

Belief-Calibrated Optimization: An Explicit World Model for Agentic Optimization

Yuhan Chen¹, Zhihua Tian¹, Mahavir Dabas¹, Charith Peris², Rahul Gupta²,
Ming Jin¹, Feiyang Kang¹, Siyuan Zhang³, Nan Wang³, Ruoxi Jia¹

¹Virginia Tech, ²Amazon, ³Independent Researcher

Abstract

The performance of an LLM agent depends on the *scaffold* around a frozen model. A common way to improve that scaffold is to use a *coding agent* as an optimizer: it reads current scores and traces and iteratively edits the source, producing a new candidate each round. Each edit is chosen according to a belief about how the environment will respond: what went wrong, and which change should help. That belief is typically implicit. It lives in the coding agent’s reasoning on the current call, or remains latent in its parameters, rather than as something written down. Later calls therefore see scores and traces, but they do not use that belief. We introduce Belief-Calibrated Optimization (BCO), a method that writes that belief down as a persistent in-context document and continually revises that document as new candidates are evaluated. The resulting document is a *world model*: the current account of how the environment responds to edits. Added to an otherwise standard loop, BCO reaches a higher train passrate than a matched control that lacks only the world model, on five benchmarks spanning memory QA, tool-use QA, code-as-action app agents, and terminal agents. The gap remains on every held-out split, which is not used to select the candidate. After a target-model swap, in which the frozen model is replaced and the scaffold is not, the selected BCO scaffold leads on the tasks we test, except where context-window overruns leave it unfinished. An offline ablation then asks whether that gap comes from what the world model says. A fresh predictor given the accumulated document forecasts how the environment will respond more accurately than predictors given either no document or a same-form copy whose content has been falsified. The comparison indicates that the document carries reusable information in its content, not only in its form.

1 Introduction

The performance of an LLM agent is determined by both its weights and the *scaffold* around them. Strong models are typically served as frozen, closed endpoints, so the scaffold is what a practitioner can actually change. A recent line of work uses a coding-agent *proposer* as an optimizer: it reads the current scaffold’s scores and traces, diagnoses what went wrong, and edits the source to produce a new candidate, whose evaluation outcome then informs the next round (Hu, Lu, and Clune 2024; Zhang et al. 2024; Yang et al. 2023; Lee et al. 2026; Chen et al. 2026; Liu et al. 2026; Zhang et al.

2025). Throughout, the frozen model is not updated; only the surrounding program evolves.

Each edit is chosen according to a belief about how the environment will respond: where the bottleneck is, and which change should help which tasks. That belief typically remains in the proposer’s reasoning or parameters, so later rounds see scores and traces without using the belief that produced the last edit.

We introduce Belief-Calibrated Optimization (BCO), which writes that belief down as a persistent in-context document and continually revises that document as new candidates are evaluated (Figure 1). The resulting document is a *world model*: the current account of how the environment responds to edits. Within a run the target model, tasks, and evaluation stay fixed, so how the environment responds can be accumulated rather than relearned. This is the setting of a Bayes-Adaptive MDP, from which we inherit one fact: what to carry forward is a belief about that response (Duff 2002; Ghavamzadeh et al. 2015).

Our contributions are as follows:

1. **Belief-Calibrated Optimization.** We present BCO, which maintains a world model as a persistent in-context document (§3).
2. **Gains across four task families, and evidence for the mechanism behind them.** Against a matched control that lacks only the world model, BCO reaches a higher train passrate on all five benchmarks, and the gap remains on every held-out split. After a target-model swap, the selected scaffold leads on the tasks we test, except where context-window overruns leave it unfinished. An offline ablation indicates that a fresh predictor given the accumulated document forecasts environmental responses more accurately than predictors given no document or a same-form copy whose content has been falsified, so the reusable information is in the content, not only the form (§4).

2 Iterative Agentic Optimization

We define *agentic optimization* as an iterative process in which an LLM-based agent improves an artifact by proposing modifications, evaluating their outcomes, and using the resulting evidence to guide subsequent proposals. An artifact may be a prompt, program, workflow, or agent scaffold. At




Figure 1: **Overview of BCO.** *VANILLA* (top) updates the scaffold from scores and traces. *BCO* maintains a persistent world model and repeats three steps: predict task-level effects before evaluation (1), apply and evaluate a mechanism-level edit (2), and correct beliefs from observed traces (3).

iteration t the proposer sees the artifacts already evaluated and chooses one as the parent to edit. An edit a_t of that parent yields a new candidate x_t . The environment evaluates x_t on a fixed *scored* task set Q , drawn once from a task distribution $\mathcal{Q}$, and returns an outcome o_t : an aggregate score, task-level results, execution traces, and tool outputs. After T iterations the optimizer returns one of the candidates it actually evaluated, selected by the only utility it can observe:

$$\hat{x} = \arg \max_{x \in \{x_1, \dots, x_T\}} \hat{U}_Q(x), \quad \hat{U}_Q(x) = U(x) + \varepsilon_x, \quad (1)$$

where U denotes the population utility over $\mathcal{Q}$. In our experiments, it is estimated on a held-out task set disjoint from Q . The noise term ε_x collects split-specific and evaluation noise. Selecting on $\hat{U}_Q$ while being judged on U is the optimizer’s-curse setting (Smith and Winkler 2006): the candidate that scores highest on Q is the one whose ε_x is most favourable, so hill-climbing $\hat{U}_Q$ alone can lose utility on Q . An explicit model of the environment is meant to help the proposer tell a real effect from a favourable ε_x .

3 Belief-Calibrated Optimization

3.1 Overview

How the environment will respond to an edit is unknown at the start of a run. Within a run the frozen target model, the scored set Q , and the evaluation procedure stay fixed, so each outcome remains evidence about the same response. *BCO* carries a belief about that response as a persistent world model W_t . This unknown-but-fixed response, in this loop, is the setting of a Bayes-Adaptive MDP, from which we inherit the decision to carry a belief (Duff 2002; Ghavamzadeh et al. 2015). Figure 1 illustrates the overall workflow of *BCO*. At iteration t , the optimizer considers the prior interaction history h_t (artifacts, edits, scores, and traces so far) and W_t , chooses a parent from those artifacts, and proposes an edit:

$$a_t \sim \pi_{\text{opt}}(\cdot \mid h_t, W_t). \quad (2)$$

That edit yields a new candidate. Before evaluation, the optimizer records a prediction for that candidate at the granularity supported by the protocol (typically a task subset). The candidate is then executed to obtain scores and traces.

Before the next iteration begins, *BCO* compares the predicted and observed candidate outcomes and uses their discrepancies to update the world model:

$$W_{t+1} = \text{Update}(W_t, \hat{\mathcal{O}}_t, \mathcal{O}_t), \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_t$ and $\mathcal{O}_t$ denote the predicted and observed outcomes, respectively. The prediction $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_t$ is included because it makes the update local. It specifies which beliefs were staked on the candidate and what outcomes they implied. The resulting discrepancy can therefore identify the beliefs implicated by the observed outcome, rather than merely indicating that some revision is necessary. The calibrated W_{t+1} is then provided to the optimizer when proposing the next candidate. *BCO* thus retains the standard propose-and-evaluate optimization loop while making the beliefs behind candidate generation explicit and continually revising them against experimental evidence.

Instantiation. W_t is a single Markdown document, `world_model_calibration.md`, copied into the proposer’s workspace at the start of an iteration and written back at its end. The proposer’s instructions are a `SKILL.md` file assembled by including other files. One included file, the *calibration module*, tells the proposer how to maintain that document and how to run the predict–observe–correct loop. Removing this include yields *VANILLA*, used as the comparison method throughout our experiments. Both methods receive the *same evidence surface*: every previous iteration’s diff, evaluation output, traces, and full source snapshot, plus the cross-iteration task–score matrix, all readable on demand. *VANILLA* lacks a persistent place to record its conclusions, so each of its calls must reconstruct its understanding from the raw evidence.

3.2 Belief Construction

The document W_t records reusable beliefs formed from the current artifact, task-level scores and traces, and previous candidate evaluations. We distinguish *execution beliefs* from *evaluation beliefs* according to which part of the environment’s response they describe.

