the runtime that produced the run.

Extensibility. manifest.json carries a format version; consumers check the major version and tolerate minor-version additions. Additional columns on existing streams are permitted and must be ignored by consumers that do not recognise them. The public extension point for new metadata is annotations.jsonl’s namespace field: a consumer claims a namespace, writes domain-specific payloads under it, and the format guarantees that round-tripping a card through a reader that does not understand the namespace preserves those rows intact. Namespaces can therefore carry benchmark-specific state, domain metadata, redaction notes, licensing flags, or reporting-rule hints without changing the base streams.

E.2 Reporting rules and validation

A valid bundle also contains, either in manifest.json or in a separate reporting-rule registry file, the reporting-rule list used for any reported numbers. Each entry records a name, implementation or version identifier, configuration, input streams, output target, and drops manifest. A typed reader can generate field-level drops by logging row and field access; semantic losses such as “timing erased” or “dependency edge collapsed” are author declarations attached to that field-access record.

The reference implementation supplies three non-normative utilities: a JSON-schema export for the row types in Table 10, an exporter that writes a completed run as the archive above, and a validator that checks layout, content hashes, monotonic sequence fields, append-only-stream conformance, namespace consistency, and acyclicity of the edge stream. These utilities are evidence that the format is concrete, but any independent system can produce a conformant card by writing the same streams and reporting-rule metadata.

F Experimental Setup

This appendix describes the source records and re-grading protocol used in §4. RQ1 uses public releases that already contain labels, partial logs, span/process traces, or action/search traces; RQ2 uses public archives whose preserved outputs can be scored under more than one reporting rule. No

RQ1 result required new policy rollouts, and no RQ2 result changes the underlying model output, patch, submission, or trajectory being scored.

F.1 Public source artefacts

Table 11 lists the public artefact classes used in the two experiments. Appendix A describes the RQ1 sources in more detail; the table here records why each source is scoreable without rerunning the original system.

Table 11: Public artefacts used for the experiments. RQ1 asks new questions of preserved traces; RQ2 changes reporting rules while holding the preserved artefact fixed.

Use	Source class	Preserved record	Reporting contrast
RQ1	GAP public results	Text-safety labels, tool-call safety labels, forbidden-call fields	Visible response safety vs tool-channel safety
RQ1	MAESTRO trace parquet	Spans, outcomes, token counts, scaffold identifiers	Run outcome vs coordination overhead
RQ1	COPRA miniF2F selected logs	Theorem outcomes, realised steps, elapsed time, successful proof text	Proved/failed vs proof-search cost
RQ1	Tree-of-Thought crossword logs	Paired prune/no-prune DFS action paths and reward snapshots	Final reward vs search shape
RQ2	Public answer, patch, submission, and trajectory archives	Archived artefacts for the same model output or benchmark case	Alternative graders, denominators, thresholds, weights, and trajectory success definitions

The public Hugging Face release contains 21 card exports: 17 trace-publication exports plus four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports. The 17 trace-publication exports consist of 11 full multi-step traces, one span/process trace export, and five one-step trace exports. The four non-trace exports are GAP, COPRA miniF2F, MLE-Bench, and SWE-bench cross-harness. These four exports preserve labels, partial logs, submissions, verdicts, view outputs, reporting-rule metadata, and drops manifests sufficient for the paper’s reanalyses, but they are not full rollout traces and we do not claim that they support open-ended community reanalysis in the same way as the trace-publication exports. The broader 25-source corpus remains available only through the local artefact build rather than the public release. Table 12 groups the released exports by evidence type.

F.2 Storage profile of released card exports

The public export metadata is sufficient to profile storage overhead, although it does not retain wall-clock exporter or validator timings. Table 13 reports representative released exports using Hugging Face file manifests. The total size includes sharded run records, reducer outputs, drops manifests, resource blobs, checksums, and manifest files; the compression ratio is the uncompressed-to-compressed size ratio for the parquet shards only. Resource-heavy span traces can be much larger than one-step or analytic exports, but the compact parquet streams compress by roughly 3–5 $\times$ for the larger releases.

