

VibeMemBench: Evaluating Memory Systems for Coding Agents on Real Repository Coding Tasks

Liyang Fan^{1,4} Yingcheng Shi² Yongbin Li^{2,†} Chenghao Sun¹ Xin Chen³
 Xander Xu³ Hu Wei³ Shiwen Ni^{4,†} Min Yang^{1,4,†} Jieping Ye²

¹Shenzhen Institutes of Advanced Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences

²Alibaba Token Hub, Alibaba Group

³Alibaba Group

⁴SUAT

Abstract

Coding agents operate on real repository coding tasks, and persistent memory systems promise to reuse experience across tasks. Yet existing evaluations do not show whether those systems improve executable repository work. Repository benchmarks test code changes but do not isolate memory, while memory benchmarks score recall without measuring downstream coding outcomes. We introduce VibeMemBench, a benchmark for evaluating memory systems on 111 coding targets from 90 SWE-rebench V2 repositories and 3,634 history trajectories from the target repositories. The targets follow the SWE benchmark style and cover bug fixes, feature requests, interface changes, and configuration work. An agent edits each target codebase under a declared memory condition. Executable tests decide task resolution. Each target is retained only when injected history experience improves its executable outcome in a reference setting, so every target carries a prior experience whose usefulness is verified by execution in that setting. The frozen verified experience is then transferred to five held-out solvers. Direct injection raises observed task resolution on four of them by 1.1 to 4.5 percentage points while lowering agent steps on all five. Yet when four existing memory systems must construct and retrieve experience from the same history, eleven of twelve solver and system pairings fail to exceed the matched memory-off baseline. VibeMemBench exposes the gap between the useful experience that repository history holds and the experience existing memory systems deliver for repository coding tasks.

1 Introduction

Persistent memory in coding agents presents a measurement problem. Executable tests give coding tasks a grounded outcome, while useful memory remains latent. No instance-level label says which earlier observation a system ought to write, retain, or retrieve, and a gold memory label would answer a different question from whether memory improves work.

Existing evaluation families observe only one side of this problem. Memory benchmarks probe facts from interaction histories [Maharana et al., 2024, Wu et al., 2025], but recall alone does not establish whether an experience helps a coding agent repair a repository. Repository benchmarks measure executable task outcomes [Jimenez et al., 2024], but do not isolate a persistent memory intervention. The left panels of Figure 1 show these two partial signals.

The right panel turns memory evaluation into a matched comparison of repository work. Both runs share the task, agent, tools, sandbox, and budget. Only the declared memory condition changes. Executable tests

[†]Corresponding authors: shuide.lyb@alibaba-inc.com, min.yang@siat.ac.cn.

Code available at: <https://github.com/AlibabaResearch/DAMO-ConvAI/tree/main/VibeMemBench>

🔍 Does persistent memory improve executable repository work?




Figure 1: From partial benchmark signals to a controlled memory comparison. Left: memory benchmarks probe recall without an executable coding outcome, while repository benchmarks test repairs without isolating a memory intervention. Right: VibeMemBench pairs two runs of the same repository task under a fixed agent, tools, sandbox, and budget. Memory off supplies no retrieved record; the depicted memory-on condition supplies a retrieved experience. Executable tests determine task resolution. The comparison reports paired differences in Resolved, solver tokens, and agent steps.

measure whether the supplied experience improves task resolution rather than whether it matches a gold retrieval label. We report Resolved with solver token consumption and agent steps. The latter two measure solver use, not latency or total memory-system resource consumption.

VibeMemBench builds on SWE-rebench V2, a large-scale corpus of language-agnostic software engineering tasks with executable validation [Badertdinov et al., 2026]. A four-stage construction pipeline builds the targets. We name it SIEVE for its filtering stages, not as an acronym. It screens history from the same repository by patch patterns and keeps only targets whose injected experience shows uplift verified by execution. The benchmark comprises 111 targets across 90 repositories and 3,634 completed history trajectories. Each released target retains provenance, its test command, and its execution result, so the task outcome is auditable without a gold retrieval label.

The paper makes three contributions.

- We construct VibeMemBench, a benchmark whose 3,634 trajectories from the target repositories supply a persistent memory substrate and whose executable tests determine task resolution. SIEVE controls leakage and verifies that a useful experience exists for every retained target.
- We formulate a matched intervention protocol for agent components whose intermediate choices lack an oracle. It changes only the declared memory condition and separates frozen verified experience transfer from retrieval by existing memory systems under an auditable reporting contract.
- We report a gap between availability and use. The frozen verified experience yields small positive aggregate Resolved differences for four of five transfer solvers, while retrieval by existing memory systems fails to exceed the matched memory-off baseline in eleven of twelve solver and system pairings. Failure attribution locates the dominant break at the form of the supplied record, which a strip ablation traces to transcript volume rather than instruction semantics. The value of a record is further conditioned

on solver headroom rather than intrinsic to it, so the same record helps a weaker solver and harms a stronger one.

2 Related Work

Coding benchmarks. SWE-bench resolves GitHub issues through executable tests [Jimenez et al., 2024]. RepoBench, RepoCoder, and Hierarchical Context Pruning study repository context, retrieval, and cross-file completion [Liu et al., 2024, Zhang et al., 2023, 2025a]. GitTaskBench and DSCodeBench make repository artifacts, task criteria, and executable validation explicit [Ni et al., 2026, Ouyang et al., 2026]. Talk2Code evaluates multi-turn code generation with dual-track code and interaction criteria [Yang et al., 2026b], and SWE-Bench-CL orders software engineering tasks into continual learning sequences [Joshi et al., 2025]. None of these benchmarks isolates a matched persistent memory intervention across coding work.

Long-horizon agent benchmarks. DMT-RoleBench measures dynamic multi-turn role-playing [Yuan et al., 2025], RealWebAssist studies long-horizon web assistance with real users over time [Ye et al., 2026], and ProBench evaluates GUI agents with process information [Yang et al., 2026a]. Their primary evaluation signal is dialogue, web, or GUI behavior rather than a matched memory-on versus memory-off effect on executable repository repair.

