

MODULARRSI: MODULAR AND GENERALIZABLE RECURSIVE HARNESS SELF-IMPROVEMENT

Siwei Wu^{2,3,*}, Jincheng Ren^{4,6,*}, Yizhi Li^{3,†}, Haau-Sing Li³, Chengran Yang³, Yuxuan Zhang³, Weicheng Gu³, Jian Yang^{1,‡}, Riza Batista-Navarro², Chuanyi Zhang⁶, Xianglong Liu¹, Ming Zhou⁵, Bryan Dai³, Chenghua Lin^{2,‡}

¹Beihang University, ²University of Manchester, ³IQuest Research,

⁴M-A-P, ⁵Langboat, ⁶Hohai University

{siwei.wu-2@postgrad., chenghua.lin@}manchester.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Recent work extends Recursive Self-Improvement (RSI) to agent harnesses for long-horizon coding and terminal tasks, enabling agents to improve their execution mechanisms from experience. However, achieving and demonstrating **generalizable harness RSI** remains challenging. First, existing approaches often evolve harnesses directly on evaluation benchmarks or subsets drawn from them, making it difficult to distinguish reusable harness improvements from benchmark-specific adaptation. Second, updates derived from individual trajectories can entangle systematic harness deficiencies with instance-specific reasoning and solution details, leading to task-specific modifications that transfer poorly to unseen tasks. Third, even when recurring behavioral deficiencies are identified, localizing them to the responsible components within a monolithic harness remains difficult. Whole-harness optimization can therefore entangle unrelated mechanisms and produce changes that are difficult to attribute and validate. We propose **ModularRSI**, a benchmark-disjoint, contrastive, and modular framework for generalizable harness evolution. ModularRSI contrasts successful and failed trajectories for the same task and aggregates evidence across tasks to identify recurring behavioral deficiencies. It further decomposes the evolvable harness into five functional modules: *Agent Loop*, *Tool Use*, *Observation Management*, *Context Management*, and *Task Completion Detection*. Each module is evolved independently within a restricted modification scope, after which an integration stage combines the evolved modules into a unified harness and resolves potential conflicts among them. To evaluate generalization beyond evolution experience, we additionally curate 2,000 executable evolution tasks from external data sources that are disjoint from downstream evaluation benchmarks. Experiments on TerminalBench 2.0 and SWE-Bench Verified show consistent improvements on unseen in-domain and cross-domain tasks, with the evolved harness also transferring across different foundation models. All our code and datasets are available at <https://github.com/IQuestLab/ModularRSI>.

1 INTRODUCTION

CLI agents have achieved remarkable performance on complex software engineering and terminal-based tasks (Jimenez et al., 2024a; Deng et al., 2025; Merrill et al., 2026b; Hong et al., 2026). Beyond foundation models, their effectiveness increasingly depends on agent harnesses that govern execution, tool interaction, context management, and environment feedback. Recent work has therefore explored recursive self-improvement (RSI) of harnesses, allowing agents to refine these mechanisms from execution experience.

However, achieving **generalizable harness RSI** remains challenging because task-level outcomes provide only coarse supervision for harness evolution. We identify three coupled challenges. First, there is a **data-level challenge in obtaining high-quality evolution experience**. Harness RSI requires executable long-horizon terminal tasks with reliable environments and correctness feedback,

but constructing such an evolution dataset at sufficient scale and diversity is costly and difficult. Although recent work has explored automatically generating terminal-related instances, ensuring their environment completeness, task validity, and evaluator reliability at scale remains challenging, limiting the availability of high-quality data for Harness RSI (Pi et al., 2026; Wu et al., 2026a). Consequently, existing Harness RSI methods typically rely on data from downstream benchmarks for evolution (Lee et al., 2026; Lin et al., 2026; Du et al., 2026; Chen et al., 2026a; Pan et al., 2026; Luo et al., 2026a; Nguyen et al., 2026), which makes it difficult to determine whether the evolved harness captures generalizable improvements or merely adapts to benchmark-specific patterns. Second, there is a **trajectory-level ambiguity in identifying what should be improved**. Individual or one-sided execution trajectories entangle systematic harness deficiencies with task-specific reasoning and solution details. Optimizing directly from such evidence may therefore introduce task-specific behaviors that transfer poorly to unseen tasks. Third, there is a **mechanism-level credit-assignment problem**: even when a recurring behavioral deficiency is identified, it remains unclear which harness component should be modified. Although some recent work explores localized diagnosis and repair (Chen et al., 2026a), many approaches still optimize or rewrite large portions of the harness (Lin et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2026a; Lee et al., 2026; Pan et al., 2026). This large modification space can entangle unrelated mechanisms, making targeted and reliable evolution difficult.

To address these challenges, we propose **ModularRSI**, a **contrastive and modular credit-assignment framework for harness self-evolution**. ModularRSI translates coarse task-level outcomes into localized harness evolution signals by contrasting successful and failed trajectories and aggregating evidence across tasks to identify recurring behavioral deficiencies. To further localize these deficiencies, we decompose the evolvable harness into five functional modules: Agent Loop, Tool Use, Observation Management, Context Management, and Task Completion Detection. Each module is evolved independently within a restricted modification scope, and the resulting improvements are subsequently integrated into a unified harness. This design reduces both task-specific adaptation and interference across unrelated harness mechanisms.

To evaluate whether these improvements generalize beyond the evolution experience, we further establish a **benchmark-disjoint evolution protocol** with 2,000 independently curated executable tasks that are fully disjoint from downstream evaluation benchmarks. The evolved harness is frozen before evaluation, and proposed modifications are retained only after validation for correctness, executability, and task-specific overfitting.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

1. We propose **ModularRSI**, a contrastive and modular framework that addresses the credit-assignment problem in harness self-evolution. By combining same-task trajectory contrast, cross-task evidence aggregation, and module-restricted evolution, ModularRSI converts coarse task-level outcomes into localized harness modification signals while reducing task-specific and cross-mechanism interference.
2. We establish a **benchmark-disjoint evolution protocol** for evaluating generalizable Harness RSI. We independently curate 2,000 executable evolution tasks from external data sources and apply instance-level similarity filtering and fine-grained domain analysis to minimize overlap with downstream benchmarks, providing a standardized evolution resource for studying transferable harness improvements.
3. We extensively evaluate ModularRSI on **TerminalBench 2.0** and **SWE-Bench Verified**. The evolved harness consistently improves performance on unseen in-domain and out-of-domain tasks and transfers across different foundation models. Our controlled studies further show that independently evolving and merging harness modules substantially outperforms joint or non-modular evolution, while different modules contribute complementary improvements to execution reliability and interaction efficiency.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 AGENT HARNESSES AND SELF-IMPROVEMENT

Alongside advances in coding models such as LoopCoder and IQuest-Coder-V1 (Yang et al., 2026b;a), executable environments and verified trajectories provide scalable signals for agent im-

Method	Modular Evolution	Whole-Harness Evolution	Not Use Benchmark Data
AutoHarness (Lou et al., 2026b)	✗	✗	✗
Meta-Harness (Lee et al., 2026)	✗	✓	✗
AHE (Lin et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗
Self-Harness (Zhang et al., 2026a)	✗	✗	✗
RHO (Pan et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗
HarnessFix (Chen et al., 2026a)	✓	✗	✗
Living-Harness (Du et al., 2026)	✓	✗	✗
HarnessForge (Chen et al., 2026b)	✓	✓	✗
HarnessBank (Luo et al., 2026a)	✓	✓	✗
RSEA (Nguyen et al., 2026)	✓	✗	✗
TACO (Ren et al., 2026)	✗	✗	✗
ModularRSI (Ours)	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: Comparison of representative self-evolving agent and harness frameworks. Do Not Use Benchmark Data indicates whether benchmark instances, trajectories, or benchmark-derived rewards are excluded from harness evolution.

provement (Wu et al., 2026a; Gandhi et al., 2026; Cheng et al., 2026). Prior work uses such experience to adapt model weights (Wang et al., 2026c; Zweiger et al., 2026; Luo et al., 2026b), accumulate reusable skills or context artifacts (Zhang et al., 2026c; Yan et al., 2026), and optimize prompts or external agent mechanisms through trajectory feedback (Agrawal et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2026d; Fan et al., 2026). Other approaches use execution traces to diagnose failures and localize editable components (Lin et al., 2026; Chen et al., 2026a), while recent work directly evolves agent implementations or synthesizes harness code (Zhang et al., 2026b; Lou et al., 2026a; Lee et al., 2026). TACO further specializes harness evolution to observation compression for terminal agents (Ren et al., 2026).

