

# Prompt-Induced Waste in Coding Agents: Reasoning, Effort, Harness Design, and End-to-End Cost

A Preregistered Benchmark with Harness Extensions

Sarel Weinberger  
PointFive  
sarel.weinberger@pointfive.co

Amir Hozes  
PointFive  
amir@pointfive.co

August 2026

## Abstract

Coding-agent efficiency cannot be characterized by token count or model price alone. End-to-end cost and task success depend jointly on prompt semantics, inference effort, harness policy, model, task difficulty, tool use, context management, and provider accounting. Controlled experiments show that prompt wording can change reasoning and verification behavior without changing the task, that additional inference effort can help on difficult tasks but can also add cost without benefit, and that the value of an efficiency intervention can change when the harness changes. These results show that prompt, effort, and harness are interacting experimental factors rather than independent controls. We model efficiency as cost per successful task induced by the agent trajectory. Token and cache counts are measurements of that trajectory, not sufficient optimization targets. Agent evaluations should therefore measure success and end-to-end cost while controlling the system variables that determine how the trajectory is produced.

## 1 Introduction

Coding-agent cost is usually analyzed through quantities such as input tokens, output tokens, context size, cache use, or model price. These quantities are important for billing, but they do not determine how much work an agent performs. The same task can produce different numbers of reasoning steps, model turns, tool calls, repository reads, edits, tests, and retries. The central question of this paper is therefore not only how expensive each token is, but what determines the trajectory that generates those tokens and tool actions.

We examine three controllable parts of that trajectory. The first is *prompt semantics*. Instructions can change how the agent searches, branches, verifies, and decides to stop even when the task, model, harness, and nominal effort setting are fixed. The second is *inference effort*. More reasoning can be useful on difficult tasks, but additional effort can also add computation without improving the solution. The third is the *agent harness*. Harnesses determine the system prompt and tool schemas, expose or set reasoning controls, manage context, define tool and subagent behavior, and shape when the model is called again. These choices can change the effect of both the prompt and the effort setting.

The prompt experiments isolate the first factor. They show that instructions which request alternative solutions, deeper analysis, or unusually strong certainty can increase reasoning or verification without a corresponding gain in task success. The mechanism is behavioral rather than lexical: a longer prompt that merely restates the task does not reproduce these effects. The relevant variable is the work requested by the instruction.

The effort experiments test the opposite boundary. Reducing computation is not always beneficial. On sufficiently difficult repository-scale tasks, additional inference effort can improve success for some model–task combinations, while in other cases it raises cost without improving outcomes. Efficiency therefore cannot be defined as minimum reasoning or minimum tool use. The relevant quantity is whether additional work improves the probability of solving the task enough to justify its cost.

The harness experiments add a system-level factor. Different production agent runtimes expose different fixed context, tool surfaces, turn structures, verification policies, context-management rules, and reasoning defaults. Holding the task, model, prompt, and controller logic fixed while changing the harness can materially change both baseline computation and the effect of an effort or prompt intervention. The value of an efficiency control is therefore conditional on the runtime policy in which it operates.

We represent these experiments with a common model. A task, model, prompt, effort setting, harness, and execution environment jointly induce an agent trajectory. That trajectory determines model requests, tool actions, context updates, tokens, cache traffic, latency, and eventually task success. Provider prices then map the measured trajectory to billed cost. The terminal efficiency metric is cost per successful task, not token count by itself.

The empirical program separates these factors rather than pooling them. One set of controlled experiments isolates prompt effects under matched model–task–harness–effort conditions. A separate hard-task campaign measures the cost–success effect of explicit effort where baseline failures are common enough to expose a trade-off. Cross-harness extensions then hold the model, tasks, prompts, and intervention logic fixed while changing the runtime. These experiments test which factors change agent work, when additional work is useful, and which interactions must be controlled in efficiency benchmarks. The specific benchmark suites, harness implementations, models, experimental counts, effect sizes, confidence intervals, and implementation checks are reported in the Experimental Setup, Results, and Appendices rather than used to define the problem in the introduction.

The same system model also yields a concrete training problem for an adaptive controller: condition on the observed agent state and select among a small set of safe interventions to minimize expected remaining cost subject to a success non-inferiority constraint (Section 8).

## 2 Experimental setup

Six open-weight reasoning models ( $\geq 500\text{B}$ -class, served by one provider) and Claude Sonnet 5 were evaluated on 24 deterministic coding tasks under two production agent harnesses: PI.DEV directly and Claude Code through a pinned protocol-translation gateway, with an additional native Claude Code arm for the closed model. Each task has a frozen fixture, visible tests, and hidden deterministic tests that are unavailable to the agent. Eighteen frozen prompt variants manipulate only the user instruction. Nine primary variants preserve the objective, acceptance criteria, and test command verbatim; Table 4 reports the exact manipulated clauses and Appendix C gives the complete templates.

Hypotheses, metrics, and decision thresholds were preregistered. The main screening findings were evaluated on a frozen 8-task holdout, and all comparisons are paired within task–model–harness blocks with task-clustered bootstrap intervals. The **4,644 valid runs** and **2,801 condition-blind trace annotations** reported for this core benchmark refer to this controlled prompt/harness program and its associated replications; they do *not* include the separate hard-task effort campaign in Appendix N. That SWE-bench campaign contains 150 paired model–task–effort cells and manipulates effort level rather than prompt wording. It is used to test the boundary condition on “less compute

is better,” not to re-estimate the  $2.4\text{--}7.4\times$  prompt effect or the  $5\text{--}30\times$  between-harness cost gap. A further post-registration extension changes the harness to DeepSeek Harness (dsh) 0.1.0rc7 while holding Sonnet 5, the five activation fixtures, prompts, hidden evaluators, controller logic, and statistics fixed. That extension contains 75 valid comparative runs ( $5\text{ tasks} \times 5\text{ arms} \times 3\text{ repetitions}$ ) after an explicit baseline activation gate and is analyzed separately in Appendix O. Appendices A–D provide the full core design, trace-annotation protocol, gateway validation, and billing reconciliation.

### 3 Prompt wording changes agent work and cost

Prompt wording changed both reasoning volume and end-to-end spend under otherwise matched conditions. The instruction to *develop several approaches, compare their trade-offs, and implement the best one* increased reasoning tokens by  $2.4\text{--}7.4\times$  across all six open models at comparable success, with the effect reproduced on the frozen holdout. Deep-thinking instructions increased reasoning by  $1.6\text{--}2.2\times$  across three collection phases, and certainty-oriented wording by  $1.3\text{--}1.9\times$ . Scope-expanding language was the only prompt family that consistently widened code diffs. A bounded-efficiency template specifying scope, a smallest-sufficient-change criterion, and a stopping rule had no measurable cost penalty and reduced reasoning for one model. By contrast, verbatim restatement of the task had approximately unit cost, indicating that prompt content rather than prompt length drives the observed effects in this setup. Complete per-model results appear in Appendix E.

Because forced branching produced the largest and most consistent increase in reasoning, we separately tested whether it improved task success. Across 878 branching runs and 225 paired blocks, there was no statistically credible success benefit. Aggregate success was 96.5% for baseline and 95.2% for branching, with discordant blocks favoring baseline 26:13. On easy cells, branching reduced success from 98.8% to 96.4% and increased scope violations by approximately  $3\times$ . An exploratory +4.8 percentage point effect on hard task–model cells did not survive cross-fitted validation: the difficulty label failed to reproduce on held-out runs and the branching effect fell to +0.4 percentage points. Hidden-test-only failures were not reduced by branching (2 baseline vs. 3 branching), and no annotated trace showed a discarded branch identifying a solution that a baseline run had searched for and missed. The benchmark contains few architecture-dependent tasks, so potential benefits of branching in that regime remain outside the scope of the present evidence (Appendix P).

### 4 Composition of additional reasoning

For the seven models with provider-exposed reasoning text, we annotated 2,801 traces using a frozen rubric and a condition-blind judge. The judge was not shown the prompt variant and was required to provide an evidence quote for each nonzero mechanism count. Appendix A describes the annotation and validation protocol, and Appendix H provides verbatim examples.

The annotations distinguish several mechanisms. Multiple-approach prompts add approximately 3.5 candidate strategies per run, of which approximately 3 are elaborated and then discarded; the number of implemented alternatives increases by exactly one across all models, corresponding to the selected approach. Deep-thinking prompts add no median increase in the observable functional units defined by the rubric—hypotheses, evidence collection, verification, or grounding—despite  $2.2\times$  more recorded reasoning text. Certainty-oriented prompts add redundant re-verification of already settled facts on all six screening models. Misleading architectural hints add hypotheses that remain unsupported by inspected code and increase pre-edit deliberation by  $4.2\times$ ; unsupported assumptions are also the only annotated semantic marker negatively associated with success ( $\rho = -0.19$ ).




Figure 1: Two waste mechanisms with different cost carriers. Bars show the raw median no-cache cost per run; labels above each bar show the median number of tool calls. Unused solution branches nearly double cost while calls remain approximately flat, indicating primarily reasoning-borne overhead. Redundant verification increases both cost and tool activity, indicating trajectory- and tool-borne overhead. Success remains approximately flat across severity levels.

Bounded-efficiency wording does not reduce diagnosis or final validation on well-specified tasks. A follow-up campaign identifies a boundary condition: on an ambiguous specification, its stop-early framing reduced evidence seeking and produced 3/5 hidden-test failures versus 0/5 at baseline because the relevant in-repository requirements file was not consulted (Appendix M). Accordingly, efficiency instructions should retain an explicit requirement to inspect repository evidence when the specification is ambiguous. These statements concern provider-exposed reasoning traces rather than latent computation [8]; Claude Sonnet 5 is excluded from trace-level claims because its reasoning text is not recoverable in this dataset.

## 5 Mechanisms of excess cost

Joining the reasoning annotations with deterministic tool telemetry across all 4,644 runs shows that the dominant mechanisms propagate cost through different channels.

Discarded branches are primarily **token-borne**: runs with one unused branch have  $\approx 1.9\times$  the median cost of clean runs ( $n = 1,934$  clean vs. 354 one-branch runs), while median tool calls change only from 7 to 8. Code-edit counts are unchanged on all six screening models, indicating that the additional branch exploration occurs mainly in recorded reasoning rather than repository interaction. Redundant verification is **tool-borne and increases with severity**:

Certainty-oriented wording produces this profile: +1.75 post-success calls (sign-consistent on 6/6 models), extra test executions, +4s latency; the most extreme observed loop re-ran an already-green suite six times. Even local tools with no direct monetary charge create model cost: their results re-enter context and account for a bounded 4–12% of run cost. The synthesis:

| Redundant verification | $n$   | median (rel.) | mean (rel.) | wins. mean (rel.) | 95% CI (median, rel.) | calls     |
|------------------------|-------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------|
| level 0                | 1,585 | 1.00×         | 1.00×       | 1.00×             | [0.96, 1.03]          | 6         |
| level 1                | 835   | 1.48×         | 1.77×       | 1.70×             | [1.44, 1.58]          | 8         |
| level 2                | 168   | 2.36×         | 4.34×       | 4.28×             | [2.01, 2.67]          | 9         |
| level 3+               | 213   | <b>18.25×</b> | 17.74×      | 18.38×            | [15.13, 21.06]        | <b>15</b> |

Table 1: Cost by judge-annotated redundant-verification level ( $n = 1,585$  clean vs. 213 high-redundancy runs). Runs at level 3+ cost **18×** the clean-run median, execute  $2.5\times$  the tool calls, and take  $3\times$  the wall-clock, with no success gradient. The gradient survives winsorization at the 95th percentile ( $18.4\times$  on winsorized means); the level-3+ lower quartile is  $10\times$  the level-0 median. All cost columns are normalized to the clean-run (level-0) median; absolute values are retained in the public artifact (`rv_cost_robustness.json`).

| Condition           | Observable reasoning effect                                  | Tool-layer effect                            | Cost carrier                | Success                                 | Evidence                          |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| multiple_approaches | +3 discarded branches; +1 implemented                        | weak/secondary ( $p \approx .06$ ); edits +0 | token-borne                 | none                                    | strong semantic; directional tool |
| deep_thinking       | $2.2\times$ text, zero new functional units                  | none ( $p = .26$ )                           | token-borne                 | none                                    | strong                            |
| max_certainty       | +1 redundant re-verification (6/6)                           | +1.75 post-success calls; repeat tests       | tool-borne + induced tokens | none                                    | strong                            |
| misleading_hints    | +1 unsupported assumption; $4.2\times$ pre-edit deliberation | directional (+1.75 calls, +0.5 failed)       | reasoning-borne             | none / possible harm ( $\rho = -0.19$ ) | mixed                             |
| bounded_efficiency  | no loss of diagnosis/validation                              | null ( $p = 1.0$ )                           | — (avoids waste)            | preserved                               | strong null                       |

Table 2: Integrated mechanism table. “None” = no success gain in paired comparison; all counts are medians of per-model paired deltas.