- **Execution beliefs** characterize how an edit is expected to affect agent behavior under particular conditions. They connect properties of the *model*, *current scaffold*, *task*, and *external environment* to anticipated changes in the execution trajectory. For example, they may capture a recurring model limitation, a bottleneck in the current scaffold, a capability required by a class of tasks, or a constraint imposed by an external tool. These beliefs help the optimizer estimate how a candidate edit is likely to affect agent behavior and task performance.
- **Evaluation beliefs** characterize how reliably the evaluation system maps an execution trajectory to an observed outcome. They record recurring limitations or errors of the evaluator revealed by previous evaluations, as well as the conditions under which its feedback may be unreliable. These beliefs help the optimizer account for evaluation limitations when comparing predicted and observed performance.

We represent W_t as a collection of atomic beliefs:

$$W_t = \{\beta_{t,i}\}_{i=1}^{m_t}, \quad (4)$$

$$\beta_{t,i} = (\phi_{t,i}, \mathcal{C}_{t,i}, c_{t,i}, s_{t,i}, E_{t,i}^+, E_{t,i}^-, \mu_{t,i}),$$

where $\phi_{t,i}$ is a falsifiable claim about the execution or evaluation process, $\mathcal{C}_{t,i}$ specifies the conditions under which it applies, $c_{t,i} \in [0, 1]$ denotes its confidence, $s_{t,i} \in \{\text{hypothesis, confirmed, refuted}\}$ its status, $E_{t,i}^+$ and $E_{t,i}^-$ record supporting and contradictory evidence, and $\mu_{t,i}$ is the *mass* of the belief: the approximate number of observed failures it explains. This quantity helps prioritize experimental budget across beliefs. m_t is the number of beliefs in iteration t . Scores and trace events provide the evidence for these beliefs, while the beliefs themselves capture explanations and generalizations that can inform future candidate generation. BCO retains a task-specific diagnosis in W_t only when it supports such a reusable claim. In the document these atoms are its **Beliefs** section, one entry per $\beta_{t,i}$, beside an **Experiments** section recording which edits already probed each belief and with what verdict, so an edit that paid no information or gain is not tried again. The document starts *empty*: it is filled only from the run’s own evidence, and pre-seeding guessed failure modes is forbidden, since that would place confidence on claims no observation supports.

3.3 Belief Calibration

After evaluation, the proposer compares the prediction with the observed outcome and updates W_t one belief at a time. Beliefs that this outcome does not address are left unchanged. The update is a short list of operations on W_t :

$$\Delta W_t = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_{k_t}), \quad (5)$$

$$\delta_j \in \{\text{ADD, REVISE, MERGE, REMOVE}\},$$

$$W_{t+1} = \text{Apply}(W_t, \Delta W_t).$$

ADD inserts a new belief. REVISE changes an existing belief’s claim, scope, confidence, status, or evidence. MERGE combines overlapping beliefs. REMOVE deletes a belief that the accumulated evidence has refuted.

This update runs at the start of the next iteration, before a new edit is chosen. The proposer first grades the previous prediction file `prediction.md` against the raw outcome, using per-task results relative to the parent and the execution traces, not the scaffolded agent’s final message. It applies ΔW_t to the Beliefs section and appends one record to an append-only History, so a refuted belief remains on the record. It then chooses the next edit: a probe of an uncertain belief, or an action on a well-supported one. Only then does it write the next `prediction.md`, before any source change.

The prediction names the belief at stake, the mechanism of the edit, and a claim about a *subset* of tasks. The candidate code remains general: a prediction may name task IDs, but the source may not branch on them.

Example 1 instantiates this loop on GAIA; Listings 2–3 give the same files verbatim.

Example 1 (GAIA, iterations 15–16)

Predict. At iteration 15, the world model identifies buried evidence in long interaction histories. It predicts that answering from a compressed evidence summary will improve that long-context subset by at least 0.10.

Observe. That summary recovers five tasks but causes four regressions: it runs after every episode and replaces main-loop answers that were already correct.

Correct. Iteration 16 runs the summary turn only when the main-loop answer is empty or a placeholder, and accepts only a concrete output. Five more tasks pass, none regress, and train passrate rises from 0.450 to 0.575.

Algorithm 1 in Appendix A states the complete procedure, marking what BCO adds relative to VANILLA. Appendix B gives the fragment sizes, the grading axes, and one instance of each artifact.

4 Experiments

We organize the evaluation around three questions. **RQ1** asks whether BCO discovers stronger scaffolds and whether their gains persist on held-out tasks (§4.2). **RQ2** asks how the resulting scaffolds behave when the frozen target model is replaced by an unseen model (§4.3). **RQ3** asks whether the accumulated world model contains reusable information about how scaffold edits affect task behavior (§4.4). We study these questions with matched optimization runs across five benchmarks, target-model swaps, and a controlled offline prediction ablation.

4.1 Experimental Setup

Matched comparison. For each benchmark, the two methods share the initial scaffold x_0 , the editable source surface, the frozen target M (the open-weight model DeepSeek-V4-Flash on the memory, tool-use, and code benchmarks, and MiniMax-M3 on Terminal-Bench 2.0; frozen within every matched pair), the train/test split, the evaluation harness, and the iteration budget T . Both methods start from the same

iteration-0 artifact; the comparison measures the protocol-level effect of adding the calibration layer in §3.1. The proposer is a fixed strong coding LLM at maximum reasoning effort and runs in a sandbox¹; it is identical across the two methods within each matched pair.

Benchmarks and splits. We evaluate on five benchmarks spanning four task families.

- **Memory QA: LongMemEval-s (LME)** (Wu et al. 2025) (train 100 / test 400) and **LoCoMo** (Maharana et al. 2024) (train 80 / test 1449) test memory across long, multi-session conversations, including temporal and causal reasoning; the scaffold is a long-term-memory ontology with retrieval and context packing.
- **Tool-use QA: GAIA** (Mialon et al. 2024) (train 40 / test 99) poses real-world questions requiring reasoning, browsing, multimodal understanding, and tool use; the scaffold is a function-calling loop over real tools.
- **Code-as-action agents: AppWorld** (Trivedi et al. 2024) (a scenario-disjoint train 45 / test 372 split drawn from the challenge pool, so no test scenario is seen in training); the scaffold is a ReAct code agent that completes tasks in simulated everyday apps by writing Python against the environment’s APIs.
- **Terminal agents: Terminal-Bench 2.0 (TB2.0)** (The Terminal-Bench Team 2026) (train 20 / test 66) contains realistic, execution-verified command-line tasks; the scaffold is a terminal-use agent loop (Terminus-2) driving a live shell in a sandboxed container.

Because train score guides the search, we apply a pre-optimization stability screen before fixing the AppWorld and Terminal-Bench 2.0 train subsets. The screen removes *oscillating* tasks whose repeated trials disagree under an identical scaffold, providing a more consistent optimization signal. Appendix C documents the screen, the Spider2-lite diagnostic, and results on the initial Terminal-Bench split.

Graders. Each benchmark keeps its own standard grader, fixed across methods and identical on train and held-out; Appendix C lists them. Candidates are evaluated at temperature 0, one repeat per task except Terminal-Bench 2.0 ($k=2$).

Metric and candidate selection. The reported number is held-out passrate. On GAIA, AppWorld and Terminal-Bench 2.0 each method contributes its top-1 train-frontier candidate, ties broken by the earliest iteration. Both memory benchmarks run 30 iterations, and their large headroom over the initial scaffold leaves a group of candidates bunched at the top of the train split; there each method’s *three* highest-train candidates are evaluated held-out and the best is reported. That procedure selects partly on the held-out split, so the two memory rows report best-of-three estimates. The same selection rule is applied to both methods, and Appendix C lists every evaluated candidate with its train and held-out score. Appendix F provides a complementary three-method

diagnostic with free-form persistent notes, and Appendix E reports proposer token usage.

4.2 RQ1: Does BCO Improve Optimization and Held-Out Performance?

This experiment measures both search progress and generalization. The best-so-far train passrate shows how far each optimizer moves the scaffold on the split that guides its search; the held-out passrate shows whether the selected scaffold retains that improvement on unseen tasks. We compare bco with VANILLA under the matched protocol of §4.1 across all five benchmarks.

Optimization result. Both methods raise train passrate over the initial scaffold. On every benchmark, bco ends higher than VANILLA (left half of Table 1), from +0.025 on TB2.0 to +0.150 on GAIA. Figure 2 shows the best-so-far trajectory.

Held-out result. Each method’s selected candidate is then evaluated on the split unused for search (right half of Table 1). Held-out passrate is lower than train on every row. The ordering is unchanged: bco remains higher than VANILLA, from +0.022 (TB2.0) to +0.152 (GAIA).