2.2 GENERALIZATION IN SELF-IMPROVEMENT

A central challenge in self-improvement is distinguishing transferable improvements from adaptation to the development data. Data selection therefore matters: source-aware rubrics and shortcut filtering help ensure that learning signals reflect the intended capability (Wang et al., 2026a; Zhang et al., 2026e). Existing evaluations cover repository repair, terminal interaction, and online workflows (Deng et al., 2025; Merrill et al., 2026a; Zhang et al., 2026f), while HarnessDev and broader studies explicitly examine harness evolution, feedback budgets, and held-out generalization (Wu et al., 2026b; Wang et al., 2026b). Aspire studies weight and harness evolution under hidden evaluation (Wu et al., 2026c), and S³Gym separates self-testing, self-judging, and improvement through history, memory, or parameter updates (Shi et al., 2026).

Despite these advances, existing harness-evolution methods often rely on data drawn from evaluation benchmarks or treat the harness as a monolithic whole, leaving broadly generalizable, fine-grained harness improvement underexplored. To address these limitations, we construct a benchmark-disjoint evolution dataset and propose ModularRSI, which decomposes the harness into functional modules and performs self-evolution through contrastive trajectory analysis.

3 METHOD

Existing harness self-evolution methods face a fundamental **credit-assignment problem**: task-level rewards indicate whether an execution succeeds or fails, but provide limited guidance on which harness mechanisms are responsible and how they should be improved. To address this challenge, we propose **ModularRSI**, which decomposes the behavioral components of a harness into independently evolvable modules and uses contrastive trajectory analysis to translate task-level outcomes into localized function-level evolution signals.




Figure 1: Overview of ModularRSI. The framework collects and analyzes contrastive trajectories, performs module-wise harness modification, and retains modifications through validation gates.

3.1 OVERVIEW OF MODULARRSI

As illustrated in Fig. 1, ModularRSI consists of three stages: (i) **Contrastive Trajectory Sampling and Analysis**, which identifies recurring harness weaknesses from successful and failed executions; (ii) **Module-wise Harness Evolution**, which converts these findings into localized function updates; and (iii) **Validation Gates**, which filter proposed modifications through program checks, generalization-oriented diff review, and execution validation.

Starting from a shared initial harness, we decompose its behavioral mechanisms into five functional modules. During module-wise evolution, the modules are evolved independently without sharing intermediate updates, allowing them to be processed in parallel. For each module, ModularRSI analyzes trajectory evidence in batches and restricts modifications to its functional scope. The agent under evolution itself serves as the **Code-Modify Agent** for both trajectory analysis and harness modification. After all five modules have been evolved independently, we perform **Cross-Module Integration** to combine the evolved modules into a unified harness and resolve potential conflicts among their modifications.

To control the growing function library, we apply **Function Merge** to remove redundant functions and use a **Task-Aware Function Composer** to activate only task-relevant functions. After all module-level evolution is completed, the evolved modules are combined and refined through cross-module integration. The resulting function library is then frozen for downstream evaluation.

3.2 HARNESS MODULARIZATION

A harness contains both infrastructure-level components and behavioral mechanisms. Since components such as sandbox initialization, parallel execution, and LLM communication mainly concern system infrastructure rather than task-solving behavior, ModularRSI restricts evolution to mechanisms that directly mediate agent–environment interaction. Based on our analysis of existing harness implementations and execution trajectories, we organize these mechanisms into five functional modules:

1. **Agent Loop.** Controls the iterative reasoning–action–observation process, including execution flow, interaction control, and recovery behavior.
2. **Observation Management.** Processes environmental feedback by preserving task-relevant information while filtering or compressing noisy observations.
3. **Tool Use.** Manages the selection, invocation, and validation of external tools.
4. **Context Management.** Maintains and organizes interaction history across execution steps, including information retention, compression, and retrieval.

5. Task Completion Detection. Determines whether the task has been completed or further interaction is required.

Specifically, the Agent Loop coordinates the outputs of the other modules and constructs prompts for the LLM to interact with the environment, while the remaining modules process different types of information required during execution. Details of the interactions among modules and the function interfaces within each module are provided in Appendix A.

We use Terminus-2 from Harbor (Merrill et al., 2026b) as the initial harness and reorganize its behavioral mechanisms into these five modules, which serve as the shared starting point for subsequent module-wise evolution.

3.3 CONTRASTIVE TRAJECTORY SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS

For each evolution instance x_i , we roll out the agent K times, obtaining trajectories $(tra_i^1, tra_i^2, \dots, tra_i^K)$. Each trajectory is evaluated by the task-specific evaluator and assigned a binary reward r_i^k , where $r_i^k = 1$ indicates success and $r_i^k = 0$ indicates failure. Based on the rollout rewards, we divide tasks into three groups:

$$\mathcal{G}_i = \begin{cases} \text{Positive,} & \sum_k r_i^k = K, \\ \text{Contrastive,} & 0 < \sum_k r_i^k < K, \\ \text{Negative,} & \sum_k r_i^k = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

We further maintain a **Trajectory Memory** that stores historical trajectories and their rewards for each task across evolution epochs. This allows experience from previous epochs to provide additional contrastive evidence when the current rollouts alone are insufficient.

The Code-Modify Agent analyzes each group according to the available trajectory evidence. For the **Contrastive group**, successful and failed trajectories of the same task are paired and compared to identify function-level factors associated with different outcomes. For the **Negative group**, where all current rollouts fail, the agent first queries the Trajectory Memory for a previously successful trajectory of the same task. If one exists, it is paired with a current failed trajectory for contrastive analysis. Otherwise, the agent performs single-sided diagnosis over the failed trajectories to identify evident execution deficiencies, such as repetitive loops, incorrect tool usage, ineffective recovery, or premature termination. For the **Positive group**, where all rollouts succeed, the analysis focuses on opportunities to improve execution quality and efficiency, such as redundant actions, repetitive exploration, or unnecessary tool calls.

After analyzing all tasks in a batch, the Code-Modify Agent consolidates the diagnoses into structured findings in JSON format. Each finding specifies the module under analysis, supporting trajectory evidence, the rationale for or against modification, and a proposed change when applicable. The detailed analysis prompt and output schema are provided in Appendix B and Appendix C.1.

3.4 MODULE-WISE HARNESS MODIFICATION

Based on the findings identified in Sec. 3.3, we again employ the **Code-Modify Agent** to modify the corresponding harness functions through two mechanisms designed to improve modification reliability.

Modification Target Selection. For each batch, we first consolidate semantically similar diagnoses that target the same function into candidate modifications. Each candidate is then assigned a vote count based on the number of distinct tasks that provide supporting evidence. We prioritize the highest-ranked candidates for subsequent evolution, favoring modifications supported across multiple tasks while reducing the influence of instance-specific failures.

Evolution History. To reduce redundant or conflicting modifications and mitigate evolution oscillation across iterations, we maintain an *Evolution History* for each function being updated. The history records previous code changes and the functionality introduced by each revision. By exposing these historical changes to the Code-Modify Agent, subsequent updates can better preserve previously evolved functionality while avoiding repeated or contradictory modifications.

The prompts used for harness evolution are provided in Appendix C.2.

3.5 VALIDATION GATES

Only validated modifications are retained during evolution. After each function update, we apply a sequence of validation gates to ensure that the modified harness remains executable and compatible with the surrounding system.

Program Check. We first perform a series of static checks on the modified harness, including AST validation, import checks, protocol compliance, discovery-contract verification, and static self-attribute audits. If a modification fails any of these checks, we use the recorded diffs to roll back the affected function to its previous version.

Diff Review. To mitigate the risk of task-specific modifications, we ask the Code-Modify Agent to review each modification diff. The agent checks whether the introduced changes encode task-specific solutions, heuristics, or conditions that are unlikely to generalize beyond the current training instances. Modifications identified as overly task-specific are rejected and rolled back. The review prompt is provided in Appendix C.3.

Execution Validation. Finally, we validate the executability of the modified harness through actual task execution. After each modification, we randomly sample two tasks from the current batch and execute them using the updated harness. If the modification introduces runtime errors or violates the expected execution protocol, we use the recorded diffs to roll back the harness to its previous version.

3.6 CROSS-MODULE INTEGRATION

After the five modules have been evolved independently, their validated variants are combined into a unified harness. Since independently optimized modules may introduce duplicated mechanisms, conflicting behaviors, or inconsistent interactions when composed together, direct combination may not produce a coherent final system.

We therefore perform an additional **cross-module integration epoch** on the evolution set. The integrated harness is executed on evolution tasks, and the Code-Modify Agent analyzes the resulting trajectories to identify cross-module conflicts. It then refines module interactions by removing duplicated mechanisms, clarifying module responsibilities, and adjusting coordination logic where necessary.

After integration, the evolved function library is frozen and no further modifications are allowed during downstream evaluation. The prompt used for cross-module integration is provided in Appendix C.4.

3.7 FUNCTION LIBRARY MANAGEMENT

ModularRSI maintains an expanding library of evolved functions. We introduce two complementary mechanisms to control its complexity: Function Merge reduces redundancy in the persistent library, while Task-Aware Function Composition restricts the functions activated for each task.

Function Merge. Within each module, an LLM compares the descriptions and behaviors of its functions and merges those with highly similar or overlapping functionality, reducing redundancy while preserving their learned capabilities.