## 6 Harness effects

Prompt effects are measured within a harness, but the between-harness differences are larger. On matched model–task–prompt triples, Claude Code transmits a  $12\text{--}15\times$  larger fixed prefix than PI.DEV and uses  $2\text{--}7\times$  more turns, producing  $5\text{--}30\times$  higher cost per success at comparable success rates. Its tool profile is verification-heavy: approximately half of all calls are test executions, compared with 22% under PI.DEV (Figure 2, left). Reasoning traces under Claude Code also contain larger shares of planning, error recovery, and self-correction. Prompt effects are not invariant across harnesses: for example, goal-only prompts reduce reasoning under Claude Code but reduce verifiability under PI.DEV. Provider-side safety classifiers do not account for the measured billing gap: most of the comparison uses Together-hosted open models outside Anthropic’s serving path, and native Anthropic billing reconciles from visible usage fields (Appendix D).

### 6.1 DeepSeek Harness extension: harness changes the value of effort control

A post-registration extension uses DeepSeek Harness (dsh) 0.1.0rc7 with Claude Sonnet 5 held fixed. The five tasks, prompts, fixtures, hidden judges, controller decisions, and paired statistics are inherited from the frozen activation benchmark; only the harness changes. Wire capture established before comparative runs that the evaluated dsh composition enabled aggressive reasoning by default on every ordinary request. The primary estimand is therefore within-dsh arm versus dsh baseline, not absolute dsh versus Claude Code cost.

| Arm      | Mean billed cost/run | Change vs. dsh baseline | Success |
|----------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------|
| baseline | \$0.2753             | —                       | 15/15   |
| policy   | \$0.2114             | −23.2%                  | 15/15   |
| rewrite  | \$0.2109             | −23.4%                  | 15/15   |
| effort   | \$0.0696             | −74.7%                  | 15/15   |
| full     | \$0.0490             | −82.2%                  | 15/15   |

Table 3: DeepSeek Harness extension (Sonnet 5;  $n = 15$  paired runs per arm-versus-baseline contrast). Point estimates are shown for compactness; the preregistered paired bootstrap/McNemar/Holm procedures are retained in the extension artifact. Component effects overlap and are not additive.

The effort-only arm accounts for approximately 91% of the observed baseline-to-full dollar reduction. This mechanism differs from the original Claude Code activation benchmark, where the same controller’s effort arm reduced cost by about 19% and the full stack by about 27%. Under dsh the effort arm reduced cost by about 75% and the full stack by about 82%. The result is a direct empirical interaction: the benefit of effort control depends on the harness default and request policy. The policy and rewrite arms have much smaller point effects; the rewrite-only inferential result is not promoted as independently conclusive. Absolute cross-harness dollar comparisons are secondary because static prompts, tool composition, context management, and cache behavior differ across harnesses.

The published DeepSeek Harness architecture separates the agent spine, tool registry, persistence/checkpoint policy, compaction, subagents, workflows, and model adapters [4]. Its tool registry can expose native function calls or Code Mode. In Code Mode, nested tool dispatches can remain local to execution while only the outer result enters model history [4]. These components define additional measurable variables: model round trips, context crossings, intermediate results added to history, compaction events, and subagent boundaries. They were not varied in the present extension and are not treated as experimental effects here.

## 7 Model of agent cost and success

The experiments can be represented with a common trajectory model. Let

$$\theta = (T, M, P, E, H, X, \Pi),$$

where  $T$  denotes the task (including difficulty and uncertainty),  $M$  the model,  $P$  prompt semantics,  $E$  explicit inference effort,  $H$  the harness configuration and policy,  $X$  the execution environment and available tool surface, and  $\Pi$  the provider pricing/cache regime. The behavioral trajectory is

$$\tau \sim \mathcal{G}(T, M, P, E, H, X; \epsilon),$$

a sequence of model requests, reasoning, tool actions, edits, retries, and stopping decisions. Token and cache quantities are consequences of this trajectory, not independent primitives. If request  $k$  contains uncached input  $U_k$ , cache reads  $R_k$ , cache writes  $W_k$ , and generated output  $O_k$ , then a general billed-cost model is

$$C(\tau; \Pi) = \sum_{k=1}^{N(\tau)} (p_U U_k + p_R R_k + p_W W_k + p_O O_k) + C_{\text{tool}}(\tau),$$




Figure 2: Harness design changes both the agent trajectory and the value of control. Left: baseline tool calls are shown in absolute calls per run rather than normalized shares; Claude Code executes more calls and allocates a larger fraction to tests, while PI.DEV is more inspection-heavy. “Other” combines search, navigation, and residual tool categories. Right: on the same Sonnet 5 activation tasks, the same effort-control logic produces a much larger cost reduction under DeepSeek Harness than under Claude Code. The comparison is within each harness relative to its own baseline and illustrates the measured harness-effort interaction.

where  $C_{\text{tool}}$  is zero for the local tools in the core benchmark but need not be zero in a general agent system. The terminal quantity is success-adjusted cost,

$$\text{CPS}(\theta) = \frac{\mathbb{E}[C(\tau; \Pi) \mid T, M, P, E, H, X]}{\Pr(S(\tau, T) = 1 \mid T, M, P, E, H, X)}$$

with latency and other resource terms reported alongside it rather than silently converted into dollars.

The dependence is not additive. A useful empirical expansion is

$$\log \text{CPS} = \beta_0 + \sum_j f_j(x_j) + \sum_{j < k} f_{jk}(x_j, x_k) + u_T + \varepsilon,$$

where  $f_{jk}$  represents pairwise interactions. The dsh extension provides evidence for an  $H \times E$  interaction; the cross-harness prompt results show  $H \times P$  variation; and the SWE-bench campaign shows variation in  $T \times E$  and  $M \times E$ . We do not estimate every term in this expression. The equation specifies the variables that must be controlled or reported when attributing an efficiency effect to a single intervention.

## 8 Training an adaptive efficiency controller

The interaction structure above makes a fixed global rule unsuitable as a general optimization policy. A practical controller should condition on the current agent state and select among a small set of

interventions. This section states the training problem implied by the experiments; the controller itself is a proposed follow-up and is not evaluated in the present paper.

**State rather than interaction tables.** At decision time  $t$ , define a compact state representation

$$s_t = \phi(T, M, H, P, E, h_t, b_t),$$

where  $h_t$  is the observed trajectory prefix and  $b_t$  is the current resource state. The representation should retain stable factors such as model and harness, task features such as structural difficulty and specification uncertainty, and online signals such as turns, tool calls by type, edits since the last test, test status, repeated commands, context volume, compaction, latency, and accrued cost. Harness identity should not be treated as a label alone: measurable descriptors such as fixed-prefix size, tool-schema surface, reasoning defaults, context-crossing behavior, and subagent/workflow policy are part of the state. This lets a policy represent interactions such as  $H \times E$  or  $T \times E$  without enumerating a separate rule for every Cartesian product.

**Small action space.** The controller need not manipulate every measured variable. Its action set can remain small:

$$a_t \in \mathcal{A} = \{\text{effort, prompt policy, tool policy, context policy, verification, stop}\}.$$

Concrete actions include lowering or escalating inference effort, removing a branching or certainty cue, allowing or blocking a repeated tool call, selecting which tool output re-enters context, requesting additional evidence, and stopping after sufficient validation. Deterministic safety constraints should define a state-dependent admissible set  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{safe}}(s_t)$ . For example, a green test with no intervening edit can block an identical re-test, whereas an ambiguous specification can forbid an aggressive stop-early action until repository evidence has been inspected.

**Training targets.** The training target should be outcome utility, not token reduction. Logged executions provide tuples

$$\mathcal{D} = \{(s_t, a_t, c_t, y, s_{t+1})\},$$

where  $c_t$  is incremental resource cost and  $y$  is terminal task success. The paired prompt, effort, and harness experiments are especially useful because they provide matched observations of alternative policies on the same tasks. An initial controller can fit two calibrated outcome models,

$$\hat{c}_{\text{rem}}(s, a) = \mathbb{E}[C_{\text{remaining}} \mid s, a], \quad \hat{p}_{\text{succ}}(s, a) = \Pr(S = 1 \mid s, a),$$

and choose

$$a_t^* = \arg \min_{a \in \mathcal{A}_{\text{safe}}(s_t)} \hat{c}_{\text{rem}}(s_t, a) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \hat{p}_{\text{succ}}(s_t, a) \geq p_{\min}(s_t).$$

Here  $p_{\min}$  is a non-inferiority floor derived from the matched baseline, not a fixed global success threshold. This formulation prevents a controller from appearing efficient by terminating difficult runs early.

**Staged policy learning.** A conservative training sequence follows directly from the evidence. First, encode high-confidence deterministic rules for repeated successful tests, repeated unchanged failures, and other clearly dominated actions. Second, fit supervised cost and success models on the accumulated paired benchmark and production telemetry. A small tabular model, gradient-boosted

trees, or a shallow network with categorical embeddings for model/harness and numeric trajectory features is sufficient for this stage; an additional large language model is not required for the control decision. Third, use the fitted models as a conservative contextual policy that changes only actions with adequate data support. Because actions alter later state, a mature version is a constrained offline reinforcement-learning problem rather than a pure one-step classifier. The corresponding episode-level objective is

$$\pi^* = \arg \min_{\pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[C(\tau; \Pi)] \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \Pr_{\pi}(S = 1 \mid z) \geq \Pr_{\text{base}}(S = 1 \mid z) - \delta$$

for prespecified evaluation strata  $z$  (for example model–harness and task family), with latency or other resources added as explicit constraints when needed. Online deployment should therefore proceed by guarded A/B evaluation with non-inferiority checks, not by unconstrained reward maximization.

**What the controller learns.** The objective is not to learn that “low effort is efficient” or that “fewer tool calls are better.” It should learn conditional policies: low effort can be sufficient under an over-provisioned harness, higher effort can be useful on some cross-module tasks, repeated verification after a stable green test is usually dominated, and early stopping can be unsafe when requirements remain uncertain. The empirical role of the state representation is to absorb these interactions into one policy while keeping the intervention surface small and auditable.