Memory benchmarks. LoCoMo and LongMemEval evaluate long multi-session histories through question answering, temporal reasoning, and knowledge updates [Maharana et al., 2024, Wu et al., 2025], and MemBench broadens this setting with factual and reflective memory under multiple interaction scenarios [Tan et al., 2025]. Their primary signal is a queried answer over stored history. They do not measure whether latent useful memory changes executable coding success.

Memory systems as evaluated components. Persistent memory systems supply write, update, retention, and retrieval policies. MemGPT, MemoryBank, MEMORYLLM, MemoryART, and LightMem develop tiered context management, long-term personal stores, self-updatable latent memory, and lightweight record extraction [Packer et al., 2023, Zhong et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024, Dai et al., 2026, Fang et al., 2025]. VibeMemBench evaluates Mem0, SimpleMem, MemoryOS, and A-MEM [Chhikara et al., 2025, Liu et al., 2026, Kang et al., 2025, Xu et al., 2025] as four memory-on components under one shared executable protocol for repository tasks, filling the gap these families leave.

3 VibeMemBench

The benchmark resolves a missing evaluation signal. It makes the downstream coding outcome executable while leaving the selection of useful memory latent. One target is a repository state, a coding instruction, prior trajectory observations, and an executable test predicate, and a run succeeds when it passes. The release preserves the command, environment, and result that reproduce each run, and Figure 2 summarizes the construction stages and both evaluation layers.

3.1 Benchmark Profile

The left chart in Figure 3 reports the language distribution across nine languages. The distribution concentrates on Python and three mainstream languages, so an aggregate score chiefly reflects these languages.

The retained targets are repository-level coding tasks instantiated through a SWE-style executable repair protocol, not a bug-repair slice. A construction audit, using artifacts that never reach the solver, assigns each




Figure 2: VibeMemBench construction and evaluation overview. The upper lane shows offline construction. The lower panel shows the released target-history archive and the two evaluation layers.




Figure 3: Language (left) and primary task type (right) distributions of the 111 targets. Other groups TypeScript, Swift, Kotlin, Java, and PHP. The task type chart merges the eleven audited types into six. API adds behavior change and compatibility fix, and Config adds refactor, test infrastructure, and documentation change. Appendix D gives all eleven counts.

target one primary task type in the right chart of Figure 3. Bug fixes account for under a third of the labels, and feature, interface, configuration, and test infrastructure work covers the rest.

The 111 targets span 90 repositories after deduplication by history directory and draw on 3,634 completed history trajectories. Figure 4 reports the eligible history visible to each target. Targets from the same repository can share history trajectories, so the bars describe target-level visibility.

3.2 SIEVE Construction

SIEVE constructs history-target pairs under leakage control and turns history into target-aware experience. Its stages are source validation, patch-pattern screening, history execution with experience distillation, and




Figure 4: History availability per target. Bars count earlier trajectories from the same repository. Bins sum to 111 targets.

retention by uplift.

The first two stages control what enters the benchmark. Validation runs the declared tests with the source gold patch and discards every instance whose gold patch fails. The second stage is an oracle-assisted offline patch-pattern screen. It admits only earlier instances from the same repository and excludes every target identifier, so no target enters its own history pool. A deterministic score over shared files, directories, and cleaned identifiers shortlists candidates, and an LLM judges each repair pattern with structured evidence. The target gold patch enters only this offline screen, the target test patch remains evaluator only, and neither artifact reaches experience construction, runtime memory retrieval, or the target solver context. Appendix C lists every inherited source field with its visibility rule.

The third stage turns screened history into injectable experience. SIEVE executes each selected history task and keeps the completed trajectory. Target-aware experience construction then distills one experience per pair from the target problem statement, the history problem statement, a compressed history trajectory, and the history final patch. The target statement selects which historical lesson to emphasize, and every concrete claim remains anchored in the historical trajectory or patch. The distillation never sees the target gold patch, test patch, or test outcome. Each experience records a bug class, root cause, fix pattern, and reusable lesson.

History execution uses one fixed reference MiniSWEAgent configuration [Yang et al., 2024], and this configuration, the scoring rule, the shortlist defaults, and the gating policy appear in Appendix B.

3.3 Target Selection and Frozen Verified Experience

The benchmark uses a reference setting to establish that a useful prior experience is available for a target. A target-seed run is resolved when the target’s declared test predicate passes, and the resolved share of a condition averages this binary outcome over its four seeds. Let $\mathcal{K}_t$ be the finite set of candidate-memory combinations that the preceding SIEVE stages construct for target t , with the reserved index $0 \notin \mathcal{K}_t$ denoting the memory-off condition. For $k \in \mathcal{K}_t$, let $\hat{p}_{t,k}^{\text{ref}}$ be the resolved share for target t after injecting combination k , and let $\hat{p}_{t,0}^{\text{ref}}$ be the memory-off share. The uplift in the reference setting is

$$g_{t,k} = \hat{p}_{t,k}^{\text{ref}} - \hat{p}_{t,0}^{\text{ref}}. \quad (1)$$

For every retained target, the frozen verified experience is the combination $k_t^* = \arg \max_{k \in \mathcal{K}_t} g_{t,k}$. Retention requires $\hat{p}_{t,0}^{\text{ref}} < 1$ and $g_{t,k_t^*} > 0$. This rule is the fourth SIEVE stage. Selection uses deepseek-v4-flash

[DeepSeek AI, 2026] and MiniSWEAgent with four seeds per condition. The argmax ranges over the shortlist $\mathcal{K}_t$ rather than the full history pool, so k_t^* certifies that the history contains at least one useful experience for the target, not that it is the most useful.

This reference comparison is a selection audit, reported apart from the transfer results. Its uplift is specific to the selected targets under the reference solver, and the seed-level argmax lets seed noise inflate it. Cross-model transfer reuses the frozen verified experience and reselects no memory combination for the evaluation model, so the transfer estimates inherit the selected population but not the argmax optimism.