4.3 RQ2: How Do the Scaffolds Transfer to an Unseen Target Model?

Scaffold edits can depend on the target used during optimization. We therefore hold each selected artifact and the held-out tasks fixed, and replace only the target with a model from a different family and provider. The comparison separates scores under the original target from scores after that swap.

Protocol. For GAIA and AppWorld, we re-evaluate the initial artifact and the VANILLA and bco selected candidates from Table 1, using each run’s original source snapshot. The new target is gpt-5.6-luna, at each of its three reasoning-effort tiers (high, medium, and low). On GAIA the agent loop is capped at 30 iterations for all three scaffolds, because the swapped target takes more turns per task. Figure 3 reports two sets: the full split, counting a non-completion as a failure, and the tasks that all three scaffolds complete. Exact values are in Appendix D (Table 6).

GAIA. All three scaffolds complete every task, so the two sets coincide. bco has the highest passrate at high, medium, and low effort (Figure 3). At high effort, VANILLA scored 0.111 below the initial scaffold. The traces show longer searches that overwrite answers found earlier in the trajectory; this study does not isolate that mechanism.

AppWorld. The two sets diverge. The bco scaffold re-injects its entire natural-language scratchpad at every turn, with no length bound. That design stays within the context budget of the original, terser target, but not of the more verbose swapped target: the scaffold returns no output on 99/77/65 of the 372 tasks at high/medium/low effort. The initial and VANILLA scaffolds complete every task; VANILLA keeps a sliding window of 16 recent exchanges. Counting non-completions as failures, bco scores 0.516, 0.524, and 0.532 versus 0.685, 0.608, and 0.538 for VANILLA, so bco is last at high and medium effort and matches VANILLA at low

¹Concretely, the memory-QA runs use Kimi-K2.6, GAIA and AppWorld Kimi-K2.7, and the Terminal-Bench 2.0 pair a Codex proposer (GPT-5.6 at maximum reasoning effort).




Figure 2: Best-so-far train passrate by iteration (lines); stars mark the held-out passrate of each selected candidate. BCO finishes higher than VANILLA on both train and held-out across all five benchmarks.




Figure 3: Target-model swap to gpt-5.6-luna at three reasoning-effort tiers (H/M/L). Solid bars include all tasks and count non-completions as failures; hatched extensions restrict to tasks completed by all three scaffolds. See Appendix D (Table 6) for exact values and completion counts.

effort. Restricting to tasks all three complete, BCO is first at every tier, by +0.007, +0.031, and +0.091. The completed-run ordering is consistent with a transferable task strategy; the full-set ordering shows that transfer also depends on context consumption.

4.4 RQ3: Does the World Model Carry Predictive Information?

Train and held-out scores measure the scaffold, not what the world model contains. We therefore freeze each candidate and its realized outcome, and vary only the document given to a predictor that did not design the candidate. The predictor forecasts, for each question type, whether that candidate’s edit will help (**Upside**) or hurt (**Downside**).

Protocol. All predictors receive the same parent source, diff, and base per-type passrates. **None** re-

ceives no document; **Intact** receives the run’s final `world_model_calibration.md` with that candidate’s outcome block removed; **Scrambled** keeps the file’s length, format, and vocabulary but falsifies its mechanism verdicts and type-level effects. Two blind judges compare each pair of predictions to the realized per-type changes; upside hit rate and downside precision are a judge-free cross-check (Appendix G).

Result. Table 2 gives the same ordering on every measure: $\text{None} < \text{Scrambled} < \text{Intact}$. Scrambled over None is consistent with a benefit from structure and from naming regressions. Intact over Scrambled is consistent with additional information in the learned content. Both judges agree with the mechanical metrics; the largest mechanical gap is downside precision. Candidates are nested in four runs, so the run is the independent unit (Appendix G; two-sided sign-test $p = 0.125$). The comparison shows that a predictor that did not write the document can use its content to forecast outcomes of candidates from those runs; it does not test whether the same document would transfer to a new optimization trajectory.

4.5 Additional Ablation: Persistence Without Calibration

The offline ablation isolates document content. It does not test whether any persistent file would suffice. On LongMemEval-s we therefore add a third method, **Notes**: one freely editable `agent_notes.md` that persists across iterations, with no prediction, grading, or predict–observe–correct update. VANILLA remains the comparison method; BCO is the full protocol.

Three independent ten-iteration trajectories per method on the 100-example training split give means 0.430 (VANILLA), 0.427 (Notes), and 0.467 (BCO), with within-method ranges 0.11, 0.07, and 0.13 (Table 3). Persistence alone does not reproduce BCO’s mean on this diagnostic, but three short trajectories cannot show that free-form notes are ineffective. The paired held-out comparison and the content-controlled

Table 1: Held-out generalization across five benchmarks. Each method uses the same initial scaffold, editable source, train/test split, target model, proposer, evaluation harness, and optimization budget. Train and held-out entries are passrates; the held-out split is never used to optimize the scaffold except for the disclosed best-of-three selection on the two memory benchmarks.

Benchmark	Scaffold	Train/Test	Target	Proposer	Train			Held-out		
					Initial	VANILLA	BCO	Initial	VANILLA	BCO
LME	Memory retrieval	100/400	DeepSeek-V4-Flash	Kimi-K2.6	0.160	0.590	0.710	0.148	0.533	0.608
LoCoMo	Memory retrieval	80/1449	DeepSeek-V4-Flash	Kimi-K2.6	0.288	0.412	0.475	0.295	0.375	0.453
GAIA	Tool-calling	40/99	DeepSeek-V4-Flash	Kimi-K2.7	0.400	0.425	0.575	0.283	0.343	0.495
AppWorld	ReAct code	45/372	DeepSeek-V4-Flash	Kimi-K2.7	0.600	0.800	0.933	0.694	0.766	0.796
TB2.0	Terminus-2	20/66	MiniMax-M3	Codex (GPT-5.6)	0.450	0.525	0.550	0.477	0.470	0.492

World model	None	Scrambled	Intact
Upside hit rate	0.441	0.460	0.538
Downside precision	0.142	0.181	0.217
Judge wins vs. None	—	26–12 / 24–9	36–4 / 35–2
Judge wins vs. Scrambled	—	—	26–12 / 26–12

Table 2: Offline prediction ablation on 40 candidates. Upper rows are judge-free; lower rows report blind wins–losses under Kimi-K2.6 / DeepSeek-V4-Flash. Ties are excluded. Because candidates are nested within four optimization runs, the run is the independent unit; all four runs favor the same ordering, giving a two-sided sign-test $p = 0.125$ (Appendix G).

ablation remain the primary evidence.

5 Related Work

LLM-driven optimization of the program around a frozen model. Closest to our setting is work that optimizes the *harness*: end-to-end harness optimization (Lee et al. 2026), composible and evolvable foundries (Chen et al. 2026), sustained self-improvement on open-ended task streams (Liu et al. 2026), accelerated self-evolution loops (Hu et al. 2026), and dedicated evaluation environments (Zheng et al. 2026), extending earlier agents that rewrite their own scaffold or code (Zhang et al. 2025; Yin et al. 2024; Shang et al. 2024; Zhou et al. 2024; Zweiger et al. 2025). A parallel line optimizes agent systems and prompts: agentic-system design (Hu, Lu, and Clune 2024), graph-structured topologies (Zhuge et al. 2024), workflow generation (Zhang et al. 2024), LLM-as-optimizer (Yang et al. 2023) and evolutionary (Guo et al. 2023; Fernando et al. 2023) prompt search, and compiling declarative LM programs by optimizing their instructions and demonstrations (Khatab et al. 2023; Opsahl-Ong et al. 2024). These methods show that an LLM can improve the program around a frozen model using observed scores, often together with free-form reflection, to guide edits over program space. A concurrent analysis separates producing useful updates from benefiting from them at solve time and finds update

Method	Run 1	Run 2	Run 3	Mean
VANILLA	0.37	0.44	0.48	0.430
Notes	0.43	0.46	0.39	0.427
BCO	0.42	0.43	0.55	0.467

Table 3: Persistent-state ablation on LongMemEval-s. Entries are the best-so-far training passrate over successfully evaluated candidates in three independent trajectories (100 training examples; nominal ten-iteration proposer budget).

quality roughly flat across base-model tiers. This pattern suggests that the *update protocol*, rather than the evolver’s raw capability alone, is an important lever (Lin et al. 2026). Belief-Calibrated Optimization changes what the optimizer carries from one iteration to the next.