Task-Aware Function Composition. It dynamically constructs the active harness for each task. Each evolved function is associated with a natural-language description of its current behavior. Given the task description and the descriptions of all candidate functions, an LLM selects a subset of task-relevant functions, and only these functions are activated during execution.

Those mechanisms are used during both trajectory collection and downstream evaluation. This allows the underlying function library to expand through evolution while keeping the active harness compact and task-specific.




Figure 2: The data distribution of our evolution data.

4 EVOLUTION DATASET AND PROTOCOL

To construct diverse and generalizable evolution instances, we first extract high-level domain information (i.e., task category labels) from mainstream terminal-related benchmarks, including the **TerminalBench** and **SWE-Bench** families. Using these category labels as search guidance, human annotators retrieve relevant publicly available resources from external sources, including but not limited to GitHub repositories¹, Hugging Face², Kaggle³, and Linux kernel documentation⁴. The retrieved resources are then used as source materials to construct new executable tasks in the Harbor format. Importantly, downstream benchmarks provide only high-level domain guidance for resource retrieval; no benchmark instances or task-specific information are used during task construction.

We apply a multi-stage quality-control pipeline to the constructed instances. First, LLM-based filtering evaluates three aspects: **Environment Completeness**, ensuring that all required data, dependencies, files, and tools are available; **Practicality and Non-triviality**, excluding artificial or overly simple tasks with limited reasoning or environment interaction; and **Evaluator Validity**, requiring the test suite to assess functional correctness rather than superficial completion signals. We then perform executable validation by requiring the reference `solution.sh` to pass all task-specific tests while ensuring that a no-op submission cannot receive a positive reward. Finally, each instance is manually reviewed for task clarity, environment completeness, and evaluator correctness, followed by LLM-based semantic similarity screening to remove instances with high overlap with downstream benchmarks.

As shown in Fig. 2, this pipeline yields 2,000 high-quality, benchmark-disjoint evolution instances. The data are relatively balanced across task categories, with broadly comparable distributions for TB-related and SWE-related instances. Overlap between the two groups is limited by their distinct construction sources: SWE-related tasks are built around GitHub repositories and require repository-level software engineering, whereas TB-related tasks are constructed for direct interaction with terminal environments.

This standardized evolution set provides a shared foundation for our experiments and future research on harness self-evolution, enabling evaluation of whether Harness RSI methods learn generalizable improvements rather than adaptations to downstream evaluation benchmarks.

¹<https://github.com/>

²<https://huggingface.co/>

³<https://www.kaggle.com/>

⁴<https://docs.kernel.org/>

5 EXPERIMENT SETTING

5.1 BENCHMARKS

To validate the effectiveness of ModularRSI, we evaluate it against the baseline on two recent and challenging terminal-related benchmarks: **TerminalBench 2.0** (Merrill et al., 2026b) and **SWE-Bench-Verified** (Jimenez et al., 2024b). TerminalBench 2.0 contains **89** diverse long-horizon terminal tasks, while SWE-Bench-Verified contains **500** human-validated software engineering tasks from real-world repositories. Together, they provide complementary evaluation of general terminal interaction and repository-level software engineering. For reproducibility, we use the original released benchmark versions and conduct all evaluations under the Harbor framework.

5.2 METRICS

Considering the stability of the evaluation results and the need to compare both the efficiency and performance of different harnesses, we evaluate the following four metrics:

Accuracy (Acc): Accuracy measures the average success rate over all rollout trajectories. A trajectory is considered successful if the agent successfully completes the corresponding task according to the task-specific evaluator.

Pass@3: Pass@3 measures whether the agent can successfully solve a task within three independent rollout attempts. A task is counted as solved if at least one of the three trajectories succeeds, and the final score is averaged across all evaluation tasks.

StepNum: Average Step measures the average number of agent-environment interaction steps required per rollout. It reflects the execution efficiency of the agent, with fewer steps generally indicating a more efficient problem-solving process.

Pass³: Pass³ measures the consistency and reliability of the agent across 3 independent rollout attempts. A task is counted as successfully solved only if all 3 trajectories succeed, and the final score is averaged across all evaluation tasks.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

In our experiments, all evolution processes, including single-module evolution and joint-module evolution, are conducted for **3 epochs**. Due to computational and time constraints, we select **120** instances from each of the TB-related and SWE-related subsets of the 2,000-instance evolution dataset for harness evolution. The primary models used for evolution are **DeepSeek-V4-Flash-Preview** and **DeepSeek-V4-Flash-0731**. We provision the deployed models with a **TPM limit of 2 million tokens** and use a **batch size of 10** throughout the evolution process.

6 RESULTS

6.1 GENERALIZATION BEYOND EVOLUTION EXPERIENCE

The central challenge of Harness RSI is not only improving performance on the tasks used for evolution, but discovering harness modifications that generalize beyond the evolution experience. To evaluate this capability, we construct two independent evolution sets, i.e., TB-related and SWE-related. From each set, we sample 120 instances for harness evolution, resulting in 120 TB-related and 120 SWE-related evolution tasks. We then evaluate the evolved harnesses on both TerminalBench 2.0 and SWE-Bench-Verified under in-domain and out-of-domain settings. The evolution sets are completely isolated from the evaluation benchmarks, preventing direct exposure to evaluation tasks during evolution.

As shown in Table 2, with **DeepSeek-V4-Flash-Preview** as the backbone model, ModularRSI consistently improves performance across both evaluation benchmarks under different evolution settings. In the in-domain setting, the evolved harness improves accuracy from 47.57 to 52.43 on TerminalBench 2.0 and from 73.40 to 76.45 on SWE-Bench-Verified. We further analyze perfor-

Table 2: Cross-benchmark transfer of frozen evolved harnesses. After evolution on TB-related or SWE-related tasks, each harness is frozen and evaluated on both held-out benchmarks using the same inference backbone.

Evolution Set	SWE-Bench-Verified				TerminalBench 2.0			
	Eval. Setting	Acc $\uparrow$	Pass@3 $\uparrow$	Pass ³ $\uparrow$	Eval. Setting	Acc $\uparrow$	Pass@3 $\uparrow$	Pass ³ $\uparrow$
No Evolution	–	73.40	83.20	62.80	–	47.57	58.43	30.34
TB-Related	Out-of-Domain	75.80	84.67	66.20	In-Domain	52.43	65.17	35.96
SWE-Related	In-Domain	76.45	85.30	66.80	Out-of-Domain	49.40	60.67	30.34

Table 3: Generalization across different inference models with a frozen evolved harness on TerminalBench 2.0.

Inference Model	Method	Acc $\uparrow$	Pass@3 $\uparrow$	Pass ³ $\uparrow$
GLM-5.2	Baseline	59.55	70.79	46.07
	ModularRSI	61.80	74.16	49.44
MiniMax-2.5	Baseline	41.57	56.18	24.72
	ModularRSI (Ours)	44.94	57.30	30.34
DeepSeek-V4-Flash	Baseline	47.57	58.43	30.34
	ModularRSI (Ours)	52.43	65.17	35.96

mance across successive RSI generations and observe a largely monotonic improvement throughout the evolution process (see Appendix F).

More importantly, these gains transfer beyond the evolution domain. The harness evolved on TB-related data improves SWE-Bench-Verified accuracy to 75.80, while the harness evolved on SWE-related data improves TerminalBench 2.0 accuracy to 49.40. These results suggest that ModularRSI discovers reusable improvements to the underlying agent execution mechanism, rather than merely specializing to the tasks encountered during evolution.

Notably, the gain is particularly pronounced for Pass³ on TerminalBench 2.0, which increases from 30.34 to 35.96. This improvement suggests that harness evolution not only increases average task-solving capability but also enhances execution reliability, reducing stochastic failures across repeated trials.

6.2 CROSS-MODEL GENERALIZATION

Beyond task-level generalization, we further examine whether the discovered harness improvements are transferable across different foundation models. Since different models exhibit different behaviors in planning, tool interaction, and error recovery, a model-specific optimization may fail to generalize.

To evaluate this capability, we freeze the harness evolved with DeepSeek-V4-Flash Preview on the TB-related evolution set and apply it to different foundation models on TerminalBench 2.0.

As shown in Table. 3, the evolved harness consistently improves Acc, Pass@3, and Pass³ across all evaluated foundation models. For example, the evolved harness improves GLM-5.2 accuracy from 59.55 to 61.80 and MiniMax-2.5 accuracy from 41.57 to 44.94.

These results demonstrate that ModularRSI learns transferable improvements to the agent execution process rather than exploiting model-specific behaviors.

6.3 EFFECT OF MODULAR EVOLUTION

As shown in Table 4, independently evolving modules and then integrating them achieves the best overall performance, improving Acc from 47.57 to 52.43. In contrast, both joint and non-modular evolution reduce accuracy below the baseline. This suggests that restricting the modification scope helps reduce interference when optimizing the harness.