3.4 Memory Intervention

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be the fixed set of coding targets, $\mathcal{S}$ the set of evaluation seeds, and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{S}$ the paired evaluation set. Let A denote the fixed agent configuration, including the model, prompt, tools, sandbox image, context budget, resource limits, task order, and aggregation rule, and let $m \in \{\text{off}, \text{on}\}$ denote the memory condition. For each $(t, s) \in \mathcal{P}$, VibeMemBench compares $A(t, s, \text{off})$ and $A(t, s, \text{on})$, and m may change only the declared persistence and retrieval mechanism.

The memory-on specification declares the write policy, the retrieval trigger, the context insertion rule, and the record truncation rule, and the memory-off control replaces those records under the same fixed context budget. Appendix F states the full condition contract and the manifest fields that every reported run fills.

3.5 Evaluation Layers

The first layer transfers the frozen verified experience that the deepseek-v4-flash reference setting identifies for each retained target. The main comparison holds that experience fixed and evaluates deepseek-v4-pro [DeepSeek AI, 2026], glm-5 [GLM, 2026], glm-5.2 [Z.AI, 2026], kimi-k2.7-code [Kimi Team, 2025, Moonshot AI, 2026], and qwen3.8-max [Qwen Team, 2026] with four seeds per condition, testing whether the experience transfers across solver models. An irrelevant-memory control keeps the injection rule and every other setting fixed but injects one fixed distractor passage of everyday sentences with no software content. The control and the memory-system layer report deepseek-v4-pro, glm-5, and kimi-k2.7-code. glm-5.2 and qwen3.8-max enter as transfer-only solvers.

The second layer evaluates retrieval by existing memory systems. Mem0, SimpleMem, MemoryOS, and A-MEM [Chhikara et al., 2025, Liu et al., 2026, Kang et al., 2025, Xu et al., 2025] ingest the full eligible prior-work history available to a target. After ingestion and organization, a declared target query selects one top-ranked experience, which the protocol injects into MiniSWEAgent. This condition measures whether existing memory systems supply experiences that improve downstream execution, and it is not online closed-loop memory, because retrieval occurs before the target solver trajectory rather than during it.

For the existing memory systems, deepseek-v4-flash [DeepSeek AI, 2026] extracts memory records from trajectories, Qwen3-Embedding-4B [Zhang et al., 2025b] embeds retrieval queries and records, and the release manifest records the retrieval configuration and the target query template.

4 Experiments

Every reported comparison fixes the agent configuration A of the intervention protocol and varies only the memory condition, so an observed difference is attributable to memory rather than to a changed agent setup.

4.1 Metrics

The primary metric is task resolution. We report *Resolved*, the share of target-seed runs whose declared test predicate passes, as defined in the target selection stage. For $(t, s) \in \mathcal{P}$ and $m \in \{\text{off}, \text{on}\}$, let $y_{t,s}^{(m)}$ equal one

Condition	Resolved	95% CI	4/4	Input / run	Output / run	Steps / run
<i>deepseek-v4-pro</i>						
Memory off	67.1%	—	49	1.67M	19.1k	50.3
Frozen verified experience	67.1% (+0.0)	[−5.63, +5.86]	51 (+2)	1.49M (−0.18M)	18.9k (−0.2k)	47.6 (−2.7)
Irrelevant-memory control	63.7% (−3.4)	[−8.11, +1.35]	46 (−3)	1.51M (−0.16M)	18.1k (−1.0k)	47.1 (−3.2)
<i>glm-5</i>						
Memory off	55.0%	—	35	2.45M	15.4k	77.1
Frozen verified experience	57.4% (+2.4)	[−2.25, +7.21]	34 (−1)	1.93M (−0.52M)	13.2k (−2.2k)	66.2 (−10.9)
Irrelevant-memory control	54.3% (−0.7)	[−5.63, +4.05]	36 (+1)	2.13M (−0.32M)	14.5k (−0.9k)	69.3 (−7.8)
<i>glm-5.2</i>						
Memory off	76.8%	—	67	4.06M	45.9k	68.2
Frozen verified experience	80.4% (+3.6)	[−0.90, +8.11]	74 (+7)	3.40M (−0.67M)	39.3k (−6.6k)	61.0 (−7.2)
<i>kimi-k2.7-code</i>						
Memory off	69.8%	—	56	1.56M	16.2k	56.0
Frozen verified experience	74.3% (+4.5)	[−0.23, +9.46]	62 (+6)	1.57M (+0.01M)	16.4k (+0.2k)	53.8 (−2.2)
Irrelevant-memory control	69.1% (−0.7)	[−5.18, +3.83]	57 (+1)	1.62M (+0.06M)	16.6k (+0.4k)	55.9 (−0.1)
<i>qwen3.8-max</i>						
Memory off	79.1%	—	68	4.03M	55.2k	52.9
Frozen verified experience	80.2% (+1.1)	[−2.93, +5.41]	70 (+2)	4.00M (−0.03M)	60.3k (+5.1k)	50.6 (−2.3)

Table 1: Frozen verified experience transfer on the 111 outcome-selected targets. Italic rows group the five transfer solvers. Resolved is the share over 444 target-seed runs whose declared tests pass. The 95% CI column gives percentile bootstrap bounds in percentage points on the paired Resolved difference from the memory-off row. The 4/4 column counts targets that pass in every seed. Input / run and Output / run are solver-side mean input and output tokens per run, and Steps / run is the mean count of declared agent steps. Parentheses give changes from the memory-off row, Resolved changes in percentage points and other changes in displayed units. Bold marks the better value between the memory-off and frozen verified experience rows. The glm-5.2 and qwen3.8-max blocks have no irrelevant-memory control.

when condition m resolves target t at seed s by passing the declared test predicate and zero otherwise. The resolved share $\hat{p}_m$ for condition m averages $y_{t,s}^{(m)}$ over $\mathcal{P}$, and the paired memory effect is $\hat{\Delta} = \hat{p}_{\text{on}} - \hat{p}_{\text{off}}$. The uncertainty unit is the target, so the reported intervals resample the 111 targets with their four seeds intact 10,000 times and give percentile bounds for $\hat{\Delta}$. Tabulated percentage-point changes remain descriptive.