Verbal self-reflection and memory. Agents can also improve by writing natural-language reflections on their own behavior—repeated self-feedback on a single output (Shinn et al. 2023; Madaan et al. 2023), tool-verified self-correction (Gou et al. 2023), a persistent skill library (Wang et al. 2023), or a streamed memory of experience (Park et al. 2023). These approaches use episodic or free-form memory to retain useful experience across interactions. Belief-Calibrated Optimization instead organizes persistent state around explicit predictions, observations, and revisions of an environment model.

POMDPs, Bayes-adaptive RL, and Bayesian optimization. The setting is that of a Bayes-adaptive MDP: the environment’s response is unknown but fixed within a run, so what to carry between iterations is a belief about that response (Duff 2002; Ghavamzadeh et al. 2015; Åström 1965; Kaelbling, Littman, and Cassandra 1998). Sample-based planners that search the belief-augmented state space instantiate the same idea in parametric form (Guez, Silver, and Dayan 2012). The optimization loop can also be read as Bayesian optimization (Shahriari et al. 2016): the world model plays a surrogate-like role, and the choice between probing an uncertain belief and acting on a well-supported one plays an

acquisition-like role. We instantiate those roles in natural language and in context, without a parametric surrogate or a learned solver. That choice follows the view of in-context learning as implicit Bayesian inference (Xie et al. 2021).

6 Conclusion

Belief-Calibrated Optimization writes the optimizer’s belief about how the environment responds to edits as a persistent world model, and revises that document by predict–observe–correct. On five benchmarks spanning memory QA, tool-use QA, code-as-action app agents, and terminal agents, BCO reaches a higher train passrate than VANILLA and keeps that gap on every held-out split.

When the target is replaced with an unseen model, the BCO scaffold ranks first across all GAIA settings and on the common completed-task sets in AppWorld. Its unbounded context use, however, reduces full-set AppWorld performance. A fresh predictor given the accumulated world model also forecasts outcomes more accurately, indicating that the document contains information usable beyond the run that produced it. More broadly, an optimizer’s knowledge of its environment need not remain implicit and disposable. When made explicit, falsifiable, and calibration-tracked, it becomes an artifact that can be maintained and improved.

7 Limitations

- **The belief is approximate, and its self-assessment is heuristic.** The world model W_t is an LLM’s natural-language summary of evidence, not a statistically calibrated posterior. Our analysis therefore focuses on de-noised, subset-averaged behavior, since single-task pass/fail sits below the evaluation noise floor; raising the per-task repeat count would admit stable single-task claims at proportionally higher cost.
- **The environment’s response is treated as fixed within a run, and the scaffold can overfit the target.** We freeze the target model and the benchmark for a run, so the response does not drift by design. A target swap or external-tool drift changes the response and would require detecting the shift and discounting older evidence, which the current protocol does not include. The AppWorld transfer result in §4.3 also shows that target-dependent resource use can affect full-set performance. Future variants could optimize against multiple targets or score a candidate’s resource envelope alongside its passrate.
- **The evaluation covers five screened benchmarks.** Four benchmarks share one proposer family and one target model, while Terminal-Bench 2.0 uses an independent stack. Each matched comparison contains one trajectory per method, so the aggregate evidence measures consistency across five benchmarks rather than within-benchmark repetition; the transfer study changes the target at evaluation time. We also screened initial-scaffold behavior before fixing the AppWorld and Terminal-Bench 2.0 train subsets, which narrows the claim to environments with sufficient repeatable failure mass and may favor benchmarks on which score-guided optimization is easier (Appendix C).

References

- Åström, K. J. 1965. Optimal control of Markov processes with incomplete state information. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 10(1): 174–205.
- Chen, T.; Lu, S.; Zhao, K.; Meng, W.; Teng, H.; Li, T.; Li, C.; Liu, X.; Liang, J.; Zhang, Z.; Xie, Y.; Qu, H.; Shao, K.; and Luan, J. 2026. HarnessX: A Composable, Adaptive, and Evolvable Agent Harness Foundry. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.14249*.
- Duff, M. O. 2002. *Optimal Learning: Computational Procedures for Bayes-Adaptive Markov Decision Processes*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Fernando, C.; Banarse, D.; Michalewski, H.; Osindero, S.; and Rocktäschel, T. 2023. Promptbreeder: Self-Referential Self-Improvement Via Prompt Evolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16797*.
- Ghavamzadeh, M.; Mannor, S.; Pineau, J.; and Tamar, A. 2015. Bayesian Reinforcement Learning: A Survey. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 8(5–6): 359–483.
- Gou, Z.; Shao, Z.; Gong, Y.; Shen, Y.; Yang, Y.; Duan, N.; and Chen, W. 2023. CRITIC: Large Language Models Can Self-Correct with Tool-Interactive Critiquing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.11738*. Published at ICLR 2024.
- Guez, A.; Silver, D.; and Dayan, P. 2012. Efficient Bayes-Adaptive Reinforcement Learning using Sample-Based Search. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25: 1034–1042. NIPS 2012.
- Guo, Q.; Wang, R.; Guo, J.; Li, B.; Song, K.; Tan, X.; Liu, G.; Bian, J.; and Yang, Y. 2023. EvoPrompt: Connecting LLMs with Evolutionary Algorithms Yields Powerful Prompt Optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.08532*. Published at ICLR 2024.
- Hu, S.; Lu, C.; and Clune, J. 2024. Automated Design of Agentic Systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.08435*.
- Hu, Z.; Lu, M.; Wang, Z.; Ruan, J.; Chen, C.; Pan, Z.; Guan, Y.; Wang, R.; Yu, Z.; Zhang, C.; and Ding, Y. 2026. FlashEvolve: Accelerating Agent Self-Evolution with Asynchronous Stage Orchestration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.08520*.
- Kaelbling, L. P.; Littman, M. L.; and Cassandra, A. R. 1998. Planning and acting in partially observable stochastic domains. *Artificial Intelligence*, 101(1–2): 99–134.
- Khattab, O.; Singhvi, A.; Maheshwari, P.; Zhang, Z.; Santhanam, K.; Vardhamanan, S.; Haq, S.; Sharma, A.; Joshi, T. T.; Moazam, H.; Miller, H.; Zaharia, M.; and Potts, C. 2023. DSPy: Compiling Declarative Language Model Calls into Self-Improving Pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.03714*.
- Lee, Y.; Nair, R.; Zhang, Q.; Lee, K.; Khattab, O.; and Finn, C. 2026. Meta-Harness: End-to-End Optimization of Model Harnesses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28052*.
- Lin, M.; Wu, J.; Wang, Z.; Shi, Z.; Sang, Y.; He, B.; Liu, Z.; Wei, T.; Wang, D.; Zhang, X.; Dumoulin, B.; Xie, C.; Zhou, Y.; Wang, S.; and Lu, H. 2026. Harness Updating Is Not Harness Benefit: Disentangling Evolution Capabilities in Self-Evolving LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.30621*.
- Liu, Z.; Shi, Z.; Sang, Y.; He, B.; Lin, M.; Wei, T.; Wang, D.; Dumoulin, B.; Jin, W.; and Lu, H. 2026. Adaptive Auto-Harness: Sustained Self-Improvement for Agentic System Deployment on Open-Ended Task Streams. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.01770*.
- Madaan, A.; Tandon, N.; Gupta, P.; Hallinan, S.; Gao, L.; Wiegrefe, S.; Alon, U.; Dziri, N.; Prabhume, S.; Yang, Y.; Gupta, S.; Majumder, B. P.; Hermann, K.; Welleck, S.; Yazdanbakhsh, A.; and Clark, P. 2023. Self-Refine: Iterative Refinement with Self-Feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.17651*.
- Maharana, A.; Lee, D.-H.; Tulyakov, S.; Bansal, M.; Barbieri, F.; and Fang, Y. 2024. Evaluating Very Long-Term Conversational Memory of LLM Agents. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 13851–13870. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mialon, G.; Fourrier, C.; Wolf, T.; LeCun, Y.; and Scialom, T. 2024. GAIA: A Benchmark for General AI Assistants. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Opsahl-Ong, K.; Ryan, M. J.; Purtell, J.; Broman, D.; Potts, C.; Zaharia, M.; and Khattab, O. 2024. Optimizing Instructions and Demonstrations for Multi-Stage Language Model Programs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11695*. Published at EMNLP 2024.
- Park, J. S.; O’Brien, J. C.; Cai, C. J.; Morris, M. R.; Liang, P.; and Bernstein, M. S. 2023. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03442*.
- Shahriari, B.; Swersky, K.; Wang, Z.; Adams, R. P.; and de Freitas, N. 2016. Taking the Human Out of the Loop: A Review of Bayesian Optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1): 148–175.
- Shang, Y.; Li, Y.; Zhao, K.; Ma, L.; Liu, J.; Xu, F.; and Li, Y. 2024. AgentSquare: Automatic LLM Agent Search in Modular Design Space. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.06153*.
- Shinn, N.; Cassano, F.; Berman, E.; Gopinath, A.; Narasimhan, K.; and Yao, S. 2023. Reflexion: Language Agents with Verbal Reinforcement Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11366*. Published at NeurIPS 2023.
- Smith, J. E.; and Winkler, R. L. 2006. The Optimizer’s Curse: Skepticism and Postdecision Surprise in Decision Analysis. *Management Science*, 52(3): 311–322.
- The Terminal-Bench Team. 2026. Terminal-Bench: Benchmarking Agents on Hard, Realistic Tasks in Command Line Interfaces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Trivedi, H.; Khot, T.; Hartmann, M.; Manku, R.; Dong, V.; Li, E.; Gupta, S.; Sabharwal, A.; and Balasubramanian, N. 2024. AppWorld: A Controllable World of Apps and People for Benchmarking Interactive Coding Agents. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 16022–16076. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Wang, G.; Xie, Y.; Jiang, Y.; Mandlekar, A.; Xiao, C.; Zhu, Y.; Fan, L.; and Anandkumar, A. 2023. Voyager: An Open-Ended Embodied Agent with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*.