Table 4: Comparison of different harness evolution strategies on TerminalBench 2.0.

Method	Acc $\uparrow$	Pass@3 $\uparrow$	Pass ³ $\uparrow$	StepNum $\downarrow$
Baseline	47.57	58.43	30.34	34.70
Non-modular Evolution	46.44	64.04	24.72	29.03
Joint All-Module Evolution	44.19	61.80	24.72	44.34
ModularRSI (Ours)	52.43	65.17	35.96	35.57

Table 5: Performance of single-module evolution and cross-module integration on TerminalBench 2.0. Each row under *Single-Module Evolution* reports the harness obtained by independently evolving only the corresponding module from the same baseline. *ModularRSI (Ours)* further integrates the five independently evolved modules through Cross-Module Integration to construct the final evolved harness.

Method	Acc $\uparrow$	Pass@3 $\uparrow$	Pass ³ $\uparrow$	StepNum $\downarrow$
Baseline	47.57	58.43	30.34	34.70
<i>Single-Module Evolution</i>				
Context Management	49.44	61.80	31.40	35.10
Tool Use	50.19	62.92	30.34	41.28
Agent Loop	50.56	64.04	34.83	40.40
Observation Management	49.81	65.17	33.70	22.50
Task Completion Detection	49.44	65.17	31.40	31.06
<i>Cross-Module Integration</i>				
ModularRSI (Ours)	52.43	65.17	35.96	35.57

We further examine the contribution of each independently evolved module before integration. Since ModularRSI evolves all five modules independently for three epochs each, evaluating single-module variants also helps assess whether improvements can be achieved without the larger aggregate trajectory budget of the full framework. As shown in Table 5, all single-module variants improve accuracy over the baseline, with different modules providing distinct benefits. Agent Loop yields the largest single-module accuracy gain, whereas Observation Management substantially reduces the average number of execution steps. Integrating the independently evolved modules further increases Acc to 52.43 and Pass³ to 35.96, suggesting that the modules capture complementary improvements that can be effectively combined.

6.4 COMPARING WITH EXISTING RSI METHODS

Considering task compatibility, reproducibility, and method performance, we adapt and reproduce **AHE** and **Meta-Harness** under a unified experimental protocol. Specifically, all methods are adapted to the Harbor framework and evolve from the same **Terminus-2** harness using the same 120 evolution instances. ModularRSI evolves each module independently for three epochs, followed by a merging stage. To match the aggregate number of evolution rounds, accounting for both module-wise evolution and merging in ModularRSI, we evolve AHE and Meta-Harness for 16 epochs. For all methods, the harness from the final generation is evaluated on the downstream benchmark. All methods use **DeepSeek-V4-Flash-0731** for both evolution and evaluation, with the same TPM limit of 2M tokens per minute. We additionally disable web search for all methods to prevent the evolved harnesses from retrieving task solutions from external sources.

Table 6: Comparison with existing harness evolution methods on TerminalBench 2.0.

Method	Acc $\uparrow$	Pass@3 $\uparrow$	Pass ³ $\uparrow$
Baseline	61.79	73.03	50.56
Meta-Harness	62.92	74.16	50.56
AHE	62.54	73.03	51.69
ModularRSI (Ours)	67.42	78.65	56.18

As shown in Tab. 6, although existing RSI methods can achieve strong performance when evolving directly on benchmark data, their improvements are much more limited under our benchmark-disjoint protocol. Both AHE and Meta-Harness remain close to the Terminus-2 baseline, with accuracy changes of approximately one percentage point, whereas ModularRSI improves accuracy by

more than five points. This substantially larger gain demonstrates the stronger generalizability of ModularRSI to unseen tasks.

6.5 THE EFFECT OF CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS

Our ModularRSI leverages contrastive trajectory analysis and modular evolution to more accurately localize deficiencies in the harness and identify generalizable harness improvements. To examine the role of contrastive analysis, we analyze both the proportion of contrastive trajectory pairs during evolution and representative case studies.

Specifically, as shown in Fig. 3, we report the proportion of contrastive trajectory pairs among all trajectory groups in each epoch on Terminal-Bench 2.0. As evolution progresses, the proportion of available contrastive pairs gradually decreases. This trend suggests that the harness progressively incorporates the reusable behavioral improvements revealed by these contrastive examples, thereby reducing the occurrence of cases in which successful and failed trajectories coexist for the same task.

In addition, the case studies in Appendix D further illustrate how our Contrastive Trajectory Analysis helps identify generalizable harness improvements. In particular, comparing successful and failed trajectories exposes key behavioral differences, allowing ModularRSI to abstract them into reusable harness mechanisms rather than task-specific fixes.




Figure 3: The contrastive trajectory pairs ratio variation during evolution.

6.6 EFFECT OF EVOLUTION DATA QUALITY

Beyond the evolution strategy, the quality of evolution experience also affects the effectiveness of Harness RSI. Since harness evolution relies on execution feedback to identify systematic failures and improve interaction strategies, the informativeness of evolution tasks is crucial. In particular, the difficulty distribution of evolution data plays an important role in determining the quality of evolution signals. Moderately difficult tasks are more likely to provide informative contrasts: easy tasks contain insufficient failure cases, while extremely difficult tasks rarely yield successful trajectories that reveal effective interaction strategies. Therefore, we hypothesize that a balanced difficulty distribution can facilitate the discovery of generalizable harness improvements.

To verify this hypothesis, we construct two evolution settings with different difficulty distributions: a *Medium-centered* setting and a *Hard & Easy* setting. The detailed procedure for constructing these evolution datasets is described in the Appendix. E.

As shown in Fig. 4, the Medium-centered setting achieves consistently stronger improvement throughout the evolution process. Moreover, as shown in Tab. 7 the evolved harness generalizes better to downstream evaluation: the harness evolved with the Medium-centered distribution achieves 76.45% accuracy on SWE-Bench Verified, outperforming the Hard & Easy setting by 2.20 percentage points (74.25%). This demonstrates that evolution data with more informative trajectory contrasts leads to more effective and generalizable harness improvements.




Figure 4: Accuracy variation during evolution under different difficulty distributions. DeepSeek-V4-Flash Preview is used as the foundation model.

Table 7: Performance of Harnesses Evolved with Different Evolution-Data Distributions on SWE-Bench Verified.

Difficulty Distribution	Acc $\uparrow$
Medium-centered	76.45
Hard & Easy	74.25

7 LIMITATIONS AND CONCLUSION

We present **ModularRSI**, a benchmark-disjoint and modular framework for generalizable harness self-improvement. By contrasting execution trajectories and evolving harness modules independently, ModularRSI identifies reusable mechanism-level improvements while reducing task-specific adaptation. Experiments on TerminalBench 2.0 and SWE-Bench Verified demonstrate consistent gains across unseen tasks, domains, and foundation models.

Our study has several limitations. First, we do not conduct a dedicated ablation that isolates the contribution of contrastive trajectory analysis, although our trajectory analysis and case studies provide supporting evidence. In addition, due to computational cost, our main evolution experiments use only a subset of the 2,000 curated evolution instances. We leave broader comparisons and larger-scale studies to future work.

Overall, our results demonstrate the potential of benchmark-disjoint, contrastive, and modular evolution for building more generalizable self-improving agent harnesses.

REFERENCES

- Lakshya A Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziemis, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J Ryan, Meng Jiang, et al. Gepa: Reflective prompt evolution can outperform reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2026, pp. 8479–8565, 2026.
- Mengzhuo Chen, Junjie Wang, Zhe Liu, Yawen Wang, Haiming Zheng, and Qing Wang. From failed trajectories to reliable llm agents: Diagnosing and repairing harness flaws. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.06324*, 2026a.
- Mingju Chen, Can Lv, Guibin Zhang, Heng Chang, and Shiji Zhou. Harnessforge: Joint harness and policy evolution for adaptive agent systems, 2026b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.01779>.
- Zihao Cheng, Hongru Wang, Zeming Liu, Xinyi Wang, Xiangrong Zhu, Yuhang Guo, Wei Lin, Jeff Z Pan, and Yunhong Wang. Terminal-world: Scaling terminal-agent environments via agent skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.20876*, 2026.
- Xiang Deng, Jeff Da, Edwin Pan, Yannis Yiming He, Charles Ide, Kanak Garg, Niklas Lauffer, Andrew Park, Nitin Pasari, Chetan Rane, et al. Swe-bench pro: Can ai agents solve long-horizon software engineering tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.16941*, 2025.
- Yuetian Du, Yucheng Wang, He Xu, Jiexu Xu, Shanwen Tan, Bing Zhao, Boyu Yang, Zhijie Xu, Ming Kong, Hu Wei, Jie Liu, and Qiang Zhu. Living-harness is an interactive-agent evolver, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.26598>.
- Yingying Fan, Penghui Du, Leyan Zhu, Runze He, Zimeng Wu, Yuxuan Zhang, Liang Chen, Jiahao Xie, Jiangtang Wang, Shuai Shao, et al. Medclaw: Heuristic agent harness for long-horizon surgical video reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.14015*, 2026.
- Kanishk Gandhi, Shivam Garg, Noah D Goodman, and Dimitris Papailiopoulos. Endless terminals: Scaling rl environments for terminal agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.16443*, 2026.
- Hanhua Hong, Yizhi Li, Jiaoyan Chen, Sophia Ananiadou, Xiaoli Li, Jung-jae Kim, and Chenghua Lin. HiRAS: A hierarchical multi-agent framework for paper-to-code generation and execution. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pp. 7624–7652, 2026.
- Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2024, pp. 54107–54157, 2024a.
- Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik R Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024b. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTF8yNQm66>.