Every result row also reports solver resource use. For each (t, s) and m , $u_{t,s}^{(m)}$ counts solver input and output tokens and $h_{t,s}^{(m)}$ counts agent steps under one manifest-defined rule shared by every condition. The tables report the per-run means $\hat{u}_m$ and $\hat{h}_m$ over $\mathcal{P}$. Both measure solver use and interaction length, not latency, and the protocol does not record memory-side token consumption. Wall-clock time and API price vary with provider and pricing policy, so they do not enter the comparison across systems.

4.2 Results

Three regularities organize Table 1. The frozen verified experience raises Resolved on four of the five transfer solvers and leaves deepseek-v4-pro unchanged, so the aggregate transfer effect is positive but not uniform. All five bootstrap intervals cross zero, so at 111 targets the observed gains of 1.1 to 4.5 points remain directional evidence rather than effects separable from zero. The irrelevant-memory control stays 0.7 to 3.4 points below the memory-off baseline on each of the three solvers that run it, so injected text alone reproduces none of the gains. The two largest gains add six and seven 4/4 targets, so they are not confined to single-seed flips. Injection also lowers agent steps for every solver and input tokens for four of the five, shortening the interaction

Solver	System	Resolved	95% CI	Input / run	Output / run	Steps / run
deepseek-v4-pro	Mem0	62.8% (−4.3)	[−9.68, +1.35]	1.75M (+0.08M)	20.3k (+1.2k)	51.2 (+0.9)
deepseek-v4-pro	SimpleMem	66.9% (−0.2)	[−4.95, +4.50]	1.54M (−0.13M)	18.8k (−0.3k)	48.7 (−1.6)
deepseek-v4-pro	MemoryOS	64.6% (−2.5)	[−8.11, +3.15]	1.70M (+0.03M)	19.4k (+0.3k)	50.9 (+0.6)
deepseek-v4-pro	A-MEM	63.1% (−4.0)	[−10.14, +2.03]	1.71M (+0.04M)	20.0k (+0.9k)	50.0 (−0.3)
glm-5	Mem0	49.5% (−5.5)	[−10.59, −0.45]	2.17M (−0.28M)	14.7k (−0.7k)	71.7 (−5.4)
glm-5	SimpleMem	53.2% (−1.8)	[−6.76, +2.93]	2.02M (−0.43M)	13.3k (−2.1k)	70.2 (−6.9)
glm-5	MemoryOS	57.0% (+2.0)	[−3.38, +7.43]	1.96M (−0.49M)	13.3k (−2.1k)	67.2 (−9.9)
glm-5	A-MEM	52.5% (−2.5)	[−8.56, +3.38]	2.01M (−0.44M)	14.3k (−1.1k)	66.5 (−10.6)
kimi-k2.7-code	Mem0	68.0% (−1.8)	[−6.53, +2.70]	1.61M (+0.05M)	17.6k (+1.4k)	57.0 (+1.0)
kimi-k2.7-code	SimpleMem	69.6% (−0.2)	[−4.95, +4.50]	1.62M (+0.06M)	17.2k (+1.0k)	56.1 (+0.1)
kimi-k2.7-code	MemoryOS	66.0% (−3.8)	[−8.56, +1.13]	1.60M (+0.04M)	16.7k (+0.5k)	53.9 (−2.1)
kimi-k2.7-code	A-MEM	65.8% (−4.0)	[−9.68, +1.35]	1.66M (+0.10M)	16.4k (+0.2k)	55.0 (−1.0)

Table 2: Existing memory systems in the retrieval condition. Resolved, input tokens, output tokens, and steps use the same definitions as Table 1. Parentheses give changes from the same-solver Memory off row in Table 1. The 95% CI gives percentile bootstrap bounds on that paired change. Resolved changes are percentage points and other changes use displayed units.

rather than adding context cost.

The five gains do not order by memory-off strength. glm-5 gains 2.4 points from the lowest baseline at 55.0 percent, deepseek-v4-pro gains nothing at 67.1, kimi-k2.7-code gains the most at 4.5 from 69.8, glm-5.2 gains 3.6 from 76.8, and qwen3.8-max gains 1.1 from the highest baseline at 79.1. Aggregate solver strength therefore does not predict the transfer effect, and the mechanism developed below works at the level of the single target rather than the solver.

Table 2 reports the retrieval condition for the four existing memory systems on three of the five transfer solvers. Eleven of the twelve solver and system pairings stay at or below the matched memory-off baseline, no system interval lies above zero, and the glm-5 and Mem0 interval lies entirely below it. The single exception, MemoryOS on glm-5, gains 2.0 points and still trails the frozen verified experience. This nearly uniform shortfall separates the availability of a selected useful experience from the ability of existing memory systems to supply useful solver context. All four systems cut glm-5 tokens and steps markedly, yet only one converts the shorter interaction into a resolution gain, so a shorter trajectory is not by itself evidence of useful memory.

The shortfall has a structural source in solver headroom. Across the 1,332 retrieval pairings of target, solver, and system, the net effect is a loss of 127 resolved seeds. In 42.0 percent of those pairings a memory-off ceiling of four resolved seeds out of four leaves an injected record able only to lose seeds. Every solver and condition combination gains seeds below the ceiling and loses seeds at it. The frozen verified experience offsets its ceiling losses on all five solvers, and among the systems only the largest gain does. Appendix J stratifies all twenty combinations. Below the ceiling, existing memory systems help too little, and uniform top-1 injection is not a neutral default. A wider retrieval budget does not repair the shortfall. In Appendix O a Mem0 dose curve on deepseek-v4-pro stays below the memory-off baseline at every budget from one to five records. This matches the rare ranking miss that a wider budget could mend.

The single positive pairing follows the same headroom mechanism rather than a better record. MemoryOS on glm-5 lifts 29 targets, with the seed gains concentrated where glm-5 starts at zero or one resolved seed. Those targets receive raw transcripts of the form that dominates failure attribution, and the same records help the stronger solvers less. The pairing interval crosses zero, so the gain reflects the headroom of the weakest solver rather than a superior record. Appendix R decomposes the pairing by memory-off bucket.