F.3 RQ1 dataset conversion and recovered views

Each RQ1 source is converted into the rollout-card representation at the level of fields available in the public release. We assign stable run identifiers, preserve source-level row or span identifiers, and record source-specific fields under a namespace for that benchmark. The recovered view is then a deterministic analysis over those preserved fields. For example, GAP rows preserve both `t_safe` and `tc_safe`; MAESTRO rows preserve span metadata and token counts; COPRA miniF2F records preserve theorem-level outcome and realised search cost; and Tree-of-Thought crossword logs preserve action-list prefixes and reward snapshots. Appendix A gives the per-case source files, extraction rules, and missing-field limitations.

Table 12: Preserved evidence classes in the released rollout-card exports. The machine-readable artefact records the per-source field inventory, views, reporting rules, and drops manifests.

Evidence class	Examples	Artefact treatment
Full multi-step traces	AgentRewardBench, AgentHarm, AT-Bench, Debate/MALLM, MiniWoB++, StableToolBench, SWE-smith, τ -bench, Tree-of-Thought Crosswords, Tree-of-Thought Game24, WebLINX	Trace-publication exports with inspectable messages, tool calls, browser/UI actions, or search steps
Span/process traces	MAESTRO	Trace-publication export with workers, durations, statuses, token counts, and run-level process evidence; not a full action-level transcript
One-step traces	BFCL, BrowseComp, GPQA, HumanEval, MMLU	Trace-publication exports with prompt, response or function-call, and outcome records; not full rollout traces
Analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports	GAP, COPRA miniF2F, MLE-Bench, SWE-bench cross-harness	Labels, partial logs, submissions, verdicts, view outputs, reporting-rule metadata, and drops manifests used for paper reanalysis; not full rollout traces and not claimed as reusable trace datasets

Table 13: Storage profile of representative released card exports. Sizes are computed from the Hugging Face file manifest for each export; parquet compression excludes JSON resource blobs.

Export	Evidence class	Runs	Total MB	KB/run	Parquet comp.
MAESTRO	Span/process trace	1,056	4,250.4	4,025.0	3.4×
τ -bench	Multi-step tool trace	1,980	179.8	90.8	4.5×
MMLU	One-step trace	28,084	51.4	1.8	4.1×
GPQA	One-step trace	600	3.2	5.3	3.6×
GAP	Recovered non-trace view	17,420	30.7	1.8	4.2×
MLE-Bench	Recovered non-trace view	14,466	30.4	2.1	3.5×
Tree-of-Thought Cross-words	Search trace	40	0.16	4.1	3.0×

The recovered cards are intentionally conservative. We do not infer unobserved failed proof branches for the COPRA miniF2F logs, recover hidden pruning decisions for Tree-of-Thought, assign causal labels for MAESTRO coordination overhead, or reconstruct the full GAP runtime environment. Those absent fields are limitations of the recovered view and are treated as drops from the source artefact.

These experiments evaluate a publication practice, not a new task leaderboard. RQ1 findings are descriptive reanalyses of preserved public records: they do not estimate deployment prevalence or prove that process variables such as coordination overhead caused failure. RQ2 holds the preserved artefact fixed and changes reporting rules, so it measures convention sensitivity rather than the intrinsic quality of a benchmark or model.

F.4 Cross-harness reconciliation methodology

The re-grading sweep in §4.2 uses only archives that satisfy a counterfactual-scoreability criterion: the public artefact must preserve enough of the model’s output to evaluate the same run under at least two plausible reporting rules. This excludes papers that publish only aggregate scores. It includes final answers for short-answer tasks, submitted patches for software engineering tasks, Kaggle submissions for MLE-Bench-style tasks, and tool trajectories or database states for long-horizon interaction benchmarks.

For each benchmark family, we write a dataset adapter that converts the public artefact into a rollout-card record with a corresponding drops manifest. The manifest records information that the public archive did not preserve, information that is implicit in the original harness, and fields that can be recovered only by adopting a benchmark-specific convention. We then run multiple reporting

functions over the fixed record. Depending on the benchmark, those functions vary answer extraction, LLM-judge or rule-based grading, failure handling, threshold or medal assignment, slice weighting, or trajectory success definitions.