-
- Yoonho Lee, Roshen Nair, Qizheng Zhang, Kangwook Lee, Omar Khattab, and Chelsea Finn. Meta-harness: End-to-end optimization of model harnesses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.28052*, 2026.
- Jiahang Lin, Shichun Liu, Chengjun Pan, Lizhi Lin, Shiha Dou, Zhiheng Xi, Xuanjing Huang, Hang Yan, Zhenhua Han, Tao Gui, et al. Agentic harness engineering: Observability-driven automatic evolution of coding-agent harnesses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.25850*, 2026.
- Xinghua Lou, Miguel Lázaro-Gredilla, Antoine Dedieu, Carter Wendelken, Wolfgang Lehrach, and Kevin P Murphy. Autoharness: improving llm agents by automatically synthesizing a code harness. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.03329*, 2026a.
- Xinghua Lou, Miguel Lázaro-Gredilla, Antoine Dedieu, Carter Wendelken, Wolfgang Lehrach, and Kevin P. Murphy. Autoharness: improving llm agents by automatically synthesizing a code harness, 2026b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.03329>.
- Xiaotian Luo, Dizhan Xue, Fengxingyu Wang, Chuanrui Hu, and Yafeng Deng. Harnessbank: Semantic gene-bank search with gated verification for agent-harness self-evolution, 2026a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.13683>.
- Yifu Luo, Zeyu Chen, Haoyu Wang, Xinhao Hu, Yuxuan Zhang, Zhizhou Sha, and Shiwei Liu. Learning from the self-future: On-policy self-distillation for dllms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.18195*, 2026b.
- Mike Merrill, Alexander Shaw, Nicholas Carlini, Boxuan Li, Harsh Raj, Ivan Bercovich, Lin Shi, Jeong Shin, Thomas Walshe, E Kelly Buchanan, et al. Terminal-bench: Benchmarking agents on hard, realistic tasks in command line interfaces. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2026, pp. 40903–40986, 2026a.
- Mike A. Merrill, Alexander G. Shaw, Nicholas Carlini, Boxuan Li, Harsh Raj, Ivan Bercovich, Lin Shi, Jeong Yeon Shin, Thomas Walshe, E. Kelly Buchanan, Junhong Shen, Guanghao Ye, Haowei Lin, Jason Poulos, Maoyu Wang, Marianna Nezhurina, Jenia Jitsev, Di Lu, Orfeas Menis Mastromichalakis, Zhiwei Xu, Zizhao Chen, Yue Liu, Robert Zhang, Leon Liangyu Chen, Anurag Kashyap, Jan-Lucas Uslu, Jeffrey Li, Jianbo Wu, Minghao Yan, Song Bian, Vedang Sharma, Ke Sun, Steven Dillmann, Akshay Anand, Andrew Lanpouthakoun, Bardia Koopah, Changran Hu, Etash Guha, Gabriel H. S. Dreiman, Jiacheng Zhu, Karl Krauth, Li Zhong, Niklas Muenighoff, Robert Amanfu, Shangyin Tan, Shreyas Pimpalgaonkar, Tushar Aggarwal, Xiangning Lin, Xin Lan, Xuandong Zhao, Yiqing Liang, Yuanli Wang, Zilong Wang, Changzhi Zhou, David Heineman, Hange Liu, Harsh Trivedi, John Yang, Junhong Lin, Manish Shetty, Michael Yang, Nabil Omi, Negin Raoof, Shanda Li, Terry Yue Zhuo, Wuwei Lin, Yiwei Dai, Yuxin Wang, Wenhao Chai, Shang Zhou, Dariush Wahdany, Ziyu She, Jiaming Hu, Zhikang Dong, Yuxuan Zhu, Sasha Cui, Ahson Saiyed, Arinbjörn Kolbeinsson, Jesse Hu, Christopher Michael Rytting, Ryan Marten, Yixin Wang, Alex Dimakis, Andy Konwinski, and Ludwig Schmidt. Terminal-bench: Benchmarking agents on hard, realistic tasks in command line interfaces, 2026b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.11868>.
- Michael Nguyen, Quoc Nguyen, and Paul Vuong. Recursive self-evolving agents via held-out selection, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.28374>.
- Wenbo Pan, Shujie Liu, Chin-Yew Lin, Jingying Zeng, Xianfeng Tang, Xiangyang Zhou, Yan Lu, and Xiaohua Jia. Evolving agents in the dark: Retrospective harness optimization via self-preference, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2606.05922>.
- Renjie Pi, Grace Lam, Mohammad Shoeybi, Pooya Jannaty, Bryan Catanzaro, and Wei Ping. On data engineering for scaling llm terminal capabilities, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2602.21193>.
- Jincheng Ren, Siwei Wu, Yizhi Li, Kang Zhu, Shu Xu, Boyu Feng, Ruibin Yuan, Wei Zhang, Riza Batista-Navarro, Jian Yang, and Chenghua Lin. A self-evolving framework for efficient terminal agents via observational context compression, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2604.19572>.

-
- Jiajun Shi, Siyuan Tao, Yuhao Wu, Zexuan Wang, Jingyuan Zhang, Jiaheng Liu, Xinping Lei, Xinrong Zhang, Siyuan Fang, Zhewen Tan, et al. S3gym: Can llms turn self-testing and self-judging into self-improvement? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.31100*, 2026.
- Haowen Wang, Yaxin Du, Jian Yang, Jiajun Wu, Shukai Liu, Yuxuan Zhang, Pingjie Wang, Siheng Chen, Tuney Zheng, Ming Zhou, et al. Mira: Mid-training rubric anchoring for source-aware data selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.30288*, 2026a.
- Yike Wang, Huaisheng Zhu, Zhengyu Hu, Yige Yuan, Zhengyu Chen, Shakti Senthil, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Yulia Tsvetkov, Pradeep Dasigi, and Teng Xiao. Rethinking the evaluation of harness evolution for agents. In *COLM 2026 The 2nd Workshop on Lifelong Agents: Learning, Aligning, and Evolving*, 2026b.
- Yubo Wang, Jiarong Liang, Yuxuan Zhang, Xuye Liu, Cong Wei, Yuyu Zhang, Ping Nie, and Wenhui Chen. Function-aware fill-in-the-middle as mid-training for coding agent foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.12463*, 2026c.
- Siwei Wu, Yizhi Li, Yuyang Song, Wei Zhang, Yang Wang, Riza Batista-Navarro, Xian Yang, Mingjie Tang, Bryan Dai, Jian Yang, and Chenghua Lin. Large-scale terminal agentic trajectory generation from dockerized environments. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2026a. URL <https://icml.cc/virtual/2026/poster/64240>.
- Yuhao Wu, Jingyuan Zhang, Jiajun Shi, Xinping Lei, Qingshui Gu, Yuxuan Zhang, Zexuan Wang, Chen He, Chen Huang, Maojia Song, et al. Harnessdev: Can llms create and evolve their own agent harness? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.01437*, 2026b.
- Yuhao Wu, Jingyuan Zhang, Jiajun Shi, Yuxuan Zhang, Xinping Lei, Juntong Zhou, Zexuan Wang, Yuchen Wu, Huan Zhou, Duo Wang, et al. Aspire: Can models self-evolve from vague goals? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.31111*, 2026c.
- Zhiling Yan, Dingjie Song, Hanrong Zhang, Wei Liang, Yuxuan Zhang, Yutong Dai, Lifang He, Philip S Yu, Ran Xu, Xiang Li, et al. Openskill: Open-world self-evolution for llm agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.06741*, 2026.
- Jian Yang, Wei Zhang, Shawn Guo, Zhengmao Ye, Lin Jing, Shark Liu, Yizhi Li, Jiajun Wu, Cening Liu, X. Ma, Yuyang Song, Siwei Wu, Yuwen Li, L. Liao, T. Zheng, Ziling Huang, Zelong Huang, Che Liu, Yan Xing, Renyuan Li, Qingsong Cai, Hanxu Yan, Siyue Wang, Shikai Li, Jason Klein Liu, An Huang, Yongsheng Kang, Jinxing Zhang, Chuan Hao, Haowen Wang, Weicheng Gu, Ran Tao, Mingjie Tang, Peihao Wu, Jianzhou Wang, Xianglong Liu, Weifeng Lv, and Bryan Dai. Iquest-coder-v1 technical report, 2026a. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2603.16733>.
- Jian Yang, Wei Zhang, Shuyue Guo, Yizhi LI, Linzheng Chai, Zhengmao Ye, Shukai Liu, Yuyang Song, Jiajun Wu, Che Liu, Tianyu Zheng, Siwei Wu, Leo L, Xudong Ma, Chuan Hao, Ran Tao, Yan Xing, Jianzhou Wang, Mingjie Tang, Aishan Liu, Zhoujun Li, Xianglong Liu, Weifeng Lv, and Bryan Dai. LoopCoder: Scaling code intelligence via looped language models. In Maria Liakata, Viviane P. Moreira, Jiajun Zhang, and David Jurgens (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2026*, pp. 16209–16223, San Diego, California, United States, July 2026b. Association for Computational Linguistics. ISBN 979-8-89176-395-1. doi: 10.18653/v1/2026.findings-acl.796. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2026.findings-acl.796/>.
- Hangfan Zhang, Shao Zhang, Kangcong Li, Chen Zhang, Yang Chen, Yiqun Zhang, Lei Bai, and Shuyue Hu. Self-harness: Harnesses that improve themselves. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.09498*, 2026a.
- Jenny Zhang, Shengran Hu, Cong Lu, Robert Lange, and Jeff Clune. Darwin gödel machine: open-ended evolution of self-improving agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2026, pp. 104223–104294, 2026b.
- Qizheng Zhang, Changran Hu, Shubhangi Upasani, Boyuan Ma, Fenglu Hong, Vamsidhar Kamanuru, Jay Rainton, Chen Wu, Mengmeng Ji, Hanchen Li, et al. Agentic context engineering: Evolving contexts for self-improving language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, volume 2026, pp. 86069–86100, 2026c.