## 9 Practical implications

The experiments identify different mechanisms that can change end-to-end cost. Token count alone does not identify which mechanism changed.

**Prompt design.** Requests for multiple approaches are appropriate when comparison among approaches is itself required; otherwise, the tested formulation adds substantial deliberation without improving success. Certainty requirements should be replaced by explicit verification and stopping rules, for example, running the relevant suite after the final edit and re-running it only after a relevant change or a failure. Unverified architectural hints should be avoided. Bounded-efficiency language is appropriate for well-specified tasks, but should explicitly require repository inspection when the specification is incomplete or ambiguous.

**Interpreting effect size.** Absolute per-run charges are small in this benchmark because tasks are bounded and provider prices are low. The main economic quantities are therefore multiplicative changes under matched conditions. The  $1.9\times$  discarded-branch association,  $18\times$  high redundant-verification association,  $2.4\text{--}7.4\times$  multiple-approaches effect, and  $5\text{--}30\times$  harness gap are estimates from the controlled benchmark regimes in which they were measured; they are *not* SWE-bench effect sizes. The separate SWE-bench campaign instead estimates the cost–success trade-off of explicit effort levels on harder repository-scale tasks. Applying controlled- benchmark overhead ratios to longer tasks, more expensive models, or production workloads may imply substantial aggregate consequences, but this paper does not make that extrapolation without an explicit workload model.

**Harness and gateway design.** Harness configuration is the largest cost factor measured here. Static-prefix size, tool-schema exposure, reasoning defaults, turn count, verification policy, context compaction, subagent/workflow topology, and which intermediate tool results re-enter model history

can all alter cost per success. Protocol translators can also invalidate comparisons if tool schemas or reasoning items are lost; agent benchmarks that use gateways should therefore validate multi-step tool execution and retain provider-side usage telemetry.

**What an efficiency benchmark must measure.** A token-only report is not sufficient to identify the mechanism of a saving. At minimum, paired agent evaluations should retain task success and cost per success; task family/difficulty; model and provider; prompt variant; explicit effort; harness/version/configuration; system-prefix and tool-schema surface; model round trips and turns; tool calls by type; raw and delivered tool volume; reasoning/output tokens where exposed; uncached input, cache writes, and cache reads; context-compaction events; retries, timeouts, and empty patches; subagent/workflow boundaries; wall-clock latency; and evidence that the intended intervention actually activated. These fields distinguish a true reduction in redundant work from early failure, cache-price effects, shifted work into another channel, or a harness default that simply over-provisions compute.

## 10 Related Work

*Prompt-induced agent behavior:* the present study treats user-prompt wording as an experimental factor and isolates its effect under matched coding-agent conditions using a paired design over two production harnesses. *Reasoning length and test-time compute:* work on overthinking studies how much models deliberate; we measure what deliberation is made of and what it triggers. *Faithfulness of chain-of-thought:* [8] show visible traces under-represent computation; we adopt their implication as an epistemic scope on all trace claims. *Tool selection and efficiency:* When2Tool [9] shows models latently know when a call is necessary and suppresses unnecessary calls. *Cost-aware planning:* CostBench [10] benchmarks cost-optimal plan adaptation; CATP-LLM [11] trains cost-aware tool planning; [12] survey efficiency levers across memory, tool learning, and planning. *Context optimization in coding agents:* CORVUS [13] reduces the context cost of file-read observations. These lines of work primarily address when tools should be called, how tool plans should trade off cost and utility, or how observations should be compressed. DeepSeek Harness [4] is complementary systems work: it makes orchestration choices explicit through composable capabilities for tool presentation, compaction, subagents, workflows, persistence, and model adapters. Its Code Mode is especially relevant to the present cost model because multiple tool sub-dispatches can be executed behind one model-facing result, changing context crossings without necessarily changing the underlying tool work. The present study adds controlled evidence that prompt, effort, and harness policy interact in their effect on observable reasoning, downstream tool execution, success, and end-to-end cost.

## 11 Limitations

Visible reasoning is not necessarily faithful or complete [8]; semantic labels describe observable text under a frozen rubric, never hidden cognition. Claude Sonnet 5 has no recoverable reasoning trace in this dataset (empty thinking blocks; reasoning billed inside output) and is excluded from all trace-level claims; its inclusion is limited to cost, success, turn, latency, and deterministic tool-level analyses. Reasoning-text availability is provider- and gateway-dependent. Exact per-turn cost attribution is unavailable; tool-induced model cost is a bounded estimate (4–12%). No direct tool API charge exists in this benchmark; local CPU/GPU/memory telemetry was not recorded; PI.DEV lacks per-call timing. “Post-success” rests on the visible-test completion proxy, not hidden-evaluator satisfaction. Tool counts are heavy-tailed and zero-inflated (94% of runs have zero post-green repeat

tests); H-T1 and H-T4 tool-layer effects are reported as directional rather than confirmatory. Judge validation was useful but imperfect: researcher-blind labels agreed within  $\pm 1$  on 84.9% of fields; same-model prompt sensitivity  $\kappa = 0.44$ ; cross-judge-model agreement was lower overall ( $\kappa = 0.28$ ) though 0.55–0.68 on hypothesis-critical fields. Tasks are small ( $\leq 4$  files) with high success ceilings; the token-borne character of branch waste may weaken on repository-scale tasks where alternatives demand real exploration, and findings may not transfer unchanged to long-horizon production agents. Harness and model effects may interact; the Claude Code arms are smaller by design. Cost figures use pinned catalog prices at collection time. Finally, whether forced branching helps on architecture-dependent tasks is untested: the task set contains essentially no such tasks, success ceilings limit detectable effects to  $\gtrsim 2.8$ pp, and the one suggestive subgroup signal failed cross-fitted validation (Appendix P); a follow-up adaptive-compute campaign could not create baseline failures even with purpose-built deceptive tasks, leaving evidence-triggered escalation untestable at this task scale (Appendix M). Provider-side safety classifiers may affect *latency*: their server-side execution time is not exposed in usage fields, so wall-clock time cannot be decomposed into classification, queueing, and generation components, and the absence of unexplained billing is not evidence that no classifier executes.

The dsh extension has additional scope limits. It uses one closed model (Sonnet 5) and five activation fixtures whose comparative arms all solve the task; it therefore demonstrates over-provisioned effort in that harness configuration, not the optimal effort policy on hard tasks. It does not test DeepSeek models. The evaluated unattended SDK composition also has no plug-and-play external pre-tool hook arm equivalent to the Claude Code runtime hook; a custom harness plugin would be a different intervention. Absolute dsh versus Claude Code cost is not a primary estimand because their prompts, tools, compaction, and cache traffic differ. Finally, dsh capabilities such as Code Mode, workflow orchestration, alternative subagent backends, and compaction policy were not factorially varied. The highest-value follow-up is therefore to run the already-frozen hard SWE-bench slice under dsh with both Sonnet 5 and Opus 5, crossing harness and effort on identical tasks, followed by targeted ablations of context-crossing and orchestration policies. The adaptive controller in Section 8 is a design implication, not an evaluated result: the present data do not establish that the proposed outcome models, contextual policy, or offline-RL stage will improve the cost–success frontier in deployment.

## 12 Conclusion

The experiments support a system-level account of coding-agent efficiency. Prompt semantics can change reasoning and verification under otherwise matched conditions. Explicit inference effort can improve success on some hard tasks, but its value depends on the task and model. Harness policy can change both the baseline amount of computation and the effect of an effort or prompt intervention. These factors therefore cannot be evaluated independently.

A useful unit of analysis is the agent trajectory. Task, model, prompt, effort, harness, and execution environment determine the sequence of model requests, tool actions, context updates, retries, and stopping decisions. Token volume, cache traffic, latency, and billed cost follow from that sequence. An intervention that reduces one token category can still increase end-to-end cost if it causes more turns, more tool calls, or additional reasoning; an intervention that reduces effort can lower success if the task requires more evidence or search.

The appropriate terminal metric is therefore cost per successful task, with prompt, effort, harness configuration, tool behavior, context management, latency, and provider usage accounting retained as explanatory variables. The same framework specifies how an adaptive controller should be

trained: encode the current agent state, predict remaining cost and success under a small set of safe actions, and minimize expected cost subject to a success non-inferiority constraint. The immediate experiment is to cross the frozen hard SWE-bench slice with both Sonnet 5 and Opus 5 under DeepSeek Harness; the resulting matched data can then support conservative training and evaluation of the state-conditioned controller described in Section 8. Reproduction materials, including fixtures, hidden evaluators, prompts, runners, telemetry, and analysis code, are available in the public repository.

## References

- [1] PointFive Labs. *prompt-efficiency-benchmark: benchmark code, task fixtures, prompt variants, raw ledgers, and analysis*. <https://github.com/PointFiveLabs/prompt-efficiency-benchmark>, 2026.
- [2] Earendil Works. *Pi: an AI agent toolkit and coding-agent CLI*. <https://pi.dev>, 2026.
- [3] Anthropic. *Claude Code*. <https://claude.com/claude-code>, 2026.
- [4] DeepSeek AI. *DeepSeek Harness: composable agent runtime and SDK*. <https://github.com/deepseek-ai/deepseek-harness>, 2026.
- [5] Together AI. *Inference platform and model catalog*. <https://www.together.ai>, 2026.
- [6] BerriAI. *LiteLLM proxy (v1.93.0)*. <https://github.com/BerriAI/litellm>, 2026.
- [7] Moonshot AI. *Kimi K3 technical blog*. <https://www.kimi.com/blog/kimi-k3>, 2026.
- [8] V. Baherwani, T. Goldstein, and A. Panda. *Not All LLM Reasoning Is Visible in the Chain-of-Thought*. arXiv:2607.22925, 2026.
- [9] C.-E. Sun, L. Liu, G. Yan, Z. Wang, and T.-W. Weng. *LLM Agents Already Know When to Call Tools — Even Without Reasoning (When2Tool)*. arXiv:2605.09252, 2026.
- [10] J. Liu, C. Qian, Z. Su, Q. Zong, S. Huang, B. He, and Y. R. Fung. *CostBench: Evaluating Multi-Turn Cost-Optimal Planning and Adaptation in Dynamic Environments for LLM Tool-Use Agents*. arXiv:2511.02734, 2025.
- [11] D. Wu, J. Wang, Y. Meng, Y. Zhang, L. Sun, and Z. Wang. *CATP-LLM: Empowering Large Language Models for Cost-Aware Tool Planning*. arXiv:2411.16313, 2024.
- [12] X. Yang, L. Li, H. Zhou, T. Zhu, X. Qu, Y. Fan, Q. Wei, R. Ye, L. Kang, Y. Qin, D. Liu, Q. Li, N. Ding, S. Chen, and J. Shao. *Toward Efficient Agents: Memory, Tool Learning, and Planning*. arXiv:2601.14192, 2026.
- [13] M. Zheng, D. O’Brien, S. Cui, P. Pashakhanloo, R. Mukherjee, M. Kim, and S. Kuhar. *CORVUS: Context Optimization and Reduction Via Underlying Synchronization for LLM Coding Agents*. arXiv:2607.22711, 2026.

## A Full Experimental Design, Preregistration, and Metrics

### A.1 Preregistration

Hypotheses (H1–H8, H12–H17), metric definitions, waste-classification rules, and experiment protocols were frozen in the repository before any benchmark result was inspected. The holdout phase additionally froze per-model variant selections, prompts, evaluators, and analysis code before any holdout run. The Kimi-K3 replication froze its task rule, matrix, and material-difference thresholds in a commit that predates its first result.