We report the score gap that the reporting function induces, not a new preferred leaderboard score. For each archive we record score gaps under alternative conventions, ranking inversions where model order changes, and calibration cases where independent reporting functions agree. In the SWE-bench Verified case, the principal failure-handling contrast is whether no-submission outcomes are included as unresolved attempts or excluded from the scored subset: SWE-agent has 50 such outcomes among 500 public runs, while Agentless has 4 among 500. These two conventions bracket a common harness-level choice and make the convention-dependent share of the reported score gap explicit. LLM-judge variance is one source of reporting score gaps, but the re-grading sweep also includes deterministic conventions such as denominator choice, thresholding, slice weighting, and extraction.

NeurIPS Paper Checklist

1. Claims

Question: Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The abstract and §1 claim (i) that current agent research publishes reported numbers without rollouts, producing cross-community fragmentation and reporting-convention variance, and (ii) that rollout cards plus drops manifests address both problems; these are substantiated by the 50-repo survey (Appendix B), the 37-pair variance catalogue (Appendix C), the format specification in §3 and Appendix E, and the two retrospective experiments of §4. The accompanying artefact and public Hugging Face exports make the release concrete: 21 card exports are published, comprising 17 trace-publication exports plus four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports that support the paper reanalyses. Scope limits are explicit: the evidence covers 50 audited repositories, 37 documented variance pairs, four RQ1 public-rollout reuse cases, public artefacts that preserve enough information for re-grading, and the 21 public card exports just described; it is not a prevalence estimate over all agent releases.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the abstract and introduction do not include the claims made in the paper.
- The abstract and/or introduction should clearly state the claims made, including the contributions made in the paper and important assumptions and limitations. A [No] or [N/A] answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers.
- The claims made should match theoretical and experimental results, and reflect how much the results can be expected to generalize to other settings.
- It is fine to include aspirational goals as motivation as long as it is clear that these goals are not attained by the paper.

2. Limitations

Question: Does the paper discuss the limitations of the work performed by the authors?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: §6 states that rollout cards do not choose a canonical metric and do not remove the need for judgment about privacy, licensing, redaction, benchmark design, metric choice, or selective reporting. It also scopes the evidence to 50 audited repositories, 37 documented variance pairs, four public-rollout reuse cases, and public artefacts rich enough for reanalysis or re-grading. Appendix A records missing fields for the recovered RQ1 views, and Appendix F distinguishes the 17 trace-publication exports from the four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper has no limitation while the answer [No] means that the paper has limitations, but those are not discussed in the paper.

- The authors are encouraged to create a separate “Limitations” section in their paper.
- The paper should point out any strong assumptions and how robust the results are to violations of these assumptions (e.g., independence assumptions, noiseless settings, model well-specification, asymptotic approximations only holding locally). The authors should reflect on how these assumptions might be violated in practice and what the implications would be.
- The authors should reflect on the scope of the claims made, e.g., if the approach was only tested on a few datasets or with a few runs. In general, empirical results often depend on implicit assumptions, which should be articulated.
- The authors should reflect on the factors that influence the performance of the approach. For example, a facial recognition algorithm may perform poorly when image resolution is low or images are taken in low lighting. Or a speech-to-text system might not be used reliably to provide closed captions for online lectures because it fails to handle technical jargon.
- The authors should discuss the computational efficiency of the proposed algorithms and how they scale with dataset size.
- If applicable, the authors should discuss possible limitations of their approach to address problems of privacy and fairness.
- While the authors might fear that complete honesty about limitations might be used by reviewers as grounds for rejection, a worse outcome might be that reviewers discover limitations that aren’t acknowledged in the paper. The authors should use their best judgment and recognize that individual actions in favor of transparency play an important role in developing norms that preserve the integrity of the community. Reviewers will be specifically instructed to not penalize honesty concerning limitations.

3. Theory assumptions and proofs

Question: For each theoretical result, does the paper provide the full set of assumptions and a complete (and correct) proof?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper does not state theorems or prove formal results. Appendix D gives illustrative preservation examples for views and reporting rules; these are explanatory examples of what fields a view preserves or drops, not theorem statements or proof obligations.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include theoretical results.
- All the theorems, formulas, and proofs in the paper should be numbered and cross-referenced.
- All assumptions should be clearly stated or referenced in the statement of any theorems.
- The proofs can either appear in the main paper or the supplemental material, but if they appear in the supplemental material, the authors are encouraged to provide a short proof sketch to provide intuition.
- Inversely, any informal proof provided in the core of the paper should be complemented by formal proofs provided in appendix or supplemental material.
- Theorems and Lemmas that the proof relies upon should be properly referenced.