-
- Yuxuan Zhang, Penghui Du, Bo Li, Cong Wei, Junwen Miao, Huaisong Zhang, Songcheng Cai, Yubo Wang, Dongfu Jiang, Yuyu Zhang, et al. Rewardharness: Self-evolving agentic post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.08703*, 2026d.
- Yuxuan Zhang, EunJeong Hwang, Huaisong Zhang, Penghui Du, Yiming Jia, Dongfu Jiang, Xuan He, Shenhui Zhang, Ping Nie, Peter West, et al. Watch before you answer: Learning from visually grounded post-training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.05117*, 2026e.
- Yuxuan Zhang, Yubo Wang, Yipeng Zhu, Penghui Du, Junwen Miao, Xuan Lu, Zhuofeng Li, Xingwei Qu, Zheng kang Guo, Yuanzhe Shen, et al. Clawbench: Can ai agents complete everyday online tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.08523*, 2026f.
- Adam Zweiger, Jyo Pari, Han Guo, Yoon Kim, and Pulkit Agrawal. Self-adapting language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 38:74084–74115, 2026.

A HARNESS ARCHITECTURE




Figure 5: Architecture of the five-module harness.

Figure 5 shows how the five modules interact during task execution. The outer box is Agent Loop, and the central *Loop control* box represents its runtime logic: maintaining execution state, scheduling calls, handling retries, and deciding whether to continue. Each of the other four modules exchanges inputs and outputs with this controller. The bidirectional module arrows indicate a call and its return. The LLM and environment are external resources: the LLM generates responses, while the environment runs commands and stores files and processes. Before execution, the composer selects one implementation for each module.

In a normal iteration, Agent Loop first asks Context Management to update the conversation history, compressing it when needed. It then sends the current prompt to the LLM. Tool Use parses the response into commands and a completion signal, executes the commands in the environment, and returns execution results or errors. Observation Management reads the current terminal output and converts it into agent-readable feedback. This differs from Context Management, which works on the accumulated conversation. Agent Loop combines the feedback with tool results, updates its state, and passes that state to Task Completion Detection.

Task Completion Detection returns a stop recommendation and a reason. For example, the detector requires two consecutive completion declarations. Agent Loop maintains that count and issues the confirmation prompt after the first declaration; the detector checks whether the count meets its criterion. The loop follows the recommendation, while evolved loop variants can override it. If execution continues, the loop prepares the next prompt from the feedback. Parsing errors can instead trigger a retry, and session failures or execution limits can end the run. The figure shows these modules’ relationships; the arrows do not prescribe a fixed module-to-module execution sequence.

A.1 MODULE INTERFACE EXCERPTS

Listing 1 shows the main inputs and outputs of all five modules. The signatures follow the implementation; imports, setup methods, and method bodies are omitted. Each implementation is registered with a name, description, and configuration parameters. The shared `ModuleCtx` provides task configuration, environment access, and recording services.

Listing 1: Selected interfaces of the five harness modules. Ellipses denote omitted implementations.

```

# 1. Agent Loop
# Input: task, conversation, and the other four modules.
# Output: execution status, final text, and failure tag.
class AgentLoop(Protocol):
    async def run(

```

```

        self, initial_prompt: str, original_instruction: str,
        observation: Observation, context_mgmt: ContextMgmt,
        tools: ToolSet, verification: VerificationLoop,
        chat: Chat, ctx: ModuleCtx,
    ) -> AgentLoopResult: ...

# 2. Observation Management
# Reads the environment through ctx.
# Output: observation text and updated observation state.
class Observation(Protocol):
    async def capture(
        self, prev: ObsState, ctx: ModuleCtx,
    ) -> tuple[ObsResult, ObsState]: ...

# 3. Tool Use
# Model text -> commands, completion signal, parsing errors.
# A tool call -> execution result (success, output, error).
class ToolSet(Protocol):
    def parse_llm_response(
        self, response: str,
    ) -> LLMResponseParseResult: ...

    async def execute(
        self, call: ToolCall, ctx: ModuleCtx,
    ) -> ToolResult: ...

# 4. Context Management
# Input: conversation history and the original task.
# Output: updated Chat and an optional handoff prompt.
class ContextMgmt(Protocol):
    async def maybe_compress(
        self, chat: Chat, original_instruction: str,
        ctx: ModuleCtx,
    ) -> CompressResult: ...

    async def force_summarize(
        self, chat: Chat, original_instruction: str,
        ctx: ModuleCtx,
    ) -> CompressResult: ...

# 5. Task Completion Detection
# Input: loop state, including recent feedback and signals.
# Output: a stop recommendation and its reason.
class VerificationLoop(Protocol):
    async def should_terminate(
        self, state: AgentLoopState, ctx: ModuleCtx,
    ) -> tuple[bool, str]: ...

```

The completion detector returns a recommendation; Agent Loop maintains the state and controls whether execution continues. Observation Management returns current environment feedback, whereas Context Management updates the accumulated conversation history.

B STRUCTURED ANALYSIS FINDINGS

The three trajectory groups in Sec. 3.3 describe the available reward evidence. The implementation refines these groups into routing buckets. The buckets select an analysis path. They do not change the reward of a trajectory. Table 8 shows the mapping. Tasks with infrastructure-only failures are excluded from harness diagnosis.

Each analyzed task produces one finding record. The field `task` identifies the task. The field `lens` names the analysis mode, and `locked_module` names the module that may be changed in the current evolution run. The field `is_culprit` gives the causal decision. The field `divergence`

Method group	Implementation buckets
Positive	all_pass_efficient, all_pass_wasteful
Contrastive	mixed
Negative	fixable_fail, stuck_fail, unreachable_fail
Excluded	infra_only

Table 8: Mapping from the method-level trajectory groups to the routing buckets used by the implementation.

summarizes the relevant trajectory evidence. The field `would_change_outcome` gives a counterfactual judgment: would the proposed module change plausibly change the task result? The fields `fixable_now` and `suggested_change` state whether and how the system can act on the diagnosis. For a negative attribution, `other_module` or `note` may record an alternative explanation. The field `parse_status` records whether the structured output was parsed successfully. Some optional fields are therefore absent from some records.

Listing 2 shows two findings from one evolution batch. The first finding supports a change to the Agent Loop. The second finding rejects a change because the observed reward does not reflect an Agent Loop failure. We shorten the text values for readability. We keep the field names, decisions, and causal conclusions unchanged.

Listing 2: Abridged examples of structured analysis findings. The first record supports an edit. The second record abstains from an unsupported edit.

```
{
  "findings": [
    {
      "task": "draft_dp_3493beee_outa",
      "lens": "agent_loop",
      "is_culprit": true,
      "locked_module": "agent_loop",
      "divergence": "The passing roll ran build and package commands. The failing roll ran no build or validation command and repeatedly declared completion.",
      "would_change_outcome": "Yes. A completion gate that requires validation evidence would force the missing build-and-check stage.",
      "fixable_now": true,
      "suggested_change": "Add an evidence-gated completion variant. Allow termination only after a successful build, test, or run has been observed."
    },
    {
      "task": "draft_dp_eae0dlff_outb",
      "lens": "contrast",
      "is_culprit": false,
      "divergence": "Both rolls produced functionally equivalent solutions. The failing artifact compiled and passed differential tests against the reference program.",
      "would_change_outcome": "No. The artifact evidence points to verifier-side noise rather than an Agent Loop failure.",
      "fixable_now": false
    }
  ]
}
```

C ABRIDGED PROMPTS USED IN HARNESS EVOLUTION

The full prompts contain task trajectories, module traces, findings, and code diffs. These inputs are inserted at runtime and can be long. The excerpts below preserve the original wording and order. Text in angle brackets denotes runtime input. Bracketed lines mark omitted dynamic content or repeated operational rules.