### A.2 Models, harnesses, and serving

Six reasoning models ( $\geq 500\text{B}$ -class) served by Together AI were frozen before data collection: DeepSeek-V4-Pro, Kimi-K2.6, Kimi-K2.7-Code, Nemotron-3-Ultra-550B-A55B, Inkling, and GLM-5.2. Two harnesses operate them: PI.DEV 0.82.1 speaking OpenAI chat completions directly, and Claude Code 2.1.220 speaking the Anthropic Messages protocol through a pinned LiteLLM 1.93.0 gateway that translates to chat completions. Two logging reverse proxies capture both sides of the gateway with secrets redacted, so every run retains the provider’s raw usage object.

### A.3 Tasks

24 deterministic coding tasks (8 low / 8 medium / 8 high complexity; 9 Python, 9 JavaScript, 6 Go), each with a clean fixture, one concrete objective, explicit acceptance criteria, visible tests, *hidden* deterministic tests that never exist in the workspace during a run, allowed/forbidden paths, and a per-task evaluator. 16 tasks form the development split; 8 were frozen as holdout. Every fixture was verified to fail its visible tests before the fix.

### A.4 Prompt variants

A generator renders 18 variants per task from frozen templates. Nine *primary* variants preserve the objective, acceptance criteria, and test command verbatim (validated automatically): a precise `baseline`; `verbose_repetition`; `deep_thinking`; `exhaustive_exploration`; `multiple_approaches`; `max_certainty`; `adjacent_cleanup`; `no_questions_autonomy`; `bounded_efficiency` (scope + smallest-sufficient-change + stop condition); plus `goal_only` and `scoped_authorization` for the harness axes. Seven *stress* variants intentionally break semantic equivalence (ambiguity, conflicting constraints, irrelevant context, misleading hints, multi-turn splitting and restatement) and are analyzed separately.

### A.5 Metrics

Behavioral: reasoning tokens (provider-reported, `completion_tokens_details.reasoning_tokens`), visible output tokens, tool calls by type, turns, files inspected, duplicate reads, repeated searches, repeated test runs, time to first edit, wall time, out-of-scope changes (git diff vs. allowed paths), and success on visible plus hidden tests. Billing: uncached and cached input tokens, logical input (= uncached + cached), actual cost at pinned catalog prices, and estimated no-cache cost. The primary outcome is the *paired reasoning ratio*: a run’s reasoning tokens divided by the median baseline reasoning of the same model–harness–task block. Task-clustered bootstrap yields 95% intervals. A variant is classified *wasteful* only when the median ratio exceeds 1.5 with CI lower bound above 1.1, no material success gain, and the effect appears on multiple tasks.

## A.6 Reasoning-trace availability and semantic annotation

A five-tier audit of run artifacts was completed before the semantic annotation protocol was specified. Full provider-exposed reasoning text is recorded for all seven open-weight models on both harnesses (PI.DEV turn events; Claude Code transcripts via the gateway’s translation of the provider `reasoning` field, verifiable against raw wire captures). **Claude Sonnet 5 has no recoverable reasoning text** — its thinking blocks are empty and reasoning is billed inside output accounting — so it is included in cost, success, turn, latency, and deterministic tool-level analyses, and *excluded* from all trace annotation; we neither estimate its reasoning units nor infer its reasoning structure from tool behavior. A frozen rubric (14 composition counts, 6 waste mechanisms, ordinal quality scores; hypotheses H-S1–H-S6) was committed before any annotation. A condition-blind judge (never shown variant text or names) with grammar-constrained JSON output and *mandatory evidence quotes* annotated 2,801 runs (98.9% valid; 91.1% of nonzero counts evidence-backed). Validation: researcher-blind hand labels agreed within  $\pm 1$  on 84.9% of fields; same-model prompt-sensitivity  $\kappa = 0.44$ ; cross-judge-model  $\kappa = 0.28$  overall but 0.55–0.68 on the hypothesis-critical fields (unused branches, alternatives, redundant verification). Judge-sensitive labels (task restatements, post-solution reasoning) are carried by deterministic proxies instead.

## A.7 Tool taxonomy and cost decomposition

A second frozen rubric fixes a deterministic tool taxonomy (navigation, search, read, edit, test, build, lint, git, environment, recovery), conservative redundancy rules (duplicate normalized commands with no intervening edit; re-reads of unchanged files; re-runs of already-green test scopes), and a completion proxy (last edit *and* first fully-green visible test) — hidden-evaluator mid-run satisfaction is not recoverable. Unit tests fix these rules. Blind, hand-derived labels on complete traces were then used to validate the extractor; this validation identified a TAP pass-detection error that was corrected before condition-aware analysis. Cost is decomposed into model cost (ledger), *direct tool cost* (none exists: every tool is local, so direct tool cost is zero; counts and wall-clock are reported separately), and *tool-induced model cost*: tool results re-entering context, bounded below and above because exact per-turn billing attribution is impossible. Count variables are zero-inflated and heavy-tailed (e.g. 94% of runs have zero post-green repeat tests, max 6); analyses use per-task paired medians with task-clustered bootstrap and sign-flip permutation tests; pooled correlations are not used as standalone evidence.

**Methodological consequences.** Preregistration and blinded validation changed the interpretation in three material cases: a screening signal failed on holdout, a replication threshold was triggered by a baseline-denominator shift that ratios alone obscured, and a hand-label validation pass identified an extraction error before condition-aware analysis. These checks also support treating the observed prompt effects as mechanism-specific rather than as a single uniform overhead.

## B Tasks and Exact Prompts

**Exact wording.** Because prompt wording is the manipulated variable, condition names alone are insufficient for reproduction: lexical form, ordering, length, and position may themselves affect model behavior. Table 4 therefore reproduces the exact frozen clause for every principal condition (byte-exact, SHA-256-verified against the run ledger by `paper/make_prompt_appendix.py`, with a regression test guarding staleness); Appendix C contains all 18 complete templates, the stress-family examples, the multi-turn sequences, and a full before-and-after rendering of one task.

Our findings apply to these tested formulations; post-registration analyses test semantic versus lexical generalization separately; the primary benchmark itself does not assume invariance across paraphrases.

## C Exact Prompt Templates and Experimental Manipulations

All wording below is reproduced byte-exactly from the frozen prompt files used in the experiments (task `py-low-01` as the fixed representative rendering; placeholders `{OBJECTIVE}`, `{ACCEPTANCE_CRITERIA}`, `{TEST_COMMAND}` vary per task and are instantiated identically across variants of the same task). SHA-256 hashes of every displayed prompt match the hashes recorded in the run ledger. `<TURN-BREAK>` marks the protocol’s fixed multi-turn boundary.

### C.1 Primary semantically controlled variants

**baseline** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: baseline; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 `e48b2d5b1f81` (ledger-verified). *Complete rendered prompt:*

```
Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply_discount(price, pct) must
return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount
itself.
Scope: shop/discount.py only
Acceptance criteria: apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under
tests/ passes
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v
Stop when the tests pass.
```

**verbose\_repetition** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H1; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 `1f96a9bf4320` (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

```
To restate the requirements so nothing is missed: the change must stay within
the
scope given above (shop/discount.py only), it must satisfy the same acceptance
criteria already
listed, and the verification command remains python3 -m unittest discover -s
tests -t . -v. In other words, do the
task exactly as described, within exactly the same boundaries, checked by
exactly
the same tests, and finish under exactly the same stop condition as stated
before.
```

*Complete rendered prompt:*

```
Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply_discount(price, pct) must
return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount
itself.
Scope: shop/discount.py only
Acceptance criteria: apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under
tests/ passes
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v
Stop when the tests pass.
```

| Condition               | Exact manipulated clause                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Intended manipulation                                                      |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| baseline                | <code>{OBJECTIVE} Scope: {SCOPE} Acceptance criteria: {ACCEPTANCE_CRITERIA} Verify with: {TEST_COMMAND} Stop when the tests pass.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | precise control (objective, scope, criteria, test command, stop condition) |
| multiple_approaches     | <code>Develop several distinct approaches to this fix, compare their trade-offs explicitly, and only then select and implement the best one.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | require explicit comparison among multiple candidate approaches            |
| deep_thinking           | <code>Think very deeply about this. Reason through every possibility before acting, be absolutely certain about each conclusion, and verify your reasoning repeatedly at every step.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | demand deep, repeatedly verified reasoning                                 |
| exhaustive_exploration  | <code>Before editing anything, inspect the entire repository and make sure you understand the complete system: read every source file and understand how all the parts connect, so your change is informed by the whole codebase.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | demand whole-repository understanding first                                |
| max_certainty           | <code>You must be absolutely confident in the result. Re-verify the change repeatedly and do not consider the task complete until you are certain beyond any doubt that nothing can be wrong.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | demand certainty beyond doubt / re-verification                            |
| adjacent_cleanup        | <code>While you are in there, feel free to clean up anything adjacent that could be improved: refactor awkward code, tidy naming, and make related general improvements where you see the opportunity.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | authorize scope expansion                                                  |
| no_questions_autonomy   | <code>Do not ask me any questions. Infer any missing details yourself and do whatever is necessary to complete the task autonomously.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | prohibit questions and require autonomous inference                        |
| bounded_efficiency      | <code>Work efficiently: begin with the failing test and the most likely implementation files; inspect additional files only when evidence requires it; avoid unrelated cleanup; make the smallest sufficient change; run the relevant tests; stop as soon as the acceptance criteria pass.</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                   | explicit scope + smallest change + stop rule                               |
| verbose_repetition      | <code>To restate the requirements so nothing is missed: the change must stay within the scope given above (shop/discount.py only), it must satisfy the same acceptance criteria already listed, and the verification command remains <code>python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v</code>. In other words, do the task exactly as described, within exactly the same boundaries, checked by exactly the same tests, and finish under exactly the same stop condition as stated before.</code> | restate identical requirements (length control)                            |
| goal_only               | <code>(baseline reduced to {OBJECTIVE} only; scope, criteria, test command, stop condition removed)</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | retain the objective only                                                  |
| scoped_authorization    | <code>You are authorized to modify only: shop/discount.py only You are NOT authorized to modify anything else; treat all other paths as read-only. [replaces:] Scope: shop/discount.py only</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | recast scope as explicit authorization                                     |
| misleading_architecture | <code>Note: we believe the problem is caused by the test fixtures in tests/ --- start there. [replaces:] Scope: shop/discount.py only</code>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | provide an incorrect architectural hint (stress)                           |

Table 4: Principal prompt conditions with the exact frozen wording (byte-exact; SHA-256-verified against the run ledger). Exact manipulated clause shown; complete rendered templates appear in Appendix C. Placeholders are instantiated per task, identically across variants of the same task.

To restate the requirements so nothing is missed: the change must stay within the scope given above (shop/discount.py only), it must satisfy the same acceptance criteria already listed, and the verification command remains `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`. In other words, do the task exactly as described, within exactly the same boundaries, checked by exactly the same tests, and finish under exactly the same stop condition as stated before.

**deep\_thinking** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H2; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 d8be42655ded (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Think very deeply about this. Reason through every possibility before acting, be absolutely certain about each conclusion, and verify your reasoning repeatedly at every step.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Think very deeply about this. Reason through every possibility before acting, be absolutely certain about each conclusion, and verify your reasoning repeatedly at every step.