4. Experimental result reproducibility

Question: Does the paper fully disclose all the information needed to reproduce the main experimental results of the paper to the extent that it affects the main claims and/or conclusions of the paper (regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: §4.1 describes the public source records and re-grading protocol. Appendix A gives the RQ1 source artefacts, extraction rules, and missing-field limits; Appendix F gives the public artefact classes, ingestion rules, and reporting-convention reconciliation method; Appendix E specifies the portable rollout-card bundle format. The RQ1/RQ2 reported numbers are deterministic functions of preserved public records, source artefacts, or declared re-grading conventions. The artefact provides a default Hugging Face-backed

reconstruction path for public card exports, plus a heavier local Ergon rebuild path for provenance depth; the 50-repo survey counts are released separately as verifiable audit records with pinned source references.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- If the paper includes experiments, a [No] answer to this question will not be perceived well by the reviewers: Making the paper reproducible is important, regardless of whether the code and data are provided or not.
- If the contribution is a dataset and/or model, the authors should describe the steps taken to make their results reproducible or verifiable.
- Depending on the contribution, reproducibility can be accomplished in various ways. For example, if the contribution is a novel architecture, describing the architecture fully might suffice, or if the contribution is a specific model and empirical evaluation, it may be necessary to either make it possible for others to replicate the model with the same dataset, or provide access to the model. In general, releasing code and data is often one good way to accomplish this, but reproducibility can also be provided via detailed instructions for how to replicate the results, access to a hosted model (e.g., in the case of a large language model), releasing of a model checkpoint, or other means that are appropriate to the research performed.
- While NeurIPS does not require releasing code, the conference does require all submissions to provide some reasonable avenue for reproducibility, which may depend on the nature of the contribution. For example
 - (a) If the contribution is primarily a new algorithm, the paper should make it clear how to reproduce that algorithm.
 - (b) If the contribution is primarily a new model architecture, the paper should describe the architecture clearly and fully.
 - (c) If the contribution is a new model (e.g., a large language model), then there should either be a way to access this model for reproducing the results or a way to reproduce the model (e.g., with an open-source dataset or instructions for how to construct the dataset).
 - (d) We recognize that reproducibility may be tricky in some cases, in which case authors are welcome to describe the particular way they provide for reproducibility. In the case of closed-source models, it may be that access to the model is limited in some way (e.g., to registered users), but it should be possible for other researchers to have some path to reproducing or verifying the results.

5. Open access to data and code

Question: Does the paper provide open access to the data and code, with sufficient instructions to faithfully reproduce the main experimental results, as described in supplemental material?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: An anonymised artefact bundle accompanies this submission, including the rollout-card format specification, reference implementation utilities, dataset adapters, derived rollout-card exports, drops manifests, and analysis scripts. The public Hugging Face release is hosted under the anonymous namespace <https://huggingface.co/annon124816> and consists of 21 card exports: 17 trace-publication exports plus four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports. The 17 trace-publication exports are `agent_reward_bench`, `agentharm`, `atbench`, `bfcl`, `browsecomp`, `debate_mallm`, `gpqa`, `humaneval`, `maestro`, `miniwob`, `mmlu`, `stabletoolbench`, `swe_smith`, `tau_bench`, `tot_crosswords`, `tot_game24`, and `weblinx`. The four non-trace exports are `gap`, `copra`, `mle_bench`, and `swebench_cross_harness`. Each export includes a dataset README and metadata files, including `dataset_info.json`; the OpenReview Croissant package contains RAI-augmented Croissant metadata for all 21 exports. The public releases used in RQ1 and RQ2 are cited in §4; extraction and reconciliation protocols are specified in Appendix A and Appendix F.4.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that paper does not include experiments requiring code.
- Please see the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://neurips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- While we encourage the release of code and data, we understand that this might not be possible, so [No] is an acceptable answer. Papers cannot be rejected simply for not including code, unless this is central to the contribution (e.g., for a new open-source benchmark).
- The instructions should contain the exact command and environment needed to run to reproduce the results. See the NeurIPS code and data submission guidelines (<https://neurips.cc/public/guides/CodeSubmissionPolicy>) for more details.
- The authors should provide instructions on data access and preparation, including how to access the raw data, preprocessed data, intermediate data, and generated data, etc.
- The authors should provide scripts to reproduce all experimental results for the new proposed method and baselines. If only a subset of experiments are reproducible, they should state which ones are omitted from the script and why.
- At submission time, to preserve anonymity, the authors should release anonymized versions (if applicable).
- Providing as much information as possible in supplemental material (appended to the paper) is recommended, but including URLs to data and code is permitted.