Memory-off gap	Pairs	Both nonzero	Opposite	Share
0 seeds	184	15	0	0.0%
1 seed	172	65	34	52.3%
2 seeds	52	24	18	75.0%
3+ seeds	36	14	12	85.7%
All	444	118	64	54.2%

Table 3: Opposite-sign share by memory-off gap for the deepseek-v4-pro and kimi-k2.7-code pairing. Pairs counts the 444 target and system pairs in each gap bucket, Both nonzero counts pairs where both solvers move against their memory-off runs, Opposite counts pairs moving in opposite directions, and Share divides Opposite by Both nonzero.

4.3 Case Analysis

Case analysis is predeclared before trace inspection. Three matched contrasts fix a solver across systems, fix a system across solvers on the same injected record, or pair the frozen verified experience with its memory-off run. A target enters only when the two conditions differ by at least two of four seeds. Retrieval occurs before the target trajectory, so a system injects identical text into every solver for the same target. A system contrast then isolates the supplied record, and a solver contrast isolates its use.

Failure attribution makes the system contrast mechanical. For each failing pairing defined in Table 4, the diagnostic compares the top-1 injected record against the frozen verified experience and assigns the first broken stage. An anchor is a shared file, directory, or identifier. A use failure requires trace evidence that the solver read the record. The diagnostic reference is known useful rather than a gold retrieval label.

The downstream utility of an injected experience is conditioned on the solver’s memory-off competence rather than intrinsic to the record. The predeclared solver contrast covers deepseek-v4-pro and kimi-k2.7-code with all four seeds completed in both conditions. On `pybamm-4267`, `cfn-lint-3972`, and `aihttp-8720` the same supplied record moves the two solvers in opposite directions past the two-seed margin. In every contrast the solver with the weaker memory-off result gains, while the stronger loses. A retrieval score on the record alone cannot express this dependence, and Appendix P traces each contrast.

Solver headroom, not a record property, predicts the direction across the evaluation. Table 3 profiles the 444 target and system pairs in which the same injected record reaches both solvers. Among the 118 pairs where both solvers move, 64 move in opposite directions. In 61 of those the solver with the lower memory-off count gains, and the opposite-sign share rises with the memory-off gap. Eight record attributes, among them length, anchor level, and pollution rate, stay statistically indistinguishable between opposite-sign and same-sign pairs at a smallest permutation p of 0.25, and both solver pairings that involve glm-5 repeat the pattern. A rule reading only memory-off headroom predicts the sign of the paired effect on 56.5 percent of the 641 pairings changing Resolved, above the 52.4 percent of a rule reading only record content.

Record content separates from record volume. The 334-line A-MEM record of Figure 5 drops `aihttp-7907` from four seeds to zero, while a one-line Mem0 record leaves the same target at four of four. Whether the content stays anchored to the target predicts the outcome, not its length, and losses concentrate on targets a solver resolves without memory, consistent with the ceiling behind Table 2.

4.4 Failure Attribution

The diagnostic cohort covers the deepseek-v4-pro and kimi-k2.7-code rosters of Table 2 and yields 231 failing pairings over 85 targets, attributed in Table 4. A deterministic script assigns every label from logged artifacts. Under the written anchor rule, form degradation dominates while ranking misses are nearly absent, so the

First broken stage	Definition	Pairings	Share
Coverage miss	source history never entered the system store	37	16.0%
Ranking miss	stored, but the injected record shares no anchor with it	3	1.3%
Form degradation	relevant history reached, but the fix pattern dropped or buried in raw transcript	160	69.3%
Use failure	record matches the reference on anchor and repair principle, yet the run fails	31	13.4%
All failing pairings		231	100%

Table 4: Failure attribution for the retrieval condition. A failing pairing is a target, solver, and system whose four-seed resolved count falls below the matched memory-off count. Each pairing receives the first broken stage.

Form degradation mechanism	Pairings	Share
Instruction pollution	64	40.0%
Overgeneralized fix pattern	29	18.1%
Tool or shell noise	16	10.0%
Schema omits fix field	14	8.8%
Fix replaced by symptom	6	3.8%
Other	31	19.4%
All form degradation	160	100%

Table 5: Form degradation decomposition. Each of the 160 form degradation pairings in the diagnostic cohort receives its primary mechanism. Other groups records with metadata only, retrieval of a wrong span, truncation, and unclear cases.

systems usually reach relevant history and lose the pairing in how they render it. Injected records average 65 lines against a four-field frozen record, and half trigger the lexical instruction pollution markers.

A blind LLM validity audit with two judges from model families uninvolved in construction or solving re-labeled all 231 pairings under the same written manual. The audit supports the coarse attribution and bounds the fine one. Coverage labels match the script exactly, and the combined share of the two stages located in the supplied record stays dominant for every rater at 61.9 to 81.4 percent. The boundary between ranking and form moves with how strictly a rater reads the anchor rule, at Cohen’s kappa of 0.32 and 0.24 against the script and 0.35 between the judges. The form degradation share in Table 4 therefore follows the written anchor rule rather than rater consensus. Appendix H.1 reports the full audit. Under every rater, the gap between availability and use sits in the record that existing memory systems supply, not in coverage or downstream use.

Table 5 decomposes form degradation by primary mechanism. Instruction pollution and overgeneralized fix patterns together account for over half of the cases. Transcript systems, MemoryOS and A-MEM, inject raw conversation chunks and produce every case of instruction pollution and shell noise. Atomic systems, Mem0 and SimpleMem, store facts an LLM extracts and account for all cases of overgeneralization, schema omission, and symptom substitution. The break is a design choice rather than a tuning failure. A code audit finds that instruction pollution crosses a task instruction boundary in only three of sixty-four cases, so the transcript harm is verbatim storage without an extraction filter rather than a chunk boundary, and a filter prompt would not reach the code path that concatenates the original text. In the atomic systems an extraction prompt written for dialogue facts and a schema without a repair slot collapse the fix into a generic sentence. Figure 5 shows the dominant break on one target, and Appendix M gives the mechanism attribution.