**exhaustive\_exploration** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H2; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 7fa4f53c909e (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Before editing anything, inspect the entire repository and make sure you understand the complete system: read every source file and understand how all the parts connect, so your change is informed by the whole codebase.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under tests/ passes

Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Before editing anything, inspect the entire repository and make sure you understand  
the complete system: read every source file and understand how all the parts connect, so your change is informed by the whole codebase.

**multiple\_approaches** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H3; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 820999071ae6 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Develop several distinct approaches to this fix, compare their trade-offs explicitly, and only then select and implement the best one.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in `shop/discount.py`: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/` passes  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Develop several distinct approaches to this fix, compare their trade-offs explicitly, and only then select and implement the best one.

**max\_certainty** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H4; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 1b35cdaf8727 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

You must be absolutely confident in the result. Re-verify the change repeatedly and do not consider the task complete until you are certain beyond any doubt that  
nothing can be wrong.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in `shop/discount.py`: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/` passes  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
You must be absolutely confident in the result. Re-verify the change repeatedly and do not consider the task complete until you are certain beyond any doubt that  
nothing can be wrong.

**adjacent\_cleanup** Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H5; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 58ddddcc1d43 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

While you are in there, feel free to clean up anything adjacent that could be improved: refactor awkward code, tidy naming, and make related general improvements where you see the opportunity.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/` passes  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
While you are in there, feel free to clean up anything adjacent that could be improved: refactor awkward code, tidy naming, and make related general improvements where you see the opportunity.

`no_questions_autonomy` Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H5; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 95bb97b2dc91 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Do not ask me any questions. Infer any missing details yourself and do whatever is necessary to complete the task autonomously.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/` passes  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Do not ask me any questions. Infer any missing details yourself and do whatever is necessary to complete the task autonomously.

`bounded_efficiency` Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H6; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 56954fa9ae17 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Work efficiently: begin with the failing test and the most likely implementation files; inspect additional files only when evidence requires it; avoid unrelated cleanup; make the smallest sufficient change; run the relevant tests; stop as soon as the acceptance criteria pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.

Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Work efficiently: begin with the failing test and the most likely implementation files; inspect additional files only when evidence requires it; avoid unrelated cleanup; make the smallest sufficient change; run the relevant tests; stop as soon as the acceptance criteria pass.

## C.2 Harness-axis variants

*goal\_only* Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H12; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 9e72e502257b (ledger-verified). *Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.

*scoped\_authorization* Family: semantically controlled; hypothesis: H13; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 362380e7ee68 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

You are authorized to modify only: shop/discount.py only  
You are NOT authorized to modify anything else; treat all other paths as read-only.

*Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Scope: shop/discount.py only

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
You are authorized to modify only: shop/discount.py only  
You are NOT authorized to modify anything else; treat all other paths as read-only.  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

### C.3 Stress variants (intentionally break semantic equivalence; analyzed separately)

**misleading\_architecture** Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 f01a269082e3 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Note: we believe the problem is caused by the test fixtures in tests/ --- start there.

*Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Stop when the tests pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Note: we believe the problem is caused by the test fixtures in tests/ --- start there.  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v

**ambiguous\_scope** Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: no (by design); SHA-256 37d1142ad44f (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: prompt start):*

Something in this project is producing wrong results related to the following area: price and discount calculations. Improve the situation.

*Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Something in this project is producing wrong results related to the following area: price and discount calculations. Improve the situation.

**conflicting\_constraints** Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 3a8fab0b657 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: after the baseline task block):*

Be extremely thorough and examine everything carefully, but also finish as fast as possible and touch almost nothing. Do a complete, deep job quickly and minimally.

*Baseline text removed/replaced:*

```
Scope: shop/discount.py only
Acceptance criteria: apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under
tests/ passes
Stop when the tests pass.
```

*Complete rendered prompt:*

```
Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply_discount(price, pct) must
return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount
itself.
Be extremely thorough and examine everything carefully, but also finish as fast
as
possible and touch almost nothing. Do a complete, deep job quickly and minimally.
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v
```

*irrelevant\_context* Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 dbdf31b964ba (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: prompt start):*

```
Background (for context): our organization has recently migrated from a
monorepo
to a polyrepo layout, then partially back, and several teams maintain conflicting
style guides; the previous maintainer preferred functional patterns but the
current
team is split, and there is an ongoing debate about whether to adopt a plugin
architecture in Q3, which the architecture council has deferred twice pending a
review of the service mesh proposal that may or may not affect this component.
None of that debate is resolved. Meanwhile, the actual request:
```

*Complete rendered prompt:*

```
Background (for context): our organization has recently migrated from a
monorepo
to a polyrepo layout, then partially back, and several teams maintain conflicting
style guides; the previous maintainer preferred functional patterns but the
current
team is split, and there is an ongoing debate about whether to adopt a plugin
architecture in Q3, which the architecture council has deferred twice pending a
review of the service mesh proposal that may or may not affect this component.
None of that debate is resolved. Meanwhile, the actual request:
Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply_discount(price, pct) must
return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount
itself.
Scope: shop/discount.py only
Acceptance criteria: apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under
tests/ passes
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v
Stop when the tests pass.
```

*missing\_criteria* Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: no; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 9e72e502257b (frozen template; no executed run of this variant on this task – rendered for documentation). *Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.

split\_across\_turns Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: yes; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: no (by design); SHA-256 828663820120 (ledger-verified).

*Text added relative to baseline (placement: prompt start):*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the  
<TURN-BREAK>  
Also: price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself. Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes. Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v. Stop when the tests pass.

*Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the  
<TURN-BREAK>  
Also: price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself. Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes. Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v. Stop when the tests pass.

full\_restatement\_per\_turn Family: stress; hypothesis: stress family; multi-turn: yes; objective/criteria/test preserved verbatim: yes; SHA-256 53f74e6609c7 (ledger-verified). *Text added relative to baseline (placement: prompt start):*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself. Scope: shop/discount.py only Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v Stop when the tests pass.  
<TURN-BREAK>

Reminder of the full task, restated completely: Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself. Scope: shop/discount.py only Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v Stop when the tests pass. Is it done? If not, continue.

*Baseline text removed/replaced:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

*Complete rendered prompt:*

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself. Scope: shop/discount.py only Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v Stop when the tests pass.  
<TURN-BREAK>  
Reminder of the full task, restated completely: Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself. Scope: shop/discount.py only Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v Stop when the tests pass. Is it done? If not, continue.

## C.4 Complete before-and-after example (py-low-01)

Text in **bold** differs from the baseline rendering; everything else is byte-identical.

baseline

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under tests/ passes  
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v  
Stop when the tests pass.

multiple\_approaches

Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply\_discount(price, pct) must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: shop/discount.py only  
Acceptance criteria: apply\_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under

tests/ passes  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Develop several distinct approaches to this fix, compare their trade-offs explicitly, and only then select and implement the best one.

### deep\_thinking

Fix the discount bug in `shop/discount.py`: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/ passes`  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Think very deeply about this. Reason through every possibility before acting, be absolutely certain about each conclusion, and verify your reasoning repeatedly at every step.

### max\_certainty

Fix the discount bug in `shop/discount.py`: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/ passes`  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
You must be absolutely confident in the result. Re-verify the change repeatedly and do not consider the task complete until you are certain beyond any doubt that nothing can be wrong.

### bounded\_efficiency

Fix the discount bug in `shop/discount.py`: `apply_discount(price, pct)` must return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount itself.  
Scope: `shop/discount.py` only  
Acceptance criteria: `apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0` and every test under `tests/ passes`  
Verify with: `python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v`  
Stop when the tests pass.  
Work efficiently: begin with the failing test and the most likely implementation files; inspect additional files only when evidence requires it; avoid unrelated cleanup; make the smallest sufficient change; run the relevant tests; stop as soon as the acceptance criteria pass.

`misleading_architecture`

```
Fix the discount bug in shop/discount.py: apply_discount(price, pct) must
return the price AFTER applying a pct-percent discount, not the discount amount
itself.
```

```
Note: we believe the problem is caused by the test fixtures in tests/ ---
start there.
```

```
Acceptance criteria: apply_discount(100, 20) == 80.0 and every test under
tests/ passes
```

```
Verify with: python3 -m unittest discover -s tests -t . -v
```

## D Harnesses, Gateway, Telemetry, and Billing Reconciliation

**Fixed prefix.** For a trivial prompt, PI.DEV transmits 1,147–1,642 tokens of prefix (system prompt plus 4 tool schemas), depending only on tokenizer; Claude Code transmits 15,983–20,330 tokens ( $\approx 6.7$  KB system prompt plus 24 tool schemas) — **12–15 $\times$  larger on every tokenizer**. The user prompt is under 5% of logical input under PI.DEV and under 1% under Claude Code. In this setup, prompt length has negligible direct cost while prompt content can materially change downstream work.

**Gateway compatibility.** Three gateway routes were attempted. A Responses-API route passed only 3/6 models: GLM-5.2, DeepSeek-V4-Pro, and Inkling returned *empty continuations* after tool results when reasoning items were not replayed — a protocol-translation failure indistinguishable from model failure without wire capture. A chat-completions route with default settings passed 0/6: the gateway silently dropped all 24 tool schemas because function-calling support was not declared per model. The final route (function calling declared, parameter dropping disabled) passed 6/6 on a 14-capability suite including multi-step tool loops. Gateway compatibility was therefore defined by successful multi-step tool execution rather than by generation of a text response alone.

**Metadata loss (H16).** Upstream, all models report explicit reasoning-token and cached-token fields. The gateway preserves input/output totals exactly but *drops* reasoning detail and re-derives cache fields; the Claude Code-side cost report uses the harness’s own price table for aliased models and was measured at  $3.5\times$  the true cost. All analysis therefore uses the provider-side capture.

**Provider-side classifiers and the harness cost gap.** The available evidence does not support provider-side classifiers as an explanation for the measured billing gap. First, the  $5\text{--}30\times$  cost-per-success gap was measured primarily with Claude Code driving Together-hosted open models through our protocol-translation gateway; those requests never used Anthropic’s model-serving path, so Anthropic-side components such as a prompt-injection classifier or a permission (Auto Mode) classifier could not have produced that gap. The gap is already accounted for by directly measured harness mechanics — the 15,983–20,330-token fixed prefix ( $\approx 12\text{--}15\times$  PI.DEV’s, comprising the  $\approx 6.7$  KB system prompt and 24 tool schemas),  $\approx 2\text{--}7\times$  more turns on matched runs, and a verification-heavy tool composition ( $\approx 52\%$  of Claude Code calls are test executions) — with dual-side wire capture recording the transmitted requests and tool loops, so the attribution does not rest on any assumed hidden mechanism. Second, for the 54 native Claude Code runs against Claude Sonnet 5 on the first-party API, recorded total cost reconciles from the visible usage categories alone (uncached input, cache reads, cache writes, output at the standard price table): the median discrepancy is zero and 53/54 runs reconcile within 1% (`results/summaries/cc.native.billing.reconciliation.csv`).

| Model            | mult._approaches | deep_thinking | adj._cleanup  | max_certainty | exh._explor. | bounded_eff.  |
|------------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| DeepSeek-V4-Pro  | <b>2.92 W</b>    | <b>2.12 W</b> | —             | <b>1.85 W</b> | —            | 0.97 N        |
| Kimi-K2.6        | <b>7.40 W</b>    | <b>2.21 W</b> | —             | —             | 1.29 w       | 1.06 N        |
| Kimi-K2.7-Code   | <b>5.98 W</b>    | <b>1.86 W</b> | —             | —             | —            | 0.98 N        |
| Nemotron-3-Ultra | <b>2.44 W</b>    | <b>1.57 W</b> | —             | 1.48 w        | —            | 1.16 N        |
| Inkling          | <b>5.08 W</b>    | —             | <b>3.13 W</b> | —             | 1.39 n       | 1.04 N        |
| GLM-5.2          | <b>6.18 W</b>    | <b>2.18 W</b> | <b>4.25 W</b> | —             | —            | <b>0.48 N</b> |

Table 5: Holdout confirmation: median reasoning ratio vs. own baseline on 8 unseen tasks. **W** = confirmed wasteful (ratio > 1.5, CI lower bound > 1.1, no success gain); w = replicated weaker; n = not replicated; N = confirmed neutral. “—” = not among that model’s selected features.