6. Experimental setting/details

Question: Does the paper specify all the training and test details (e.g., data splits, hyperparameters, how they were chosen, type of optimizer) necessary to understand the results?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper reports no new model training or new policy rollouts. RQ1 reanalyzes preserved public process records, and RQ2 re-grades preserved public answers, patches, submissions, or trajectories under declared alternative conventions. Appendix F specifies the source artefact classes, ingestion rules, and convention choices used for the re-grading sweep. The released card datasets are derived publication artefacts over public sources rather than new agent executions.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The experimental setting should be presented in the core of the paper to a level of detail that is necessary to appreciate the results and make sense of them.
- The full details can be provided either with the code, in appendix, or as supplemental material.

7. Experiment statistical significance

Question: Does the paper report error bars suitably and correctly defined or other appropriate information about the statistical significance of the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The RQ2 reporting-convention reconciliation is a deterministic re-grading of already-released artefacts, so no stochastic variation enters the pipeline; we report exact denominators, score deltas, and ranking inversions rather than error bars. For RQ1, the figure reports descriptive summaries over preserved public records and sample counts for binned summaries; the COPRA panel additionally reports an observational logistic trend with an explicit causal caveat.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The authors should answer [Yes] if the results are accompanied by error bars, confidence intervals, or statistical significance tests, at least for the experiments that support the main claims of the paper.
- The factors of variability that the error bars are capturing should be clearly stated (for example, train/test split, initialization, random drawing of some parameter, or overall run with given experimental conditions).

- The method for calculating the error bars should be explained (closed form formula, call to a library function, bootstrap, etc.)
- The assumptions made should be given (e.g., Normally distributed errors).
- It should be clear whether the error bar is the standard deviation or the standard error of the mean.
- It is OK to report 1-sigma error bars, but one should state it. The authors should preferably report a 2-sigma error bar than state that they have a 96% CI, if the hypothesis of Normality of errors is not verified.
- For asymmetric distributions, the authors should be careful not to show in tables or figures symmetric error bars that would yield results that are out of range (e.g., negative error rates).
- If error bars are reported in tables or plots, the authors should explain in the text how they were calculated and reference the corresponding figures or tables in the text.

8. Experiments compute resources

Question: For each experiment, does the paper provide sufficient information on the computer resources (type of compute workers, memory, time of execution) needed to reproduce the experiments?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: No model training and no new policy rollouts are performed. RQ1 consists of local analysis over public trace artefacts; RQ2 consists of ingestion and deterministic re-grading of preserved public artefacts. The default Hugging Face-backed reconstruction path downloads already-exported cards and runs local analytics; the heavier raw-source rebuild ingests public artefacts through Ergon/Postgres and may require additional storage for large trace resources. No GPU is required for any reported result.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not include experiments.
- The paper should indicate the type of compute workers CPU or GPU, internal cluster, or cloud provider, including relevant memory and storage.
- The paper should provide the amount of compute required for each of the individual experimental runs as well as estimate the total compute.
- The paper should disclose whether the full research project required more compute than the experiments reported in the paper (e.g., preliminary or failed experiments that didn't make it into the paper).