Wu, D.; Wang, H.; Yu, W.; Zhang, Y.; Chang, K.-W.; and Yu, D. 2025. LongMemEval: Benchmarking Chat Assistants on Long-Term Interactive Memory. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Xie, S. M.; Raghunathan, A.; Liang, P.; and Ma, T. 2021. An Explanation of In-context Learning as Implicit Bayesian Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.02080*. Published at ICLR 2022.

Yang, C.; Wang, X.; Lu, Y.; Liu, H.; Le, Q. V.; Zhou, D.; and Chen, X. 2023. Large Language Models as Optimizers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.03409*. Published at ICLR 2024.

Yin, X.; Wang, X.; Pan, L.; Lin, L.; Wan, X.; and Wang, W. Y. 2024. Gödel Agent: A Self-Referential Agent Framework for Recursive Self-Improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.04444*.

Zhang, J.; Hu, S.; Lu, C.; Lange, R.; and Clune, J. 2025. Darwin Gödel Machine: Open-Ended Evolution of Self-Improving Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22954*.

Zhang, J.; Xiang, J.; Yu, Z.; Teng, F.; Chen, X.; Chen, J.; Zhuge, M.; Cheng, X.; Hong, S.; et al. 2024. AFlow: Automating Agentic Workflow Generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.10762*. Published at ICLR 2025.

Zheng, C.; Xue, C.; Liang, B.; Yang, J.; and Zhang, C. 2026. SEAGym: An Evaluation Environment for Self-Evolving LLM Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.17546*.

Zhou, W.; Ou, Y.; Ding, S.; Li, L.; et al. 2024. Symbolic Learning Enables Self-Evolving Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.18532*.

Zhuge, M.; Wang, W.; Kirsch, L.; Faccio, F.; Khizbullin, D.; and Schmidhuber, J. 2024. Language Agents as Optimizable Graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.16823*. Published at ICML 2024; project name GPTSwarm.

Zweiger, A.; Pari, J.; Guo, H.; Akyürek, E.; Kim, Y.; and Agrawal, P. 2025. Self-Adapting Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.10943*.

A The Optimization Loop

Algorithm 1 is the procedure of Section 3 of the main paper. Every black line is shared with the matched control; the blue lines are what bco adds.

B The Protocol, Verbatim

This appendix shows the artifacts the main text describes: what separates the two methods, what a world model and a prediction actually look like, and how the blind judge of Section 4.4 of the main paper is configured.

B.1 What separates the two methods

Each proposer is a SKILL.md assembled by textual inclusion from three fragments. For the GAIA pair, for instance, both methods include a 61-line environment surface (the editable source files and the shape of the returned outcome) and a 123-line base contract (read the evidence, design one mechanism-level edit, write the candidate). The bco method adds one more line, `<!-- INCLUDE: _calib_addon.md -->`, pulling in

Algorithm 1 Belief-Calibrated Optimization. BCO-specific operations and inputs are shown in blue; every black line is shared with the matched control, including SELECTPARENT, in which the proposer chooses which previously evaluated candidate to build on.

Require: Initial artifact x_0 , scored task set Q , and iteration budget T

Ensure: Selected artifact $\hat{x}$ and world model W

```

1:  $o_0 \leftarrow \text{EVALUATE}(x_0, Q)$ ;  $h_1 \leftarrow (x_0, o_0)$ 
2:  $W \leftarrow \text{CONSTRUCTBELIEFS}(x_0, o_0)$ 
3: for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
4:    $x_t^{\text{par}} \leftarrow \text{SELECTPARENT}(h_t)$   $\triangleright$  proposer picks any
     evaluated ancestor
5:    $a_t \leftarrow \text{PROPOSE}(x_t^{\text{par}}, h_t, W)$ 
6:    $\hat{O}_t \leftarrow \text{PREDICT}(W, a_t, Q)$ 
7:    $x_t \leftarrow a_t(x_t^{\text{par}})$ ;  $o_t \leftarrow \text{EVALUATE}(x_t, Q)$ 
8:    $\Delta W_t \leftarrow \text{CALIBRATE}(W, a_t, \hat{O}_t, o_t)$ 
9:    $W \leftarrow \text{APPLY}(W, \Delta W_t)$ 
10:   $h_{t+1} \leftarrow h_t \cup (a_t, o_t, x_t)$ 
11: end for
12: return  $\hat{x} \leftarrow \arg \max_{x \in \{x_1, \dots, x_T\}} \hat{U}_Q(x)$ ,  $W$ 
```

a 169-line calibration module; the VANILLA file is otherwise identical, including the task description. The module is the only difference between the two methods. It specifies the two regions of `world_model_calibration.md` and their invariants, the predict–observe–correct order within an iteration, the grading rule (grade against raw tool-call outputs and harness control flow, never the agent’s own final message; exclude tasks whose cross-iteration score row disagrees with itself), the four honest causes a missed prediction can have, and the template for `prediction.md` reproduced below. It imposes no scheduling rule, no coverage quota, and no list of failure modes to look for.

B.2 The world model

Listing 1 shows the HEAD of `world_model_calibration.md` from the Terminal-Bench 2.0 bco run at its final iteration, abridged to three of nine beliefs and three of nine experiment records. Each belief is one instance of the tuple in Eq. 4 of the main paper: claim ϕ , confidence c , status s , evidence $E^\pm$ given as file paths into the stored trajectories, and mass μ . Evidence strings are elided at `[ . . . ]`; nothing else is edited.

Listing 1: HEAD of `world_model_calibration.md`, Terminal-Bench 2.0, abridged.

```

## Beliefs
[E3] Byte-exact workspace memory is a material
↔bottleneck when an ordinary stateful
    read destroys the only useful input before the
↔solver recognizes the loss; a
    concrete loss report plus a recoverable pristine
↔object changes behavior and can
    change stable task outcomes
    | conf:0.96 | status:confirmed
    | evidence:base_eval/dumps/
```

```

↪iter003_bounded_workspace_journal/db-wal-recovery/
  trajectory.json (steps 3-6: two
↪WORKSPACE_MEMORY_LOSS_DETECTED reports followed
  by exact WAL/SHM restoration); seed_eval/[...] (
↪steps 5-8: SQLite removes the
  only WAL and the solver begins guessing); [...]
↪ctrf.json (7/7 versus seed 5/7)
  | mass:~1

[E4] Comparison-ready artifact history is not a
↪demonstrated bottleneck on this train
  split: when a post-command ledger surfaced
↪recoverable candidates, the solver
  usually continued the same branch without the
↪requested criterion table
  | conf:0.26 | status:refuted
  | evidence:reference_iterations/iter_007/dumps
↪/[...]/largest-eigenval/
  trajectory.json (checkpoint steps
↪9,18,20,25,28,30 followed by further unranked
  rewrites); [...]; task_score_matrix.json (train-
↪fasttext remains stable 0)
  | mass:~0

[E9] Repeated external failure output is an earlier and
↪ more objective stagnation
  signal than plan wording: the same normalized
↪failure can recur across
  substantively different commands while the solver
↪continues modifying parameters
  | conf:0.91 | status:hypothesis
  | evidence:seed_eval/dumps/terminus2_tb2/adaptive-
↪rejection-sampler/
  trajectory.json (steps 19,21,23,24,29,30 repeat
↪"failed to accept a sample after
  100 iterations" across parameter changes and a
↪rewrite); [...]
  | mass:~3

## Experiments
- E3: bounded pre-command content-addressed workspace
↪journal with explicit deletion
  /truncation reports -> held (db-wal-recovery
↪moved stably 0->1, the three-task
  stable subset mean rose +0.333, and no stable
↪task regressed)
- E4: overwritten/deleted-path variant ledger with a
↪third-version checkpoint -> inert
  (the edited source and initial prompt were live,
↪but no checkpoint fired on the
  only evaluated target; source inspection shows
↪the ledger compared only
  pre-existing paths, so the environment claim
↪remains ungraded)
- E6: post-stall action quarantine -> VOID (the
↪iteration-6 score moved, but no
  WORKSPACE_PROGRESS_GATE signature appears in any
↪candidate trace; without a
  candidate-distinctive live signature, those
↪numbers do not update E6)