C.1 TRAJECTORY ANALYSIS

The analysis prompt has two modes. The contrastive mode compares successful and failed trajectories. The efficiency mode examines a successful but wasteful trajectory. Both modes use the same attribution rule and output format.

Listing 3: Excerpt from the trajectory-analysis prompt. Dynamic evidence and tool instructions are omitted.

```
You are a READ-ONLY diagnostician deciding ONE thing: would
changing the '<TARGET_MODULE>' module actually CHANGE or
IMPROVE this task's outcome? You get the SAME task solved on
one roll and FAILED on another (same code, different sampling).

This is NOT blame-attribution. Report a culprit ONLY if there
is a concrete '<TARGET_MODULE>' change that would plausibly
move THIS task from fail toward pass. If no such change would
help, the answer is no culprit, and you do NOT fix.

[... omitted: module scope, yardstick, and starter probes ...]

# The task: <TASK>
## PASSING roll
<PASSING_ROLL>
## FAILING roll
<FAILING_ROLL>

[... omitted: instructions for reading raw trajectories and
module traces ...]

# How to decide (in order)
1. Divergence: where did the pass and fail rolls stop behaving
the same? What did the passing roll do there that the
failing roll did not? Cite episodes or steps.
2. The counterfactual: picture a concrete change to
'<TARGET_MODULE>'. Would the failing roll plausibly have
moved from fail toward pass with that change?
- YES, and it fits inside the module: set 'is_culprit' and
'fixable_now' to true and describe the change.
- YES, but it needs an architecture change: set
'is_culprit' to true and 'fixable_now' to false.
- NO: set 'is_culprit' to false. Do not invent a marginal
tweak just to have a finding.

# REQUIRED output
<contrast_finding>
{
  "task": "<TASK>",
  "is_culprit": true or false,
  "locked_module": "<TARGET_MODULE>",
  "divergence": "<TRAJECTORY_DIVERGENCE>",
  "would_change_outcome": "<COUNTERFACTUAL>",
  "fixable_now": true or false,
  "suggested_change": "<MODULE_CHANGE_IF_APPLICABLE>"
}
</contrast_finding>

[... omitted: the efficiency-mode prompt asks where a passing
roll wasted work and whether the module can make the agent
leaner without risking correctness ...]
```

C.2 HARNESS MODIFICATION

The modification prompt receives one selected direction and all findings that support it. It asks the Code-Modify Agent to implement the shared mechanism, rather than a task-specific patch.

Listing 4: Excerpt from the harness-modification prompt. Runtime proposal evidence is omitted.

```
You are implementing ONE agreed direction on the agent's
```

```
modules.
```

```
The direction below was chosen from a backlog of directions,
and the evidence under it is the COMPLETE set of observations
that support it - every one of them, not a sample. Build the
change that addresses the direction across all of that
evidence. Do NOT narrow it to whichever single task reads most
vividly: a change that only rescues one named task is worthless
here and has sunk a lineage before.
```

```
# The direction - proposal <ID> (lane=<LANE>, action=<ACTION>)
<TARGET_VARIANT_IF_ANY>
What should change about the agent's behaviour:
<BEHAVIORAL_DELTA>
```

```
Why this is believed to be the cause:
<CAUSAL_HYPOTHESIS>
```

```
# The evidence - <N> finding(s), all of them
<SUPPORTING_FINDINGS>
```

```
[... omitted: retry or incomplete-evidence notice, when
applicable ...]
```

```
# How to work
1. Read the module(s) involved before editing.
2. Make the change general: it has to hold for every finding
   above, not one.
3. <ACTION-SPECIFIC ADD, MODIFY, OR REPLACE RULE>
4. '<validate/>', then '<commit_patch/>', then
   '<task_complete>true</task_complete>'.
```

```
[... omitted: shared editor tool syntax and path rules ...]
```

C.3 DIFFS REVIEW

The review prompt is reward-blind. It receives the proposed diff, its stated intent, and the related trajectory evidence. It checks whether the change is effective and whether it overfits the evolution tasks.

Listing 5: Excerpt from the diff-review prompt. Dynamic diffs, trajectories, and repeated rules are omitted.

```
<review_gate_mode>true</review_gate_mode>
```

```
You are the terminus-2-modular editor, reviewing a change you
just made to the agent's modules. The change is ALREADY
applied to the staging copy you can read. Your job now is NOT
to edit - it is to decide whether this change should be KEPT
or REJECTED.
```

```
# Review inputs
<DIFF>
<INTENT>
<REWARD-BLIND_TRAJECTORY_SUMMARIES>
```

```
[... omitted: architecture facts and raw-trajectory access
instructions ...]
```

```
# How to review
1. Effective? Require a concrete causal link between the
   changed mechanism and a failure shown in the trajectories.
   For a new variant, also check that the Composer could select
```

```

    it for similar tasks.
2. Overfit? Reject task names, task-specific files or outputs,
   and constants tuned to one task.

[... omitted: detailed MODIFY/ADD tests and module-trace
interpretation ...]

REJECT if the change is task-specific or fails the appropriate
effectiveness test. Otherwise ACCEPT.

# Output
<review_verdict decision="accept|reject"
                reject_class="proposal|implementation"
                reason="one sentence why"
                repair_brief="only for implementation reject"/>

[... omitted: detailed verdict-field rules ...]
```

C.4 THE CROSS-MODULE INTEGRATION

After the independently evolved module variants are combined, the run-in prompt guides the Code-Modify Agent to repair interactions among them. The following excerpt preserves the original instructions. It omits only the runtime trajectories and conflict records.

Listing 6: Excerpt from the cross-module run-in prompt. Dynamic evidence is omitted.

```

You are performing integration run-in on a library assembled
from independently evolved module lineages. This is not
feature evolution. Make at most one coherent cross-module
repair; do not add a new capability, tool, behavioral
dimension, or benchmark-specific special case.

[... omitted: frozen-bundle audit and support-generation
metadata ...]

# Same-task, same-bundle support evidence
<TRAJECTORY_SUMMARIES>

# Static conflict candidates
<CONFLICT_FINDINGS>

# Task
Read the raw trajectories and the named source locations.
Determine whether one candidate explains a repeated pass/fail
or step-amplification pattern. Prefer, in order: retire
redundancy, merge overlapping evolved variants, make a small
in-place repair, then create one replacement only if
unavoidable. A static finding is a lead, not proof.

Do not touch Kernel, composer, 'active_bundle.json',
'baseline.py', or 'editor_file_tools.py'. Validate before
committing.

[... omitted: skill-loading and lineage-metadata rules ...]

Return '<runin_meta>' with 'ADDRESSED', 'INTERACTION', and
'NEW_CAPABILITY: no'.
```

Statistic	Count	Percentage
Current rollouts provide a success–failure pair	732	40.67%
All-fail groups paired with historical success in replay	150	8.33%
All current rollouts fail, with no earlier success	262	14.56%
All current rollouts succeed	648	36.00%

Table 9: Trajectory evidence from the five runs and subsequent replay.

	Successful trajectory (r0)	Failed trajectory (r1)
Shared input	The same task instruction and Scala pipeline. The instruction requires excluding NULL categories.	
Decision	Follows the written requirement.	Follows the legacy code.
Response ex- cerpt	Episode 7: “I’ll include the filter to match the task specification.”	Episode 14: “The output includes rows with NULL category (matching Scala behavior which doesn’t filter them out).”
Code	Episode 6 adds a filter using <code>isNotNull()</code> .	The generated script has no NULL-category filter.
Output	47 rows; no NULL categories.	52 rows; five NULL categories.
Reward	1	0

Table 10: A success–failure pair from the same task and harness configuration. The response excerpts show how the two rollouts resolve the same conflict.

D CASE STUDIES ACROSS TRAJECTORY GROUPS

D.1 TRAJECTORY GROUP DISTRIBUTION

For 150 all-fail groups, a successful trajectory from an earlier encounter of the same task was available for contrastive pairing. Eight groups had no valid scores.

Historical successes were used for the 150 eligible all-fail groups during the later replay. Eight groups have no score.

D.2 CONTRASTIVE: KEEP THE TASK REQUIREMENTS IN VIEW

Task and trajectory pair. The task asks the agent to port a Scala sales pipeline to PySpark. It requires removing rows whose product category is NULL, but the Scala code has no such filter. We select one successful rollout (r0) and one failed rollout (r1) from the same task encounter in epoch 2. Both use generation 7 with the same module bundle. Table 10 shows the pair used for diagnosis.