9. Code of ethics

Question: Does the research conducted in the paper conform, in every respect, with the NeurIPS Code of Ethics <https://neurips.cc/public/EthicsGuidelines>?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper proposes a publication format, reference implementation, and public card exports for agent research. It involves no human subjects and no private data collection. The analyses and released card exports are derived from public benchmark, repository, dataset, trajectory, patch, submission, or fixed-output artefacts, with provenance, licensing, and redistribution notes recorded in the artefact. The reference implementation is released as open source.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the authors have not reviewed the NeurIPS Code of Ethics.
- If the authors answer [No], they should explain the special circumstances that require a deviation from the Code of Ethics.
- The authors should make sure to preserve anonymity (e.g., if there is a special consideration due to laws or regulations in their jurisdiction).

10. Broader impacts

Question: Does the paper discuss both potential positive societal impacts and negative societal impacts of the work performed?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: Positive impacts — improved auditability of agent-research claims, reporting-convention reconciliation, and legibility of methodology differences — are discussed in §6. The main risk is that rollout records and public card exports can contain prompts, model outputs, tool traces, or environment data requiring privacy, licensing, redaction, or access-control decisions; §6 states that rollout cards make such choices inspectable rather than eliminating them.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that there is no societal impact of the work performed.
- If the authors answer [N/A] or [No], they should explain why their work has no societal impact or why the paper does not address societal impact.
- Examples of negative societal impacts include potential malicious or unintended uses (e.g., disinformation, generating fake profiles, surveillance), fairness considerations (e.g., deployment of technologies that could make decisions that unfairly impact specific groups), privacy considerations, and security considerations.
- The conference expects that many papers will be foundational research and not tied to particular applications, let alone deployments. However, if there is a direct path to any negative applications, the authors should point it out. For example, it is legitimate to point out that an improvement in the quality of generative models could be used to generate Deepfakes for disinformation. On the other hand, it is not needed to point out that a generic algorithm for optimizing neural networks could enable people to train models that generate Deepfakes faster.
- The authors should consider possible harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended and functioning correctly, harms that could arise when the technology is being used as intended but gives incorrect results, and harms following from (intentional or unintentional) misuse of the technology.
- If there are negative societal impacts, the authors could also discuss possible mitigation strategies (e.g., gated release of models, providing defenses in addition to attacks, mechanisms for monitoring misuse, mechanisms to monitor how a system learns from feedback over time, improving the efficiency and accessibility of ML).

11. Safeguards

Question: Does the paper describe safeguards that have been put in place for responsible release of data or models that have a high risk for misuse (e.g., pre-trained language models, image generators, or scraped datasets)?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper releases a format specification (rollout cards), reference implementation utilities, and derived card datasets, not a pre-trained model or generative system. Section 3 treats release-scope metadata and drops manifests as part of the rollout-card standard: card exports declare redaction, access, licensing, redistribution, omission, and source-policy limits rather than requiring every source field to be publicly redistributed. The 21 public Hugging Face exports are derived from public upstream artefacts; the artefact records license notes and redistribution limits; raw upstream datasets are omitted where redistribution is not permitted; packaging applies basic credential/secret redaction; and the release distinguishes trace-publication exports from analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports when full traces are not published.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper poses no such risks.
- Released models that have a high risk for misuse or dual-use should be released with necessary safeguards to allow for controlled use of the model, for example by requiring that users adhere to usage guidelines or restrictions to access the model or implementing safety filters.
- Datasets that have been scraped from the Internet could pose safety risks. The authors should describe how they avoided releasing unsafe images.
- We recognize that providing effective safeguards is challenging, and many papers do not require this, but we encourage authors to take this into account and make a best faith effort.

12. Licenses for existing assets

Question: Are the creators or original owners of assets (e.g., code, data, models), used in the paper, properly credited and are the license and terms of use explicitly mentioned and properly respected?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: The paper cites the public sources used for RQ1/RQ2 analysis and card export in §4, §5, Appendix A, and Appendix F.4. The artefact records per-source URLs, version references or checksums where available, license notes, and redistribution limits for the 21 public Hugging Face exports and the broader local card corpus. Source datasets themselves are not re-released as source datasets unless the source policy permits derived public redistribution; the released objects are derived rollout-card exports with provenance and drops metadata.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not use existing assets.
- The authors should cite the original paper that produced the code package or dataset.
- The authors should state which version of the asset is used and, if possible, include a URL.
- The name of the license (e.g., CC-BY 4.0) should be included for each asset.
- For scraped data from a particular source (e.g., website), the copyright and terms of service of that source should be provided.
- If assets are released, the license, copyright information, and terms of use in the package should be provided. For popular datasets, paperswithcode.com/datasets has curated licenses for some datasets. Their licensing guide can help determine the license of a dataset.
- For existing datasets that are re-packaged, both the original license and the license of the derived asset (if it has changed) should be provided.
- If this information is not available online, the authors are encouraged to reach out to the asset's creators.