```

Two features are worth noting because they are what the protocol asks for rather than what an LLM writes by default. E4 is retained at status:refuted instead of being

deleted, so the direction is not re-proposed later. The E6 entry records a candidate whose score moved but whose mechanism left no trace signature, and refuses to credit the belief with the movement.

B.3 A prediction and its grading

Listing 2 is prediction.md from iteration 16 of the GAIA BCO run—the candidate that became the train-frontier selected candidate and the scaffold behind the GAIA row of Table 1 in the main text—and Listing 3 is the distill block appended at the start of the next iteration, grading it. Both are abridged; one marker token is rewritten as <|tool_calls|> for typesetting.

Listing 2: prediction.md, GAIA iteration 16, abridged.

```

# iter_016 prediction

## Mode
refine -- the 'long_context / evidence_noise' cell is
↪open with one partial attempt
(evidence-summary-memory in iter_015). This round
↪refines the same family by gating the
summary turn on placeholder answers and adding a
↪quality guard, which should eliminate
the regressions while keeping the breakthroughs.

## Candidate
conservative_quality_gated_summary -- after the FC loop
↪, run the evidence-summary
final-answer turn only when the current answer is empty
↪, a <|tool_calls|> marker, or a
placeholder; only adopt the summary answer if it is
↪concrete.

## Base
iter_015 -- I copied the iter_015 source snapshot into
↪the editable tree because the
mechanism is a direct refinement of its evidence-
↪summary-memory scaffold.

## Failure mode attacked
'long_context / evidence_noise' (~10-15 train tasks per
↪the map; attempts so far: 1).

## Assumption audit
Not triggered for this cell (<3 attempts). The lower-
↪layer assumptions are: (1) the
scaffold can extract tool-call results from message
↪history, (2) a compact evidence
summary preserves enough information for the model to
↪answer, and (3) a clean summary
context produces a better final answer than a bloated
↪one for episodes whose main loop
emitted a placeholder.

## Mechanism -- the behavioral change
[...] 5. Adopt the summary answer only if it is non-
↪empty AND not itself a placeholder;
otherwise keep 'original_answer'. Any exception during
↪the summary turn also falls back
to 'original_answer'. [...] It does NOT change behavior
↪on episodes that already
produced a concrete answer, preventing the iter_015

```

```

↪regressions.

## Behavioral prediction (graded from traces)
On the subset, the agent will now keep its concrete
↪direct answers when they exist and
run the clean-context summary turn only when the main
↪loop returns a placeholder/marker.

## Aggregate prediction (graded on the subset, de-
↪noised)
- expected: the subset's mean stable-pass / mean score
↪rises by >=0.10. This is
  plausible if the 5 iter_015 breakthroughs are
↪retained and the 4 regressions are
  eliminated by the placeholder gate.
- downside bound: <=1 currently-stable-passing task
↪regresses, enforced by construction.

## Anchors (optional, STABLE episodes only --
↪illustration, not the bet)
No stable anchors are available; the relevant episodes
↪oscillate across iterations due
to endpoint stochasticity and marker noise. The
↪mechanism is justified by the general
failure family, not by a single stable episode.

## Falsification
If long-context level-2 episodes that produced
↪placeholders still fail after the summary
turn, or if concrete-answer episodes regress because
↪the summary turn overwrites them,
the mechanism is refuted.

```

Listing 3: The distill block grading Listing 2, abridged.

```

## iter_015 -> iter_016 distill
- Mode: refine
- Behavioral check (self): predicted the agent would
↪gate the evidence-summary turn on
  placeholder/empty/marker answers and preserve
↪concrete direct answers. The mechanism
  is wired correctly: comparing per-episode traces, all
↪18 tasks that passed in iter_015
  also passed in iter_016 (zero regressions), and the
↪final predictions for
  previously-regressed tasks like gaia#4fc2flae and
↪gaia#3f57289b returned to their
  correct direct answers rather than being overwritten
↪by a summary. -> behavior changed
  as predicted on the targeted subset.
- Aggregate check (self): 'long_context /
↪evidence_noise' subset (~15-20 episodes) --
  predicted the subset would gain and the 4 iter_015
↪regressions would be eliminated.
  Actual: 5 additional tasks passed vs iter_015, 0
↪regressions, overall passrate
  0.45 -> 0.575. Verdict: works.
- Unstable (multi-run, excluded): many tasks have
↪oscillated across prior iterations due
  to marker stochasticity. The zero-regression result
↪vs iter_015 is treated as the
  stable signal; individual episode flips are noise.
- Blind-spot regressions: none -- no task that passed
↪in iter_015 failed in iter_016.

```

```

- What was learned: Conservative gating is the key to
↪evidence-summary-memory: only run
  the summary turn when the main-loop answer is
↪unusable, and only adopt the summary
  answer when it is concrete.
- Belief update: 'long_context / evidence_noise' is
↪still the only open, harness-fixable
  cell, and it has stable headroom. The remaining
↪placeholder episodes after summary
  suggest the summary prompt is too permissive -- it
↪lets the model emit another
  "unknown" instead of forcing a best guess.

```

B.4 Blind-judge configuration

Both judges are run as sandboxed agents, one judgement per candidate pair, in a fresh context, with no repeats and no self-consistency voting; there is no temperature sweep, and each judge runs at the same reasoning-effort setting as the predictors. The judge sees one file, `judge_input.md`, containing the mechanically computed per-type deltas as ground truth and the two predictions anonymized as Prediction A and Prediction B; the A/B assignment is drawn per candidate from a generator seeded by `seed + iteration`, and the method-to-label map is stored so the verdict can be decoded afterwards. The judge never sees which method is which, the method names, or the world models themselves. The cross-provider replication replays the byte-identical `judge_input.md` with the same stored A/B assignment, so the judge model is the only variable. The instruction is reproduced in full:

Listing 4: The judge prompt, verbatim.

```

You are an impartial judge comparing the ACCURACY of
↪two predictions. Read
'./judge_input.md' in your working directory. It
↪contains, for ONE proposed scaffold
change:
- the OBJECTIVE realised outcome (which question types
↪actually improved / regressed,
  measured after evaluation -- this is ground truth);
- two independent predictions of that change,
↪anonymised as 'Prediction A' and
  'Prediction B'.

Decide which prediction was MORE ACCURATE about reality
↪: it named the question types
  that truly moved (gains AND regressions), caught the
↪real regressions rather than
  missing them, and got the overall net direction right.
↪Penalise predictions that claimed
  improvements that did not happen or missed regressions
↪that did. Judge ACCURACY only --
  not writing style or how good the patch was.

Write your verdict to './judge_verdict.md' with EXACTLY
↪this shape:
WINNER: <A|B|TIE>
REASONING: <2-4 sentences: which types each got right/
↪wrong vs the objective outcome,
  and why the winner is more accurate>

```

A verdict is counted as a tie when the judge writes TIE or

Benchmark	Method	Candidate	Train	Held-out
LongMemEval-s	BCO	iter027	0.710	0.5925
		iter025	0.690	0.6075
		iter020	0.690	0.5950
	VANILLA	iter030	0.590	0.5300
		iter029	0.560	0.5325
		iter025	0.560	0.4825
		iter018	0.460	0.4275
		iter015	0.490	0.4000
		iter012	0.450	0.3950
LoCoMo	BCO	iter017	0.4750	0.4534
		iter023	0.4625	0.4493
		iter026	0.4625	0.4451
	VANILLA	iter013	0.4125	0.3754
		iter016	0.4125	0.3692
		iter021	0.4125	0.3596
		iter023	0.4125	0.3437
		iter015	0.3875	0.3796

Table 4: Every candidate evaluated on the memory held-out splits, both methods. Bold is the value reported in Table 1 in the main text: the best held-out score among the method’s three highest-train candidates. Rows below each method’s train threshold were also evaluated and are listed for completeness, but are not eligible under that rule. LoCoMo’s VANILLA train scores are a five-way tie, of which four were evaluated.

when no WINNER line can be parsed; ties are excluded from the sign test and reported in parentheses in Table 2 in the main text.