Change. The Contrastive pair shows the key difference: r0 keeps the explicit requirement, while r1 drops it to match the legacy code. The analysis proposes a persistent task checklist. Together with two other findings, this leads to `planning_with_guard` in generation 9. The loop shows task requirements in later prompts. When the agent declares completion without commands, it can ask the agent to check pending items. The variant passes review and sanity checks and is retained.

Later observation. In epoch 3, the same task runs with the updated loop in generation 13. Rollout r0 keeps the NULL filter. At episode 17, the loop asks for another check before completion. The agent then revisits the conflict and states that it will follow the written requirement. It runs a command to check the output. The output has 47 rows, and all 52 external tests pass. Two of the three rollouts pass in this encounter, compared with one in the selected epoch-2 encounter. Listing 7 shows this later execution. The Contrastive pair above comes from epoch 2.

Listing 7: A later execution of the same task. This is follow-up evidence, separate from the success–failure pair used for diagnosis.

```
Epoch 3, r0, episode 17, after a completion check:
```

```
"The Scala code doesn't explicitly filter NULL categories,
but the requirement says to exclude them. I'll keep my
implementation as is since it matches the requirements."
Action: run an output-schema and row-count check.
Output: 47 rows. External evaluation: 52 passed.
```

D.3 NEGATIVE: CHECK THE STATED ACCEPTANCE CONDITIONS

Problem. The task asks the agent to build FFmpeg 0.10.16. It also requires `ldd` to show `libavcodec`, `libavformat`, and `libx264`. All three epoch-1 rollouts fail, forming a Negative group. In `r0`, the binaries can convert and inspect a video, but `ldd` lists only `libx264`. The other two libraries are static archives. The agent still declares completion twice without running a command. The external evaluator reports one failed test and nine passed tests.

Change. No successful trajectory is needed to see this mismatch. The task names the required libraries, and the terminal shows which ones are linked. The Negative analysis proposes asking for fresh acceptance checks before allowing an empty completion. This finding and another finding lead to `completion_integrity_guard` in generation 6. The new loop reads the acceptance checklist from the task. It shows the checklist again when the agent declares completion without commands. It then asks the agent to run the checks. The variant is promoted, and this check is later included in `planning_with_guard`.

Later observation. The task remains a Negative group in epoch 2. In epoch 3, it uses generation 14, and all three rollouts pass. In `r0`, the loop repeats the acceptance checklist at episode 34. The agent responds by writing and running a verification script. The script includes `ldd` checks. Later terminal output lists all three required libraries, and all ten external tests pass. Thus, the later trace shows the requested change in behavior: the agent runs explicit checks instead of only repeating a completion claim.

Listing 8: FFmpeg: missing linkage in the original case and explicit verification in a later run. Addresses and unrelated output are omitted.

```
Epoch 1, r0, linkage check:
  ldd /usr/local/bin/ffmpeg 2>&1 |
  grep -E 'libavcodec|libavformat|libx264'
Output: libx264.so.164 only.
Episodes 125 and 126: "commands": [], "task_complete": true
External evaluation: 1 failed, 9 passed.

Epoch 3, r0, episode 34:
  Loop: repeats the task's acceptance checklist.
  Agent: writes and runs /tmp/verify_ffmpeg.sh.

Linkage output visible at episode 38:
  libavformat.so.53 => /usr/local/lib/libavformat.so.53 (...)
  libavcodec.so.53 => /usr/local/lib/libavcodec.so.53 (...)
  libx264.so.164 => /lib/x86_64-linux-gnu/libx264.so.164 (...)
  External evaluation: 10 passed.
```

D.4 POSITIVE: AVOID SHELL RETRIES WHEN WRITING FILES

Problem. This case comes from the Tool Use evolution run. The task asks the agent to fix a Zip Slip vulnerability in a Go file upload server. All three epoch-2 rollouts succeed, forming a Positive group, but they take 41, 24, and 43 episodes. In `r0`, the agent calls `write_file` with multi-line Go code at episode 3. The tool dispatcher rejects the newlines and sends the call to the shell. The shell returns `write_file: command not found`. The agent then retries with other ways to write the file. It eventually passes all 60 tests.

Table 11: Difficulty distributions of different evolution datasets.

Difficulty Distribution	0–20%	20–40%	40–60%	60–80%	80–100%
Medium-centered	10%	15%	50%	15%	10%
Hard & Easy	35%	10%	10%	10%	35%

Change. The Positive analysis identifies the extra work caused by this failed helper call. It proposes routing `write_file` and `edit_block` by the command name and passing the remaining text as file content. The editor combines this finding with a parser-recovery finding to create `tools/combined_robust.py` in generation 9. The variant passes review and sanity checks and is promoted. All four sanity rollouts select the new Tools variant.

Later observation. In epoch 3, the same task uses `combined_robust` in generation 12. Its multi-line dispatch code is unchanged from generation 9. At episode 4, `r0` again calls `write_file` with multi-line Go code. This time, the helper writes the file directly and returns `wrote 2204 bytes`. All 60 tests pass, and `r0` takes 26 episodes. Across the three rollouts, all rewards remain 1, while episode counts change from [41, 24, 43] to [26, 18, 31]. The mean falls from 36 to 25 episodes. Listing 9 shows the change in tool behavior.

Listing 9: A successful task with avoidable helper retries, followed by a successful run using the promoted Tools variant. Go source is omitted.

```
Epoch 2, r0, episode 3:
  write_file /opt/fileserver/extract.go package main
  [multi-line Go source]
Next observation:
  bash: write_file: command not found
Final result: reward 1; 41 episodes; 60 tests passed.

Epoch 3, r0, episode 4:
  write_file /opt/fileserver/extract.go package main
  [multi-line Go source]
Next observation:
  wrote 2204 bytes to /opt/fileserver/extract.go
Final result: reward 1; 26 episodes; 60 tests passed.
```

What the cases show. The Contrastive case identifies a requirement to preserve. The Negative case identifies a check to repeat. The Positive case identifies a tool failure that causes extra work. Each finding contributes to a promoted module update. Later traces show the intended behavior and successful task results, with fewer episodes in the Positive example. These runs also contain other updates, so the comparisons do not isolate the effect of a single change.

E THE CURATION OF DIFFERENT DIFFICULTY SETTINGS

As shown in Table. 11, we construct two SWE-related evolution sets with different difficulty distributions. We estimate the difficulty of each instance based on the success rate of eight trajectories generated by four foundation models: MiniMax M2.7, GLM-5.2, DeepSeek-V4-Pro, and DeepSeek-V4-Flash, and organize the instances into different difficulty ranges accordingly.

F THE EVOLUTION CURVE

To investigate the evolution process of ModularRSI, we evaluate harnesses from successive RSI generations on TerminalBench 2.0, as shown in Fig. 6. We report both task accuracy, computed from benchmark-provided rewards, and LLM-based trajectory scores. Specifically, we use Opus-4.8 to assess the task-solving trajectories generated by each harness using the prompt provided in Listing 10.




Figure 6: Accuracy variation during evolution under different generation on TerminalBench 2.0.

Listing 10: Prompt used for LLM-based trajectory evaluation.

```

You are an expert evaluator of LLM agent trajectories.

Given a task and the corresponding agent trajectory, evaluate the
trajectory based only on observable actions, tool interactions,
environment feedback, and the final outcome.

Task:
{TASK_DESCRIPTION}

Trajectory:
{TRAJECTORY}

Evaluate the trajectory along the following five dimensions:

1. Task Effectiveness:
How effectively the agent makes progress toward and satisfies the task
requirements.

2. Interaction Quality:
How appropriately and accurately the agent interacts with tools and the
environment, including its response to feedback and errors.

3. Reasoning Process Reliability:
Whether the observable decision process is coherent, evidence-driven,
and appropriately validated.

4. Context and State Management:
How well the agent maintains task constraints, intermediate findings,
environment state, and prior observations throughout the trajectory.

5. Efficiency and Robustness:
Whether the agent avoids unnecessary actions and recovers effectively
from errors, uncertainty, or unexpected environment behavior.

Score each dimension independently from 1 to 5:
1 = Very Poor
2 = Poor
3 = Adequate
4 = Good
5 = Excellent

Do not infer that all dimensions are good simply because the task

```

succeeds, or poor simply because it fails. Base each score on concrete evidence from the trajectory.

Compute the overall score as the mean of the five dimension scores, and normalize it to a 0--100 scale.

Return only:

```
{
  "task_effectiveness": <1-5>,
  "interaction_quality": <1-5>,
  "reasoning_process_reliability": <1-5>,
  "context_and_state_management": <1-5>,
  "efficiency_and_robustness": <1-5>,
  "overall_score": <1.0-5.0>,
  "normalized_score": <0-100>
}
```