A strip ablation tests whether instruction content causes the loss. On sixty-two of the sixty-four instruction pollution pairings we reinject each record without the flagged lines, and compare against deleting equally many unflagged lines at random. Both arms recover seeds over the untouched record, by 0.60 and 0.48




Figure 5: Record form contrast on aiohttp-7907. The frozen verified experience states the fix pattern and the `client_reqrep.py` anchor in five lines, while the A-MEM record spends 334 lines on another issue’s report, reproduction steps, and instructions. In paired traces the memory-off run locks onto the upgrade semantics and resolves every seed, while the injected record redirects deepseek-v4-pro to the record’s except block in `connector.py` and resolves none.

per pairing, and a target-level permutation test rejects the null for each. Because random deletion recovers comparably, the harm operates through transcript volume rather than instruction semantics, and the lexical pollution flag marks a bulky record rather than a failure mechanism.

A counterfactual substitution bounds what form repair could recover. Replacing each failing record with the frozen verified experience for the same target recovers 196 seeds over the 160 form degradation pairings and 78 over the 64 instruction pollution pairings. The two diagnosed solvers otherwise lose 93 seeds. This bound marks what one verified record recovers, not a prediction for a repaired system, because frozen injection changes more than record form.

5 Discussion

The benchmark separates two questions, whether the frozen verified experience helps a solver once it reaches the context, and whether existing memory systems turn the same history into useful context. The frozen record witnesses what history makes available rather than bounding it from above, so the availability-to-use gap is a floor. Where headroom exists, the gap lies in the size of the gains rather than in harm.

Failure attribution and case evidence support three design implications. All three rest on the solvers that run both evaluation layers, not on the two transfer-only solvers. Injection should be gated on expected solver headroom rather than applied uniformly. When a solver fails a target without memory and the record carries at least a directory or identifier anchor, the record raises Resolved on 55.2 percent of such pairings with no observed loss, while at a four of four ceiling even the frozen verified experience lowers Resolved on 25.7 percent of pairings. The dominant break is the form of the transcript record, and the ablation places its harm in raw volume, so a system should compress a retrieved trajectory to the span stating the fix rather than filter instruction text by surface markers. Preserving a fix field is necessary but not sufficient, because records keeping the fix pattern do not lower the loss rate, so an extraction schema must retain the constraints anchoring the fix to the target.

Selection creates one boundary. The offline patch-pattern screen compares target and history gold patches, and the 111 targets have positive deepseek-v4-flash reference uplift by design. This suits a benchmark of the downstream value of known transferable experience, not an estimate of how often a deployed agent finds such a pair. The retrieval-cohort ceiling reflects solver strength rather than a lost opportunity. All 140 ceiling target and solver pairs of that cohort stay below four of four under the reference solver, so the reference setting retained them under the uplift rule and the ceiling appears only after transfer.

6 Limitations and Conclusion

VibeMemBench measures persistent memory under a declared agent configuration and accounting rule, over 111 targets from an oracle-assisted patch-pattern screen and a positive reference uplift rule that supply no gold retrieval label. The solver pool omits proprietary frontier models such as the Claude and GPT families for reasons of inference budget, so the solver-agnostic protocol stays untested for them. The release supplies the task histories, executable predicate, and intervention protocol with full provenance.

References

- Ibragim Badertdinov, Maksim Nekrashevich, Anton Shevtsov, and Alexander Golubev. SWE-rebench V2: Language-agnostic SWE task collection at scale. In *Forty-third International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2026, Seoul, South Korea, July 6-11, 2026*, 2026. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2602.23866. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=UCAda9kS57>. ICML 2026; arXiv:2602.23866. DBLP record not available at time of bibliography audit.
- Prateek Chhikara, Dev Khant, Saket Aryan, Taranjeet Singh, and Deshraj Yadav. Mem0: building production-ready AI agents with scalable long-term memory. In Inês Lynce, Nello Murano, Mauro Vallati, Serena Villata, Federico Chesani, Michela Milano, Andrea Omicini, and Mehdi Dastani, editors, *ECAI 2025 - 28th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 25-30 October 2025, Bologna, Italy - Including 14th Conference on Prestigious Applications of Intelligent Systems (PAIS 2025)*, volume 413 of *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence and Applications*, pages 2993–3000. IOS Press, 2025. doi: 10.3233/FAIA251160. URL <https://doi.org/10.3233/FAIA251160>.
- Renke Dai, Hebin Hu, Jiahui Zhang, Yilin Kang, and Ah-Hwee Tan. MemoryART: enhancing LLMs via multi-memory models with adaptive resonance theory for healthcare agents. In Sven Koenig, Chad Jenkins, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Eighth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2026, Singapore, January 20-27, 2026*, pages 20676–20683. AAAI Press, 2026. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V40I25.39205. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i25.39205>.
- DeepSeek AI. DeepSeek API models and pricing documentation. DeepSeek API Documentation, 2026. URL https://api-docs.deepseek.com/quick_start/pricing/. Model IDs deepseek-v4-flash and deepseek-v4-pro. Accessed 2026-07-20.
- Jizhan Fang, Xinle Deng, Haoming Xu, Ziyang Jiang, Yuqi Tang, Ziwen Xu, Shumin Deng, Yunzhi Yao, Mengru Wang, Shuofei Qiao, Huajun Chen, and Ningyu Zhang. LightMem: lightweight and efficient memory-augmented generation, 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2510.18866>.
- GLM. GLM-5: from vibe coding to agentic engineering, 2026. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2602.15763>.