The initially apparent residuals were pricing-reconciliation artifacts, not hidden charges: a uniform 33.3% offset arose from comparing standard against introductory pricing, and the remaining per-run differences solve to implied cache-write rates whose median and 90th percentile equal the documented five-minute write premium ( $1.25\times$  the input rate), with a small upper tail consistent with one-hour-TTL writes ( $2\times$  the input rate) mixed within a run. The residual tracks *cache-write token volume*; a per-request classifier surcharge would instead scale with request count, turns, or classified input volume. No separately billed classifier cost was detectable in these runs — which is a claim about billing, not about provider-side compute: classifiers may well run and consume resources on Anthropic’s side. Part of Claude Code’s large system prompt likely implements safety, permission, and prompt-injection scaffolding; any token cost of that scaffolding is already included in the measured static-prefix overhead rather than constituting an additional hidden charge. Thus, the measured harness billing gap is accounted for by prefix size, turn count, and verification-heavy tool composition. No separately billed classifier cost is detectable on either serving path, although classifier latency and provider-side compute remain unmeasured.

## E Complete Primary Results

### E.1 Holdout-confirmed prompt effects

Per model, the three most waste-inducing variants were selected on development data only, frozen, and re-run on the 8 unseen holdout tasks (5 repetitions,  $n=40$  per cell, PI.DEV). Table 5 reports median paired reasoning ratios.

Four findings survive the frozen holdout. **(1)** The `multiple_approaches` instruction is confirmed wasteful on *all six* models ( $2.4\text{--}7.4\times$ ) — notably, it was absent from the pilot and surfaced only in screening, illustrating the value of the wider matrix. **(2)** `deep_thinking` is confirmed on every model where selected ( $1.6\text{--}2.2\times$ ), its third consecutive replication (pilot, screening, holdout) across three collection days; it roughly doubles wall time with identical tool behavior. **(3)** `adjacent_cleanup` is confirmed on Inkling and GLM-5.2 and, together with autonomy language, is one of only two features that produce out-of-scope edits (5–8% of their runs;  $\approx 0\%$  elsewhere). **(4)** `bounded_efficiency` is confirmed neutral-or-better on all six models and *halves* GLM-5.2’s reasoning ( $0.48\times$ ) at equal success. One selected feature failed to replicate: the autonomy phrase showed no reasoning effect on holdout ( $1.00\times$ ); its real, replicated effect is scope violations. Verbose repetition of requirements was  $\approx 1.0\times$  everywhere: verbatim repetition has no material cost effect because its added tokens are small relative to the fixed prefix.

## E.2 Stress family: input defects

Against same-task screening baselines (median across models): *misleading architectural hints* are the costliest defect tested ( $2.61\times$  reasoning, reflecting additional deliberation around the incorrect hint); *ambiguous scope* produces the lowest success rate in the benchmark (83%) plus  $1.44\times$  reasoning; splitting one task across two turns costs  $\approx 1.31\times$  and restating the full task each turn  $\approx 1.38\times$ ; *irrelevant context* ( $1.03\times$ ) and *conflicting constraints* ( $1.05\times$ ) have negligible cost effects, whereas plausible misdirection induces substantially more reasoning.

## E.3 Harness comparison

On matched model-task-prompt cells, both harnesses solved the pilot tasks at  $\approx 100\%$ , but Claude Code cost **5–30 $\times$  more per success** (e.g., Nemotron:  $\approx 18\times$  PI.DEV’s cost per success), driven multiplicatively by the  $12\text{--}15\times$  prefix and  $2\text{--}7\times$  more turns (10–41 vs. 5–7). Harness-model interaction is strong: Kimi-K2.7-Code stays at  $\sim 10$  turns under Claude Code while GLM-5.2, Kimi-K2.6, and Nemotron approach the turn ceiling on tasks they solve in  $\leq 7$  turns under PI.DEV. Prompt effects do not transfer across harnesses (H12): goal-only prompts *reduce* reasoning under Claude Code (whose system prompt supplies methodology) on 4/5 models, and exploration cues amplify  $4\text{--}4.8\times$  under Claude Code vs.  $1.1\text{--}2.4\times$  under PI.DEV on matched cells.

## E.4 Cache behavior

Provider-side prefix caching is automatic and carries no separate population charge in this serving configuration; it reduces approximately 61% of the would-be bill (billed cost  $\approx 39\%$  of the no-cache actual) while leaving behavioral metrics unchanged. This separation shows that billing reductions from caching should not be interpreted as behavioral efficiency gains. Hits are probabilistic (full/partial/none alternate under identical conditions), the cache is shared across sessions (fresh Claude Code sessions routinely receive first-turn hits of  $\sim 90\%$  of the 16–20k prefix), 60-second delays showed no eviction, changing the working directory breaks reuse (the harness embeds it in the system prompt), and one model-route pair (Nemotron via PI.DEV) received *zero* cached tokens across every phase — a provider-side anomaly that persisted for three days and would silently distort any cost-based comparison that ignored it.

# F Complete Semantic-Mechanism Results

For the seven models with recoverable traces, 2,801 runs were annotated under the frozen rubric (paired vs. baseline; medians across the six screening models [min,max]). Claude Sonnet 5 is excluded throughout this section.

**Multiple-approach prompts produce discarded branches (H-S1, holdout-replicated).** `multiple_approaches` adds **+3.5 approaches considered** [ $+3, +4$ ] of which **+3.0 become unused branches** [ $+2, +3$ ]; implemented approaches rise by exactly  $+1.0$  on every model — from 0 (a lone solution is not an “alternative”) to 1 (the selected branch). No second implemented alternative is observed. Frozen-holdout deltas are identical ( $+3.5/ +3.0/ +1.0$ ).

**Deep thinking: more text per observable unit (H-S2, refined).** Under `deep_thinking` the judge finds *no* new functional units — hypotheses, evidence, verification, grounding all  $+0.0$  (evidence collection  $+0.5$  at most) — while recorded reasoning volume rises  $2.2\times$  and intra-text

redundancy rises on 6/6 models (compression-ratio +0.05). Deep-thinking cues therefore produce *more text per observable reasoning unit under our frozen rubric*, not more observable units and not better grounding. This does not establish that no additional latent computation occurred (§Visible reasoning).

**Certainty pressure increases redundant verification (H-S3).** `max_certainty` adds +1.0 redundant re-verification of already-established facts on 6/6 models, +1.25 testing-verification units, and post-completion activity (§Cost carriers).

**Misleading hints increase ungrounded hypotheses (H-S4).** `misleading_architecture` adds +1.0 unsupported assumptions and +1.0 stated hypotheses while *grounded* hypotheses stay at +0.0, with  $4.2\times$  pre-first-edit deliberation (deterministic). Unsupported assumptions are also the one semantic marker negatively associated with success ( $\rho = -0.19$ ).

**Bounded efficiency preserves measured diagnostic work (H-S5).** Error diagnosis +0.0, final validation +0.0, unused branches +0.0: the efficiency template declines to add waste without suppressing diagnosis or validation.

**Harnesses change what reasoning is about (H-S6).** At baseline, Claude Code shifts composition toward planning (0.16 vs. 0.11 share), error recovery (0.09 vs. 0.00 — much of it harness-environment friction), and self-correction; PI.DEV spends relatively more on evidence collection (0.14 vs. 0.08) and implementation reasoning.

**Correlations.** Unused branches track reasoning tokens ( $\rho = 0.54$ ); redundant verification tracks turns ( $\rho = 0.58$ ) and tool calls ( $\rho = 0.52$ ); every waste mechanism correlates  $\approx 0$  with success ( $-0.09$  to  $+0.11$ ). Deterministic reconstruction and judge annotation are reported separately throughout; fields with weak cross-judge agreement (task restatements, post-solution reasoning) rest on deterministic proxies only.

**Visible reasoning is not the full computation.** [8] show that consequential model computation can occur without a semantically interpretable chain-of-thought trace: filler or non-explanatory tokens can alter performance, dependent on model, task, token identity, order, and context. This external result refines, not invalidates, our claims: we distinguish observable semantic reasoning units, provider-exposed reasoning text, latent computation, and downstream agent behavior — and all semantic findings here concern the first two. Prompt formulation can affect both observable agent behavior and computation that may not be faithfully exposed in a readable trace; this study characterizes the former in controlled coding-agent executions and claims no access to the latter. Nothing in [8] demonstrates hidden reasoning inside our benchmark; it establishes why complete-process readings of visible traces would be unjustified.

## G Complete Tool-Cost Results

All 4,644 valid runs (including Claude Sonnet 5) enter this deterministic layer; the frozen tool rubric fixes the taxonomy, conservative redundancy rules, and the completion proxy (last edit and first fully-green visible test).

**The two dominant mechanisms have different cost carriers.** Joining judge-annotated mechanism levels to deterministic telemetry (Fig. 1; success is flat across all levels, 0.86–0.97):

Unused branches and redundant verification show different cost profiles. Runs with one discarded branch have approximately  $1.9\times$  the median cost of clean runs ( $n = 1,934$  clean vs. 354 one-branch runs), while median tool calls change only from 7 to 8 and success remains similar. The cost association plateaus at higher branch counts. By contrast, increasing redundant-verification levels are accompanied by higher tool-call counts, latency, and cost. These results support classifying branch-related overhead as primarily token-borne and verification overhead as primarily tool-borne.

**Prompt-level tool effects (paired; median across 6 models; sign-flip permutation  $p$ ).** `max_certainty` adds +1.75 post-success calls [+1.0, +2.5] (sign-consistent 6/6), +1 test execution, and +4s latency; the most extreme observed loop is Kimi-K2.6 re-running an already-green suite six times. `deep_thinking` leaves the tool layer effectively unchanged (calls +1.0,  $p = .26$ ); its significant cost increase ( $p = .03$ ) is token-borne. `multiple_approaches` shows code edits +0.0 on 6/6 models and near-zero abandoned-exploration deltas: candidate approaches are elaborated primarily in reasoning rather than explored through repository operations; its tool-call delta (+1.5,  $p \approx .06$ ) is directional only. `misleading_architecture` is likewise directional at the tool layer (+1.75 calls, +0.5 failed calls); its robust effect is reasoning-borne (§H-S4). `bounded_efficiency` shows **no detectable tool-layer effect**: every redundancy metric +0.00 [0, 0] ( $p = 1.0$ ) with tests, edits, and diagnosis unchanged — it does not suppress useful work; its value is avoiding the other mechanisms.

**Tool-induced model cost.** Tools with no monetary price still create inference cost: results re-enter context, add input tokens, affect cache accounting, and induce further turns. Across the benchmark this accounts for an estimated **4–12% of run cost** — a bounded estimate (exact per-turn attribution is impossible because a turn’s input mixes tool results, assistant output, and harness scaffolding). No benchmark tool had a direct monetary charge; model cost, latency, and call counts are therefore reported as separate dimensions.