C Initial-Scaffold Stability and Excluded Optimization Diagnostics

Every memory-benchmark candidate we evaluated held-out. Table 4 lists them, for both methods, with the train score that made a candidate eligible and the held-out score it returned. The reported number in Table 1 in the main text is the best held-out score among each method’s three highest-train candidates, and the table shows what that choice costs: on LongMemEval-s the eligible spread is 0.5925–0.6075 for BCO and 0.4825–0.5325 for VANILLA, on LoCoMo 0.4451–0.4534 and 0.3437–0.3754. The selection moves each method by less than the gap between the methods, but it does select partly on the held-out split and the memory rows should be read as a best-of-three.

Two candidates were evaluated despite falling outside their method’s top three and are therefore not eligible: VANILLA’s LoCoMo iter015 (train 0.3875 against a 0.4125 threshold) scored 0.3796 held-out, the highest number either method produced on that benchmark outside the eligible set, and BCO’s LongMemEval-s iter014 (train 0.66 against 0.71) scored 0.6300, the highest either method produced on that benchmark. Quoting either would raise the corresponding method’s number while abandoning the train threshold that makes the rule a rule, so neither is used.

Method	Campaign	Train	Held-out
BCO	1	0.581	0.635
BCO	2	0.548	0.558
BCO	3	0.581	0.567
VANILLA	1	0.645	0.577
VANILLA	2	0.548	0.587

Table 5: All retained Spider2-lite selected-candidate evaluations. Train has 31 tasks; held-out has 104 database-disjoint tasks. Unequal numbers of completed runs are shown rather than silently dropping a campaign.

Spider2-lite. We repeated the identical initial scaffold four times on the 104-task database-disjoint held-out split. Aggregate passrates were 0.577, 0.519, 0.558, and 0.462. At the task level, 45/104 tasks (43.3%) received both a pass and a fail across the four repeats. This makes a candidate’s observed delta a weak attribution target: the proposer may revise a belief in response to a change that would also occur without an edit.

Table 5 reports every completed selected-candidate evaluation retained for this diagnostic. The method ordering changes across campaigns, so we do not include Spider2 among the five main benchmarks or summarize it with a single winner. These runs were exploratory and were not used to define the main Terminal-Bench split.

Terminal-Bench split selection. The recorded dataset is Terminal-Bench 2.0 (89 tasks), not Terminal-Bench 2.1. An initial uncurated train split was dominated by unstable and timeout-bound tasks; its held-out scores were initial 0.470, BCO 0.463, and VANILLA 0.455. We subsequently ran repeated initial-scaffold diagnostics and selected a 20-task training subset with more repeatable failures and usable optimization headroom. The main table reports that stability-screened optimization pair. Because this selection was made after inspecting initial-scaffold behavior, it remains a potential source of benchmark and split-selection bias even though it preceded comparison of the optimized methods.

D Full Target-Swap Results

Table 6 gives the exact values underlying Figure 3 in the main text. “All” counts a context-window overrun as a failure; “common” restricts every method to tasks all three scaffolds complete. GAIA has no differential completion, so its two analyses coincide. On AppWorld the common-set restriction excludes 99, 77, and 65 BCO non-completions at high, medium, and low effort, respectively.

E Proposer Token Cost

BCO’s cost profile is not part of the paper’s claim, but we report it because the hypothesis that BCO is additional prompting would predict uniformly higher proposer token consumption, while a compact-belief account would instead predict lower consumption when the document reduces re-reading of accumulated evidence. We report *total* proposer tokens (input + output) relative to VANILLA on matched pairs (Table 7). We

Benchmark / effort	Set	N	Initial	VANILLA	BCO
GAIA / high	all	99	0.586	0.475	0.657
GAIA / medium	all	99	0.556	0.545	0.566
GAIA / low	all	99	0.444	0.465	0.485
AppWorld / high	all	372	0.556	0.685	0.516
AppWorld / high	common	273	0.590	0.696	0.703
AppWorld / medium	all	372	0.500	0.608	0.524
AppWorld / medium	common	295	0.546	0.631	0.661
AppWorld / low	all	372	0.438	0.538	0.532
AppWorld / low	common	307	0.489	0.554	0.645

Table 6: Target-model swap to gpt-5.6-luna at three reasoning-effort tiers. The three scaffolds are evaluated unchanged. One measurement per cell; non-completions count as failures in the full set.

quote tokens rather than dollars because the dollar figure tracks this metric but is provider- and cache-pricing-dependent; each row compares the two methods of one pair under a single metering stack, so the Codex-stack Terminal-Bench 2.0 row is internally consistent even though its absolute token counts are not comparable to the Kimi rows.

The observed pattern is a read–write trade. BCO reads the raw rollout traces less often (raw-trace reads down 20–69%), consistent with the compact append-only belief reducing the need to re-derive the same information from the bulky history each iteration; it writes somewhat more, since each iteration emits the updated belief and the prediction. Where the run’s evidence induces heavy re-reading, the read it saves outweighs the write it adds and the *total* token count falls.

The split across benchmarks appears to track the shape of the evidence rather than the horizon. Totals fall on the memory runs (LongMemEval-s −27.4%, LoCoMo −24.7%) and on GAIA (−12.4%), and sit at or above parity on AppWorld (+5.2%) and Terminal-Bench 2.0 (+26.2%), even though raw-trace reads fall everywhere (Figure 4). A within-run control separates the two explanations for the three runs long enough to admit it: truncating the memory and GAIA pairs at iteration 10 already reproduces the split (LongMemEval-s −37.1%, LoCoMo −24.4%, GAIA −10.0% by iteration 10), so on those pairs the saving is not an amortization effect that accrues with horizon—it is set within the first iterations by how much redundant re-reading the benchmark’s evidence induces. (The AppWorld and Terminal-Bench 2.0 pairs run $T=10$ to begin with, so the truncation is vacuous there.) Memory-QA evidence is many compact per-task artifacts from which VANILLA re-derives its understanding each iteration, and the result is consistent with reduced re-reading almost immediately; the agentic environments expose a few bulky trajectories that both methods read once, leaving little redundant reading to replace while the belief’s write cost recurs every iteration. The Terminal-Bench 2.0 pair, whose metering exposes per-session diagnostics, makes the decomposition explicit: BCO issues *fewer* tool calls and file reads per iteration than VANILLA yet emits +45% more output tokens—the surplus is belief writing, not evidence re-reading. BCO is thus not uniformly more costly under the additional-

prompting hypothesis, though it is more expensive where history re-reading does not dominate the proposer’s budget.

F Persistent Memory Without Calibration

The main comparison removes the world-model layer as a whole. To distinguish the calibration protocol from the simpler benefit of giving the proposer any cross-iteration memory, we run a three-method diagnostic on LongMemEval-s. VANILLA is the comparison method of the main experiments: each proposer call starts from the raw score, trace, and diff evidence, with no separately maintained state. The **Notes** method adds exactly one persistent file, `agent_notes.md`, which the proposer may rewrite or organize however it wishes. It imposes no prediction, falsifiable belief structure, confidence or status field, self-grading, or predict–observe–correct update. BCO is the full protocol. The middle method therefore controls for persistence and summarization without imposing calibration discipline.

Table 8 reports the best training passrate found in three independent optimization trajectories per method. Each trajectory has a nominal ten-iteration proposer budget; the score is taken over all candidates successfully evaluated within that trajectory. This is an online search diagnostic on the 100-example training split, not a substitute for the held-out comparison in Table 1 in the main text.