- 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, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=VTF8yNQM66>.
- Thomas Joshi, Shayan Chowdhury, and Fatih Uysal. SWE-Bench-CL: continual learning for coding agents, 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2507.00014>.
- Jiazheng Kang, Mingming Ji, Zhe Zhao, and Ting Bai. Memory OS of AI agent. In Christos Christodoulopoulos, Tanmoy Chakraborty, Carolyn Rose, and Violet Peng, editors, *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2025, Suzhou, China, November 4-9, 2025*, pages 25961–25970. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025. doi: 10.18653/V1/2025.EMNLP-MAIN.1318. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.emnlp-main.1318>.
- Kimi Team. Kimi K2: open agentic intelligence, 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2507.20534>.
- Jiaqi Liu, Yaofeng Su, Peng Xia, Siwei Han, Zeyu Zheng, Cihang Xie, Mingyu Ding, and Huaxiu Yao. SimpleMem: efficient lifelong memory for LLM agents, 2026. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2601.02553>.
- Tianyang Liu, Canwen Xu, and Julian J. McAuley. RepoBench: benchmarking repository-level code auto-completion systems. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pPjZIOuQuF>.
- Adyasha Maharana, Dong-Ho Lee, Sergey Tulyakov, Mohit Bansal, Francesco Barbieri, and Yuwei Fang. Evaluating very long-term conversational memory of LLM agents. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar, editors, *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), ACL 2024, Bangkok, Thailand, August 11-16, 2024*, pages 13851–13870. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2024. doi: 10.18653/V1/2024.ACL-LONG.747. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.747>.
- Moonshot AI. Kimi K2.7 Code quickstart documentation. Kimi API Platform Documentation, 2026. URL <https://platform.kimi.ai/docs/guide/kimi-k2-7-code-quickstart>. Model ID `kimi-k2.7-code`. Accessed 2026-07-20.
- Ziyi Ni, Huacan Wang, Shuo Zhang, Shuo Lu, Ziyang He, Wang You, Zhenheng Tang, Sen Hu, Bo Li, Chen Hu, Binxing Jiao, Daxin Jiang, Yuntao Du, and Pin Lyu. GitTaskBench: A benchmark for code agents solving real-world tasks through code repository leveraging. In Sven Koenig, Chad Jenkins, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Eighth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2026, Singapore, January 20-27, 2026*, pages 32564–32572. AAAI Press, 2026. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V40I38.40533. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i38.40533>.
- Shuyin Ouyang, Dong Huang, Jingwen Guo, Zeyu Sun, Qihao Zhu, and Jie M. Zhang. DSCodeBench: A realistic benchmark for data science code generation. In Sven Koenig, Chad Jenkins, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Eighth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2026, Singapore, January 20-27, 2026*, pages 32628–32636. AAAI Press, 2026. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V40I38.40540. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i38.40540>.

- Charles Packer, Vivian Fang, Shishir G. Patil, Kevin Lin, Sarah Wooders, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. MemGPT: towards LLMs as operating systems, 2023. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2310.08560>.
- Qwen Team. Qwen3.8-Max: a new bar for coding and cowork. Qwen release announcement, 2026. URL <https://qwen.ai/blog?id=qwen3.8>. Released 2026-08-03. Evaluated model identifier `qwen3.8-max`. Accessed 2026-08-13.
- Haoran Tan, Zeyu Zhang, Chen Ma, Xu Chen, Quanyu Dai, and Zhenhua Dong. MemBench: towards more comprehensive evaluation on the memory of LLM-based agents. In Wanxiang Che, Joyce Nabende, Ekaterina Shutova, and Mohammad Taher Pilehvar, editors, *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2025, Vienna, Austria, July 27 - August 1, 2025*, volume ACL 2025 of *Findings of ACL*, pages 19336–19352. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2025. doi: 10.18653/V1/2025.FINDINGS-ACL.989. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2025.findings-acl.989>.
- Yu Wang, Yifan Gao, Xiusi Chen, Haoming Jiang, Shiyang Li, Jingfeng Yang, Qingyu Yin, Zheng Li, Xian Li, Bing Yin, Jingbo Shang, and Julian J. McAuley. MEMORYLLM: towards self-updatable large language models. In Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Zico Kolter, Katherine A. Heller, Adrian Weller, Nuria Oliver, Jonathan Scarlett, and Felix Berkenkamp, editors, *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 50453–50466. PMLR / OpenReview.net, 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/wang24s.html>.
- Di Wu, Hongwei Wang, Wenhao Yu, Yuwei Zhang, Kai-Wei Chang, and Dong Yu. LongMemEval: benchmarking chat assistants on long-term interactive memory. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=pZiyCaVuti>.
- Wujiang Xu, Zujie Liang, Kai Mei, Hang Gao, Juntao Tan, and Yongfeng Zhang. A-MEM: agentic memory for LLM agents, 2025. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2502.12110>.
- John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. SWE-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering. In Amir Globersons, Lester Mackey, Danielle Belgrave, Angela Fan, Ulrich Paquet, Jakub M. Tomczak, and Cheng Zhang, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 37: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2024, NeurIPS 2024, Vancouver, BC, Canada, December 10 - 15, 2024*, 2024. URL http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2024/hash/5a7c947568c1b1328ccc5230172e1e7c-Abstract-Conference.html.
- Leyang Yang, Ziwei Wang, Xiaoxuan Tang, Sheng Zhou, Dajun Chen, Wei Jiang, and Yong Li. ProBench: benchmarking GUI agents with accurate process information. In Sven Koenig, Chad Jenkins, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Eighth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2026, Singapore, January 20-27, 2026*, pages 27547–27555. AAAI Press, 2026a. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V40I32.39974. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i32.39974>.
- Weibin Yang, Liangru Xie, Jieyun Cai, Yuxiang Yan, Hong-Ning Dai, and Hao Wang. Talk2Code: A multi-turn interaction benchmark with dual-track evaluation for code generation. In Sven Koenig, Chad Jenkins, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Eighth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2026, Singapore, January 20-27, 2026*, pages 34331–34339. AAAI Press, 2026b. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V40I40.40730. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i40.40730>.