**Harness tool composition (H-T6).** Half of Claude Code’s tool calls are test executions (52%) vs. 22% under PI.DEV, which is inspection-dominated (40% reads vs. 21%) — Fig. 2. Claude Sonnet 5 makes  $\approx 2.6\times$  fewer calls than the open models under Claude Code with a higher edit share; this is a tool-level observation only, not a reasoning-level interpretation. Extreme failed-call runs (77–79 failures) are Claude Code+GLM permission-friction loops occurring across different variants: harness-caused, not prompt-caused.

## H Annotated Reasoning Examples

## I Annotated Reasoning-Trace Examples

Each example below is a verbatim excerpt from a recorded reasoning trace in the corpus. Examples were located from the condition-blind judge’s required evidence quote and re-verified against the raw trace. Minimal surrounding context is shown together with the model, task, and condition identifiers. The examples illustrate the mechanism definitions used in Section 4.

**Unused solution branches** H-S1: branches elaborated then discarded; only one is implemented. Run: DeepSeek-V4-Pro, task go-high-01, condition multiple\_approaches, turn 3. *Judge evidence quote (verbatim from the recorded trace):*

sync.Map is a bit awkward for counters. Let me reconsider.

*Surrounding trace context:*

```
.counts.LoadOrStore(key, new(int)) p := v.(*int) atomic.AddInt32(p, 1) // types don't match...
} ''' Actually sync.Map is a bit awkward for counters. Let me reconsider. **Trade-offs:** -
[U+274C] 'sync.Map' doesn't have a simple atomic increment - [U+274C] Need CAS loop or store
pointers - [U+274C] Complex, error-prone - [U+274C] 'Get' returns 'interface{}' - [U+274C] Not a
good fi...
```

**Redundant verification** H-S3: re-establishing an already-settled fact with no new evidence. Run: GLM-5.2, task py-low-02, condition max\_certainty, turn 4. *Judge evidence quote (verbatim from the recorded trace):*

Tests pass. Let me verify all acceptance criteria explicitly and re-read the file to confirm.

*Surrounding trace context:*

Tests pass. Let me verify all acceptance criteria explicitly and re-read the file to confirm....

**Post-solution reasoning** H-S3: deliberation after the last edit and a fully-green test. Run: GLM-5.2, task py-med-02, condition max\_certainty, turn 6. *Judge evidence quote (verbatim from the recorded trace):*

All 3 tests pass. Now let me thoroughly verify all the acceptance criteria mentioned in the task, beyond just the existing tests, to be "absolutely confident".

*Surrounding trace context:*

All 3 tests pass. Now let me thoroughly verify all the acceptance criteria mentioned in the task, beyond just the existing tests, to be "absolutely confident". Acceptance criteria from the task:  
1. 'parse\_value('true')' is True 2. 'parse\_v...

**Unsupported assumptions** H-S4: claims never grounded in inspected code (induced by a wrong hint). Run: Kimi-K2.6, task py-med-01, condition misleading\_architecture, turn 0. *Judge evidence quote (verbatim from the recorded trace):*

Problem believed to be caused by rounding helpers in cart/pricing.py.

*Surrounding trace context:*

mount must be deducted from subtotal BEFORE tax is applied. The docstring says that. Current code deducts it after tax. Problem believed to be caused by rounding helpers in cart/pricing.py. We need to inspect files, understand current code, then fix. We'll read the files: cart/checkout.py, cart/pricing.py, and tests. We need to verify tests: total(100,10) ...

**Task restatement / elaboration** H-S2 context: repetition inside deep-thinking traces (judge-weak field; shown for illustration, quantified via deterministic proxies). Run: Kimi-K2.6, task js-low-03, condition deep\_thinking, turn 11. *Judge evidence quote (verbatim from the recorded trace):*

The user wants me to stop when the tests pass. Let me wait for the test output.

*Surrounding trace context:*

The user wants me to stop when the tests pass. Let me wait for the test output....

## J Post-Registration Replication: Kimi-K3

Following Kimi-K3 availability on the provider (2.8T-parameter MoE per its announcement; 1M context; unit prices 2.5–3.3× the K2 generation), we froze a replication protocol — six pilot tasks, four variants (`baseline`, `multiple_approaches`, `deep_thinking`, `bounded_efficiency`), 72 PI.DEV runs plus a 24-run Claude Code directional arm, and material-difference thresholds (reasoning ratio differing >30% from *both* Kimi-K2 comparators, classification flips, >5pp scope-compliant-success change) — before viewing any result.

The PI.DEV arm completed 72/72 at 100% success (the model’s cache rebate was 81%). The preregistered material-difference threshold was crossed because Kimi-K3’s baseline deliberation floor is  $\sim 6\times$  lower (median 55 reasoning tokens vs. 351/195), so `multiple_approaches` reaches  $16.6\times$  [10.7, 34.1] and `deep_thinking`  $14.8\times$  [4.1, 33.9] against its own baseline — yet *absolute* waste tokens remain at or below K2-generation levels (625 vs. 1,606 median under `multiple_approaches`) and cost per compliant success is the lowest of the three generations at baseline despite 2.5–3.3× unit prices. `bounded_efficiency` confirmed neutral ( $0.89\times$ , CI entirely below 1). Every effect direction and classification was preserved; no new compatibility, metadata, or cache behavior appeared. Thus, the large relative ratios for Kimi-K3 arise from a substantially lower baseline deliberation floor: the tested prompt cues increase deliberation by approximately  $15\times$  despite lower absolute reasoning-token counts than in the K2-generation comparators.

## K Post-Registration Cross-Provider Study: Claude Sonnet 5

The main benchmark ran open-weight models on one provider, with Claude Code reaching them through a translation gateway. To test whether the effects are artifacts of that stack, we reversed it: both harnesses against the *first-party Anthropic API* (`claude-sonnet-5`), with Claude Code in its native environment — no gateway, no aliasing, its own prompt-caching path. The protocol (9 variants, the 6 pilot tasks, 2 repetitions; 108 PI.DEV runs plus a 54-run native-Claude Code arm) was frozen before any result existed. All 162 runs were valid (cache rebate 69–75% of the no-cache bill).

**Measurement constraint (preregistered).** The Anthropic API bills thinking inside `output.tokens` and never reports it separately — the `included_in_output_but_not_separable` category of our schema taxonomy. The frozen primary metric is therefore the paired *total-output-token* ratio versus the model’s own baseline, which is defined identically on the open-model side (the provider’s `completion.tokens` also includes reasoning tokens). Because response tokens dilute the denominator, these ratios are lower bounds on the deliberation-level effect.

**Results.** The main effects transfer. `multiple_approaches` is again the largest consistent effect on both harnesses ( $2.70\times$  [2.14, 3.86] under PI.DEV,  $2.52\times$  [1.73, 3.48] under native Claude Code) — inside the open-model range ( $2.1\text{--}4.0\times$ ) on the same tasks and metric. The neutral set replicates exactly: verbose repetition  $\approx 1\times$ , autonomy language  $\approx 1\times$ , bounded-efficiency framing near baseline ( $0.93\text{--}1.02\times$ ). The harness economics persist on the frontier stack: native-Claude Code baseline cost per compliant success is  $\sim 15\times$  PI.DEV’s (no-cache, no-cache). Two divergences are notable. First, `max_certainty` — concentrated primarily in DeepSeek among the open models ( $1.85\times$ ) — produces the largest family-level effect measured on Sonnet 5 under native Claude Code:  $4.13\times$  output tokens [1.42, 8.57] and  $2.7\times$  no-cache cost per success; certainty pressure induces re-verification loops, and an agentic harness gives them room to run. Second, `deep_thinking` — holdout-confirmed wasteful

on 5/5 open models — is the mildest elevated effect here ( $1.25\text{--}1.30\times$ , below every open model under PI.DEV), consistent with the model’s adaptive-thinking controller absorbing explicit deep-thinking instructions that fixed-effort open reasoners respond to more strongly. Scope compliance was 162/162, including `adjacent_cleanup`, which widens diffs on open models. The provider’s cache reduced billing by 69–75% relative to the no-cache counterfactual (vs. approximately 61% in the main benchmark) while behavioral metrics remained unchanged; the billing reduction is therefore not a behavioral efficiency effect.

## L Post-Registration Robustness: Paraphrases and Repetition

A separately preregistered expansion tested whether the main effects depend on exact lexical form and whether paired effects are stable across repeated runs. The completed analyses contain 2,105 valid runs of 2,106 attempted: three models  $\times$  six tasks  $\times$  25 prompt arms  $\times$  three repetitions for paraphrase tests, and two models  $\times$  16 tasks  $\times$  nine variants  $\times$  three repetitions for stability tests.

**Paraphrase generalization.** All four paraphrase forms of `multiple_approaches`, `deep_thinking`, and `max_certainty` increase reasoning on every tested model (12/12 condition–model cells at 4/4 forms), whereas length-matched controls remain at  $0.96\text{--}1.05\times$ . All five `bounded_efficiency` formulations are at or below baseline ( $0.85\text{--}0.93\times$ ). These results indicate that the principal effects generalize across paraphrases rather than depending on a single token sequence. Lexical form nevertheless changes magnitude: within `multiple_approaches`, the pooled effect ranges from  $3.0\times$  for the concise form to  $6.7\times$  for the verbose form, and instruction position produces smaller shifts (for example,  $5.2\times$  at the start versus  $4.3\times$  at the end).

**Repetition stability.** Within-cell no-cache cost coefficients of variation are 12–23% across five-repetition cells, and success is unanimous in 81–97% of cells. The direction of the paired effect does not reverse across repetitions for any confirmed waste-inducing variant in this analysis. Nonzero reversal rates (0.33) occur only for `verbose_repetition` and `no_questions_autonomy`, the two variants classified as neutral in the primary study. These expansion runs are analyzed separately from the original preregistered benchmark.

## M Adaptive-Compute Campaign (Effort and Evidence-Triggered Escalation)

A separate preregistered campaign tested whether additional test-time compute is useful when triggered by observable evidence of difficulty rather than requested in advance. Claude Sonnet 5 and Claude Opus 5 were evaluated on eight new tasks spanning deceptive, architecture-dependent, recovery, long-validation, and ambiguous specifications. The arms included baseline, bounded efficiency, upfront branching, adaptive branching, static maximum effort, harness-mediated adaptive effort, and hierarchical escalation. Fixtures were validated to fail before the target fix, and the deceptive cases were checked to defeat the intended incorrect default fixes. Manipulation checks confirmed that the harness effort control changed Sonnet 5 output volume (154 to 1,225 output tokens from off to xhigh on a fixed probe); Opus 5’s thinking-disabled mode increased visible output and was therefore excluded.

All 320 stage-1 runs were valid. At low effort, both models solved all eight tasks, leaving no baseline failures on which an adaptive policy could improve. Static maximum effort increased cost

per success by 1.5–2.8 $\times$ , gained no successes, and lost one. Evidence-triggered escalation rarely activated because phase-one visible tests usually passed; under the preregistered gate (requiring baseline success below 90% for a task family), no family qualified for the branching arms. Two findings remain informative. First, bounded-efficiency wording caused the only Sonnet failures, all on the ambiguous-specification task: visible tests passed but hidden tests failed, and the relevant requirements file was not inspected. Second, this task set did not provide the baseline-failure regime required to evaluate adaptive compute. A related capability check found that the effort control did not reliably modulate computation for the seven Together-served open-weight models: repeated probes were flat or inverted within substantial variance, unlike the first-party API. Consequently, effort-control results from that serving path are not treated as a controlled experimental axis.