BCO has a modest mean lead, but the diagnostic is noisy.

The three-run means are 0.430 (VANILLA), 0.427 (Notes) and 0.467 (BCO), so BCO leads by 0.037 over VANILLA and 0.040 over Notes. However, the dispersion *within* each method exceeds both gaps. Notes spans 0.39 to 0.46 across its three trajectories: it has the highest score in Runs 1 and 2 but the lowest in Run 3. Three trajectories of a ten-iteration search on 100 training examples are therefore too noisy to establish that Notes is ineffective or that the calibration protocol reliably outperforms free-form persistent memory. We report the diagnostic because we ran it, not because it resolves the question. What does bear on it is elsewhere: Section 4.2 of the main paper is a paired held-out comparison over 400–1449 test examples, and Section 4.4 of the main paper isolates the document’s *content* against a control that holds format, length and vocabulary fixed—a cleaner contrast than one protocol against another, since it varies only the thing in dispute.

G Per-Run Breakdown of the Offline Ablation

Table 2 in the main text aggregates 40 paired candidates. Table 9 breaks the same judgements down by run, for both judges. The run is the unit at which the candidates are actually independent: within a run they share one world model and one search trajectory. Every one of the three pairings favours the same method in all four runs, under both judges—twelve run-level comparisons, twelve in the predicted direction. With four runs, a run-level sign test cannot fall below $p = 0.125$ however consistent the direction is, so we read this as replication across runs and judges rather than as a small p -value. Per-run win rates are not directly comparable across runs, since each run contributes a different candidate set sampled at different iterations.

Benchmark	T	Proposer tokens $\Delta\%$	Raw-trace reads $\Delta\%$
LongMemEval-s	30	-27.4	-20
LoCoMo	30	-24.7	-69
GAIA	20	-12.4	-46
AppWorld	10	+5.2	-23
Terminal-Bench 2.0	10	+26.2	-42

Table 7: Total proposer tokens (input + output) and raw-trace reads, BCO relative to VANILLA, across matched pairs ($\Delta\%$; negative is fewer). Totals fall on the benchmarks whose evidence induces heavy history re-reading (memory QA, GAIA) and sit at or above parity on the agentic environments whose evidence is a few bulky trajectories; on the three pairs with $T > 10$ the split is already present when the run is truncated at iteration 10 (§E), so on those it is not a horizon effect. Each row is a within-pair comparison under one metering stack (Terminal-Bench 2.0 uses the Codex stack).

Method	Run 1	Run 2	Run 3	Mean
VANILLA	0.37	0.44	0.48	0.430
Notes	0.43	0.46	0.39	0.427
BCO	0.42	0.43	0.55	0.467

Table 8: Persistent-state ablation on LongMemEval-s. Entries are the best-so-far training passrate over successfully evaluated candidates in three independent optimization trajectories (100 training examples; nominal ten-iteration proposer budget). Notes adds cross-iteration memory but no calibration protocol. Each method’s within-method range (0.11, 0.07, 0.13) is as large as or larger than any between-method difference in means. Thus, although BCO has the highest mean, the diagnostic does not establish that Notes is ineffective.

We report downside *precision* rather than recall in Table 2 in the main text for two reasons. First, recall alone rewards naming many downside types, which a scrambled document can do without using the original content—demonstrating that regressions happen is one of the channels scrambling deliberately preserves. Second, recall is undefined whenever a batch contains no realized-regressed type at all, which is the case for one of the four runs; precision is defined for all 40 candidates.

A concrete LongMemEval-s prediction. One candidate from LongMemEval-s run 1 replaces tier-priority-first context ordering with score-first ordering and removes an artificial score boost for core and summary hits. None and Intact name the same four Upside types but disagree on the downside. None predicts that ten-word compression will hurt *single-session-preference*, which instead improves by +0.25. Intact uses a belief that tier-score miscalibration suppresses evidence and predicts that removing the boost will let archival or recall hits crowd out *single-session-assistant*; that type is the one that regresses, by -0.09. The blind judge therefore selects Intact. This final-document example illustrates what downside precision measures; it is not additional independent evidence.

H Why Belief Fidelity Is Measured Offline

A cheaper-looking way to ask whether the belief improves would be to read the *online* prediction scores—the per-

Run	Judge	I vs. N	S vs. N	I vs. S
LME 1	Kimi	10-0	5-4 (1)	8-1 (1)
	DeepSeek	9-1	5-4 (1)	9-1
LoCoMo 1	Kimi	9-1	7-3	6-3 (1)
	DeepSeek	10-0	8-1 (1)	5-3 (2)
LME 2	Kimi	8-2	7-3	6-4
	DeepSeek	6-1 (3)	5-3 (2)	6-4
LoCoMo 2	Kimi	9-1	7-2 (1)	6-4
	DeepSeek	10-0	6-1 (3)	6-4
Total	Kimi	36-4	26-12 (2)	26-12 (2)
	DeepSeek	35-2 (3)	24-9 (7)	26-12 (2)

Table 9: Blind-judge wins-losses (ties in parentheses) per run, ten candidates each, under both judges. I, S and N are the Intact, Scrambled and None conditions; LME is LongMemEval-s and the digit is the run. The two judges replay identical inputs, including the same A/B position assignment, so the judge model is the only difference between the two rows of a run. All twelve run-level comparisons favour the same condition; the two judges return the same verdict on 97 of the 120 pairs.

iteration grades the proposer assigns its own prior prediction—and check whether they rise over a run. They do not rise, and the reason is that the online score is not an instrument for belief quality: what it measures drifts systematically over a run, in two ways we can quantify (Table 10).

The prediction is optimistic by construction. The protocol asks for one improvement per iteration, so the proposer names Upside types and stakes a positive net effect essentially always: the predicted net-bet midpoint is positive in 60/60 iterations across the two runs whose protocol version logs per-type scores. A predictor that must bet on improvement every round cannot raise its score by predicting fewer improvements, only by placing them better.

The positive class shrinks as the run approaches its ceiling. The upside hit rate is a precision-style metric, measured against the set of question types that actually improved—and that set thins out as the incumbent gets stronger. The fraction of types realized-improved falls from 0.389 to 0.267 on LongMemEval-s and from 0.200 to 0.083 on LoCoMo, while realized regressions become more frequent (1.6 $\rightarrow$ 2.6 and




Figure 4: Cumulative proposer tokens vs. iteration for BCO and VANILLA (five matched pairs; Table 7). On the memory benchmarks the BCO curve separates below VANILLA within the first iterations and stays below—the token accounting is consistent with reduced history re-reading from early on, not via late amortization. On AppWorld the two lines nearly coincide, with BCO crossing slightly above only at the final iteration, and on Terminal-Bench 2.0 BCO rises above mid-run: with a few bulky trajectories there is little redundant reading to save, while the belief’s write cost recurs every iteration.

Per-iteration quantity	LME (run 2)		LoCoMo (run 2)	
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Upside hit rate	0.464	0.244	0.267	0.133
Base rate: types improved	0.389	0.267	0.200	0.083
Hit rate — base rate	0.076	−0.022	0.067	0.050
Types regressed (count)	1.6	2.6	0.9	1.5
Predicted net effect > 0	15/15	15/15	15/15	15/15

which re-derives each iteration’s per-type deltas from the stored score tables and recovers the logged hit rates exactly.

Table 10: First and second half of two 30-iteration BCO runs; LME is LongMemEval-s. The online upside hit rate falls, but so does the fraction of question types that improve at all; the hit rate’s excess over that base rate falls much less. The predicted net effect is positive in every iteration of both runs, so the online score cannot separate a better belief from an easier or harder round.

0.9 → 1.5 types per iteration). Against a shrinking positive class, a predictor of constant skill mechanically loses hit rate.

Both effects are visible in the numbers. The raw upside hit rate falls (0.464 → 0.244 and 0.267 → 0.133 between the halves of the two runs), but once the base rate is subtracted the decline is much smaller (0.076 → −0.022 and 0.067 → 0.050), and on LoCoMo it is almost entirely base-rate drift. The mirror image appears in the same logs: downside recall, whose base rate *grows* as regressions become more common, is flat or rising (0.427 → 0.431 and 0.682 → 0.875). Both curves track their own base rates more closely than they track anything about the belief, which is why the paper measures belief fidelity with the offline comparison of Section 4.4 of the main paper, where every predictor faces the same fixed candidates and the base rate is held constant by construction. The recomputation is reproducible with `scripts/analysis/el_base_rate_drift.py`,