13. New assets

Question: Are new assets introduced in the paper well documented and is the documentation provided alongside the assets?

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: New assets accompany the paper: (i) the rollout-card format specification (Appendix E); (ii) reference exporter, validator, and reader utilities for conformant bundles; (iii) dataset adapters, view/reporting-rule tooling, and drops-manifest tooling; (iv) 21 public Hugging Face card exports, comprising 17 trace-publication exports plus four analytic/recovered-view non-trace exports; and (v) ingestion, re-grading, and reporting-rule scripts for the public artefacts used in RQ1 and RQ2. The public dataset exports include dataset READMEs and machine-readable metadata; the OpenReview Croissant package contains RAI-augmented Croissant metadata for all 21 exports. The repository also documents a broader 25-source local card corpus, but the public-upload claim is the 21-export release described above. All new assets are documented in-repository and anonymised for submission.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not release new assets.
- Researchers should communicate the details of the dataset/code/model as part of their submissions via structured templates. This includes details about training, license, limitations, etc.
- The paper should discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose asset is used.
- At submission time, remember to anonymize your assets (if applicable). You can either create an anonymized URL or include an anonymized zip file.

14. Crowdsourcing and research with human subjects

Question: For crowdsourcing experiments and research with human subjects, does the paper include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable, as well as details about compensation (if any)?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: The paper involves no crowdsourcing and no human subjects. The public-rollout reanalyses, 50-repo survey, and 37-pair variance catalogue are authored by the paper’s authors against public artefacts.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Including this information in the supplemental material is fine, but if the main contribution of the paper involves human subjects, then as much detail as possible should be included in the main paper.
- According to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics, workers involved in data collection, curation, or other labor should be paid at least the minimum wage in the country of the data collector.

15. **Institutional review board (IRB) approvals or equivalent for research with human subjects**

Question: Does the paper describe potential risks incurred by study participants, whether such risks were disclosed to the subjects, and whether Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals (or an equivalent approval/review based on the requirements of your country or institution) were obtained?

Answer: [N/A]

Justification: No human subjects research is performed. No IRB review is applicable.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the paper does not involve crowdsourcing nor research with human subjects.
- Depending on the country in which research is conducted, IRB approval (or equivalent) may be required for any human subjects research. If you obtained IRB approval, you should clearly state this in the paper.
- We recognize that the procedures for this may vary significantly between institutions and locations, and we expect authors to adhere to the NeurIPS Code of Ethics and the guidelines for their institution.
- For initial submissions, do not include any information that would break anonymity (if applicable), such as the institution conducting the review.

16. **Declaration of LLM usage**

Question: Does the paper describe the usage of LLMs if it is an important, original, or non-standard component of the core methods in this research? Note that if the LLM is used only for writing, editing, or formatting purposes and does *not* impact the core methodology, scientific rigor, or originality of the research, declaration is not required.

Answer: [Yes]

Justification: LLMs and LLM agents are the central object of study. RQ1 reanalyses preserved public traces from tool-using, multi-agent, theorem-proving, and tree-search systems; RQ2 re-grades preserved outputs and trajectories produced by LLM systems under alternative reporting conventions. No LLM is used as a grading, inference, or decision component for the repository audit. That survey is documented as a pinned public-source audit: Appendix B describes the rubric and acceptance criteria, and the supplementary survey bundle releases final labels, evidence snippets, and pinned source references so the survey counts are verifiable from public audit records.

Guidelines:

- The answer [N/A] means that the core method development in this research does not involve LLMs as any important, original, or non-standard components.
- Please refer to our LLM policy in the NeurIPS handbook for what should or should not be described.