## N SWE-Effort Campaign (Hard Repository-Scale Tasks)

This is a **separate post-registration effort-control campaign**, not an extension of the 4,644-run controlled prompt benchmark and not a replication of its prompt-effect or between-harness ratios. It asks a complementary question: when tasks are genuinely difficult, does explicitly allocating more inference effort improve the cost–success frontier? To evaluate explicit effort controls in a regime with nontrivial baseline failure, we conducted two preregistered campaigns on a frozen hard slice of SWE-bench Verified. The slice contains 25 instances whose gold patches touch at least two files and 40 lines (2–21 files, at most four instances per repository, eight repositories). Selection used structural metadata only, without model outcomes, and scoring used the official SWE-bench Docker evaluator. A preregistered stage gate required low-effort success between 30% and 80% for at least one model. Claude Sonnet 5 resolved 12/25 (48%) and Claude Opus 5 16/25 (64%) at low effort, so both satisfied the gate.

The second campaign evaluated Claude Code 2.1.220 at low, high, and xhigh effort, paired by task across both models (150 cells). Pre-launch manipulation checks confirmed that the effort setting changed output volume on this path (low to xhigh: Sonnet 5, 5,253 to 35,113 output tokens; Opus 5, 9,040 to 21,719). At low effort, Sonnet 5 averaged 34.8 turns, 34.2 tool calls, 227 seconds, and approximately 4,000 thinking tokens per task, compared with 6.0 turns, 5.1 tool calls, 17.7 seconds, and near-zero thinking on the deterministic fixtures in Appendix M. Structural difficulty was positively associated with Sonnet 5 compute (Spearman  $\rho \approx 0.45$ – $0.49$  against gold-patch file count), while Opus 5 showed little such association.

All 150 cells completed without infrastructure errors. A preregistered budget cap was amended from \$250 to \$300 before success outcomes were evaluated; the rationale is recorded in the public audit trail. Increasing effort consistently increased compute: xhigh versus low added 12–16k thinking tokens and 23–30 turns and increased billed cost by 2.4–4.5 $\times$ . All six timeouts and all four empty patches occurred at high or xhigh effort.

For Opus 5, resolved counts were 17/25 at low, 18/25 at high, and 16/25 at xhigh (McNemar xhigh vs. low,  $p = 1.0$ ), with cost per resolved task of \$0.75, \$1.89, and \$3.62, respectively. No discordant pair reproduced on the preregistered second repetition. The two xhigh regressions were consistent with compute-induced failure modes: one scope-expanding edit broke previously passing tests, and one run timed out with an empty diff. Thus, low effort lies on the observed cost–success frontier for Opus 5.

For Sonnet 5, resolved counts were 12/25 at low, 19/25 at high, and 17/25 at xhigh. The preregistered primary xhigh-versus-low comparison contained six rescues and one regression ( $p = 0.125$  after the primary McNemar test; not significant after Holm correction); the secondary high-versus-low comparison contained seven rescues and no regressions ( $p = 0.016$ ). Cost per resolved

task increased from \$1.76 to \$2.32 to \$3.00, so xhigh is dominated by high in this sample. On second repetitions, three of six xhigh rescues reproduced; all three were classified as cross-module-completeness failures of the low-effort run. Six of ten discordant tasks were resolved by both effort settings on rerun, indicating substantial run-to-run variability.

A preregistered evidence-triggered escalation rule, simulated on the static arms, activated on 64–68% of tasks and did not improve the observed cost–success frontier: for Sonnet 5 it approximately matched always-xhigh, and for Opus 5 it was worse than always-low. The campaign therefore shows that difficult repository-scale tasks can induce substantial computation at low effort, while additional explicit effort has model-dependent and often unfavorable cost–success trade-offs. Full protocol and audit materials are available in the public repository.

## O Post-Registration DeepSeek Harness Extension

This extension was frozen on 2026-08-19 after a baseline activation gate and before any comparative arm. It is a harness extension of the frozen activation benchmark: tasks, prompts, fixtures, hidden evaluators, metrics, activation definition, and statistical procedures are unchanged. The variable is the agent harness.

**Setup.** The harness is DeepSeek Harness (dsh) 0.1.0rc7 using the bundled unattended `dsh-jsonrpc-agent` composition. The model is Claude Sonnet 5, held fixed relative to the Claude Code activation benchmark, served through a local OpenAI-compatible chain to the first-party Anthropic API. A body shim removes dsh’s budget-less `thinking` field so LiteLLM can map `reasoning_effort` to the Anthropic thinking budget and clamps `max_tokens` to the model output ceiling; otherwise requests are captured unchanged. Wire inspection before freezing showed that this evaluated composition enabled aggressive reasoning on every normal request. The baseline preserves that shipped behavior.

The dsh runtime is structurally different from Claude Code and PI.DEV. Its published composition includes an agent spine, local bash and file tools, subagent delegation, todo state, JSONL persistence/checkpoints, token metering, and automatic context compaction [4]. The broader project also exposes Code Mode and workflow orchestration, but those capabilities are not treatment arms in this extension.

**Arms and design.** Five arms are evaluated: `baseline`; `policy`, which appends the efficiency policy to the dsh system persona; `rewrite`, which applies wrapper prompt correction; `effort`, which adaptively overrides dsh `reasoningEffort` (low/medium/high, with xhigh mapped to high and abstention preserving the shipped default); and `full`, combining policy, rewrite, and effort. There is no runtime-hook arm in this composition. The matrix is 5 tasks  $\times$  5 arms  $\times$  3 repetitions = 75 valid runs, paired by task and repetition, with a \$20 cap, 600s timeout, and one retry only for transport `no_json` failures. Tool metrics are parsed from dsh session JSONL with the same test-pattern and reset-on-edit semantics as the original activation benchmark.

**Activation gate.** Before comparative arms, every induced-waste task had to exhibit its target behavior under the dsh baseline. The four gate runs all solved the task and are excluded from comparative analysis:

A first gate attempt encountered an environment-propagation bug before any model request was sent. Those four infrastructure-error records were removed, the runner received a one-line fix,

| Task              | Baseline activation evidence      | Billed cost |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| act-testloop-01   | repeated tests without change = 3 | \$0.167     |
| act-verify-01     | repeated tests without change = 2 | \$0.340     |
| act-approaches-01 | 28,321 output tokens              | \$0.639     |
| act-explore-01    | repeated tests without change = 1 | \$0.174     |

Table 6: DeepSeek Harness activation gate. On **act-approaches-01**, the matched Claude Code baseline was approximately 1.25k output tokens and \$0.14; this cross-harness contrast is diagnostic of activation, not a primary cost estimand.

and the gate was rerun before any comparative arm. This exclusion was disclosed in the frozen extension plan.

**Comparative results.** All 75 comparative runs were valid, and all arms solved all 15 task-repetition cells. Mean billed cost per run was \$0.2753 for baseline, \$0.2114 for policy, \$0.2109 for rewrite, \$0.0696 for effort, and \$0.0490 for full. These correspond to point reductions of 23.2%, 23.4%, 74.7%, and 82.2% relative to dsh baseline. The effort-only arm captures about 90.9% of the observed baseline-to-full dollar reduction. Interventions overlap, so these component differences are not additive. The rewrite-only point estimate is not promoted as an independently conclusive inferential result.

**Cross-harness interpretation.** The original Claude Code activation benchmark and the dsh extension use the same closed model and controller logic, but the dominant lever changes. Under Claude Code, the effort-only arm reduced cost by about 19% and the full stack by about 27%; under dsh the corresponding figures are about 75% and 82%. This is evidence for a harness-effort interaction, not a universal 82% controller effect. In the evaluated dsh composition, effort control primarily corrects a high-compute default. The result also explains why token and cache savings should not be treated as portable properties of an intervention: dsh and Claude Code expose different prefixes, tools, context-management behavior, and cache traffic.

**Scope.** This extension does not evaluate DeepSeek models, does not include a dsh runtime-hook arm, and does not establish the effort-success frontier on hard tasks because the activation fixtures remain ceiling-success tasks. The direct next experiment is a crossed replication of the frozen 25-instance SWE-bench Verified hard slice under dsh with Sonnet 5 and Opus 5, using identical low/high/xhigh effort settings and the official Docker judge. That design can estimate harness $\times$ effort, harness $\times$ model, and harness $\times$ task-difficulty interactions without changing the task set.

## P Multiple-Approaches Benefit Audit

A robustness audit evaluated whether forced branching improves success (878 branching runs incl. paraphrase forms, 821 baselines, 225 paired blocks;  $\sim 14$  subgroups, Bonferroni threshold  $p < 0.004$ ). Aggregate: 96.5% vs. 95.2%; discordant blocks 13 favoring branching vs. 26 favoring baseline (sign test  $p = 0.053$ , direction negative). The apparent advantage on non-ceiling blocks (13/1/6) is regression to the mean: its mirror is larger (26/3/6). On easy cells (pooled baseline  $\geq 90\%$ ), branching reduces success 98.8%  $\rightarrow$  96.4% ( $p \approx .003$  — the only comparison surviving multiplicity, and it is negative) with  $2.5\times$  the out-of-scope-edit rate. On hard cells (independent definition: pooled task $\times$ model baseline  $< 90\%$ , 17 cells), branching shows 80.5%  $\rightarrow$  85.3% (+4.8pp, Fisher

$p = 0.427$ ;  $\approx 5$  extra successes), a directional signal only; if taken at face value, each additional success costs  $\approx 7.7\times$  a full baseline run. Every rescue case was inspected. Several failing baseline runs were very short non-engagements (18–40 reasoning tokens), and no discarded branch ever surfaced a solution that the baseline searched for and missed (alternatives-implemented is exactly one in every annotated branching run). Power: at a 96.5% ceiling, only success effects  $\gtrsim 2.8\text{pp}$  are detectable. By construction the task set contains essentially no architecture-dependent tasks, so a plausible setting in which branching could help — first obvious fix subtly wrong, or two implementations diverging on hidden behavior — was never tested; a targeted preregistered study with such tasks is needed to evaluate that regime.

**Validation of the hard-cell signal.** The exploratory  $+4.8\text{pp}$  hard-cell effect did not survive robustness analysis. (i) *Cross-fitting*: cells classified hard on screening-phase baselines have held-out baseline success of 98.3% — the difficulty label does not reproduce — and the held-out branching effect is  $+0.4\text{pp}$  (77/78 vs. 57/58). (ii) The leave-one-out stability (all 21 LOO deltas positive,  $+3.5$  to  $+9.3\text{pp}$ ), threshold insensitivity ( $+6$  to  $+10\text{pp}$  at cutoffs 0.95–0.80), and the cell-level difficulty gradient (Spearman  $-0.54$ ) are all computed on the same data that defines difficulty and therefore inherit the regression-to-the-mean artifact the cross-fit removes. (iii) Bootstrap CI over hard cells:  $[-1.7, +12.8]\text{pp}$ . (iv) Model consistency is nemotron-heavy (5/5 positive discordant hard cells) with other models mixed. (v) Failure composition: 8/22 hard-cell baseline failures were degenerate ( $<100$  reasoning tokens) or timeouts — random engagement, not problem difficulty; branching’s own failures include 4 timeouts. (vi) Hidden-test structure: only 5 hidden-only failures exist in hard cells and branching does not reduce them (2 baseline vs. 3 branching); the theoretical case for branching — visible-pass/hidden-fail tasks — is essentially absent from the benchmark. Accordingly, the hard-cell observation is reported as exploratory and not as evidence of a branching benefit.