- Suyu Ye, Haojun Shi, Darren Shih, Hyokun Yun, Tanya G. Roosta, and Tianmin Shu. RealWebAssist: A benchmark for long-horizon web assistance with real-world users. In Sven Koenig, Chad Jenkins, and Matthew E. Taylor, editors, *Fortieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Eighth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Sixteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2026, Singapore, January 20-27, 2026*, pages 34441–34449. AAAI Press, 2026. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V40I40.40742. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v40i40.40742>.
- Dingbo Yuan, Yipeng Chen, Guodong Liu, Chenchen Li, Chengfu Tang, Dongxu Zhang, Zhenkui Wang, Xudong Wang, and Song Liu. DMT-RoleBench: A dynamic multi-turn dialogue based benchmark for role-playing evaluation of large language model and agent. In Toby Walsh, Julie Shah, and Zico Kolter, editors, *Thirty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Seventh Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Fifteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2025, Philadelphia, PA, USA, February 25 - March 4, 2025*, pages 25760–25768. AAAI Press, 2025. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V39I24.34768. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v39i24.34768>.
- Z.AI. GLM-5.2 developer documentation. Z.AI Developer Documentation, 2026. URL <https://docs.z.ai/guides/llm/glm-5.2>. Model ID `glm-5.2`. Accessed 2026-07-20.
- Fengji Zhang, Bei Chen, Yue Zhang, Jacky Keung, Jin Liu, Daoguang Zan, Yi Mao, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. RepoCoder: repository-level code completion through iterative retrieval and generation. In Houda Bouamor, Juan Pino, and Kalika Bali, editors, *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, EMNLP 2023, Singapore, December 6-10, 2023*, pages 2471–2484. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2023. doi: 10.18653/V1/2023.EMNLP-MAIN.151. URL <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.151>.
- Lei Zhang, Yunshui Li, Jiaming Li, Xiaobo Xia, Jiayi Yang, Run Luo, Minzheng Wang, Longze Chen, Junhao Liu, Qiang Qu, and Min Yang. Hierarchical context pruning: Optimizing real-world code completion with repository-level pretrained code LLMs. In Toby Walsh, Julie Shah, and Zico Kolter, editors, *Thirty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Thirty-Seventh Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, Fifteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2025, Philadelphia, PA, USA, February 25 - March 4, 2025*, pages 25886–25894. AAAI Press, 2025a. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V39I24.34782. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v39i24.34782>.
- Yanzhao Zhang, Mingxin Li, Dingkun Long, Xin Zhang, Huan Lin, Baosong Yang, Pengjun Xie, An Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Junyang Lin, Fei Huang, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen3 Embedding: advancing text embedding and reranking through foundation models, 2025b. URL <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2506.05176>.
- Wanjun Zhong, Lianghong Guo, Qiqi Gao, He Ye, and Yanlin Wang. MemoryBank: enhancing large language models with long-term memory. In Michael J. Wooldridge, Jennifer G. Dy, and Sriraam Natarajan, editors, *Thirty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2024, Thirty-Sixth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2024, Fourteenth Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2024, February 20-27, 2024, Vancouver, Canada*, pages 19724–19731. AAAI Press, 2024. doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V38I17.29946. URL <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v38i17.29946>.

Technical Appendix

This appendix holds the source-field dictionary, the construction and condition contracts, the full exclusion and audit material, and the extended breakdowns behind the main-paper claims. Section numbers restart with letters, while table and figure numbers continue from the main paper.

A Related-Work Contrast

Table 6 separates task success from memory probes on five auditable axes and records whether prior work isolates a memory intervention under matched conditions. Only the last row combines an executable task outcome with a matched memory toggle, and no family above it supplies both.

B Construction Audit

Table 7 lists each stage of the SIEVE construction, its rule, and the retained artifact. SIEVE names the successive filtering stages and is not an acronym. The release manifest records the script variant, prompt, chronology, and count fields of each stage.

B.1 Patch-Pattern Scoring Rule

For a candidate target t , the offline screen first admits only earlier instances from the same repository and excludes every target identifier. It extracts patch file paths F , directories D , and cleaned context or definition identifiers I . Let $\delta_f(t, h)$ equal one for a shared file. Let $\delta_d(t, h)$ equal one only when there is no shared file but there is a shared directory. The common deterministic score is

$$r(t, h) = 3\delta_f(t, h) + \delta_d(t, h) + \min(2, |I_t \cap I_h|). \quad (2)$$

The score favors shared files, then shared symbols and shared directories. A score of at least one reaches the shortlist. The implementation retains at most 24 candidates in descending score and recency order, then asks an LLM to judge each repair pattern with structured evidence. The release manifest names the semantic prompt variant, strict or relaxed, the model revision, and the resulting match file.

B.2 Target-Aware Experience Construction

For each retained pair, the target-aware experience construction stage produces one experience. It receives the target problem statement, the history problem statement, a compressed history trajectory, and the history final patch. The target statement only selects which historical lesson to emphasize. Each concrete claim is grounded in the historical trajectory or patch. The resulting record contains a bug class, root cause, fix pattern, and reusable lesson. The default script gates positive examples on an `all_ok` history evaluation and skips unresolved trajectories unless the run manifest declares otherwise. Target gold patches, target test patches, and target test outcomes are excluded from this construction.

C Source Instance Fields

SWE-rebench V2 records an instance identifier, repository, base commit, gold patch, test patch, problem statement, pull-request description, creation time, Docker image, language, code interface, repository license, failing-to-passing tests, passing-to-passing tests, installation configuration, and metadata. These fields provide the source material for VibeMemBench’s provenance and execution contract. The released benchmark states

Family	Task unit	Primary signal	Memory target supplied	Matched memory toggle
Coding benchmarks	Repository issue or completion	Tests or task-specific check	No	No
Memory benchmarks	Interaction history and query	Answer or capability score	Query-targeted evidence	No
Memory systems and continual coding	Update stream or ordered task sequence	System or continual-learning metric	Not a benchmark label	No
VibeMemBench	Prior coding history and target issue	Executable tests, solver tokens, and steps	No instance-level target	Yes

Table 6: Related-work contrast. Rows group prior work into four families; columns record the task unit, primary evaluation signal, whether a memory target is supplied, and whether a matched memory toggle is isolated.

Stage	Rule and retained artifact
Patch validation	Inject the source gold patch and execute the declared validation. Discard an instance when the gold patch does not pass.
Patch-pattern screening	Offline construction compares a target gold patch to earlier history patches from the same repository. Structural screening and an LLM return evidence-backed candidate pairs.
History execution	Run relevant history with MiniSWEAgent, deepseek-v4-flash, one seed, temperature 0.5, and a 250-step limit.
Target-aware experience	Use the target problem statement to focus a summary of the history trajectory and history final patch. The target gold and test patches are not inputs.
Target retention	Keep a target when memory-off is below 4/4 and the maximum-uplift candidate memory improves the deepseek-v4-flash reference setting.
Packaging	Retain the base commit, image, installation configuration, test command, and executable result for every released target.

Table 7: Construction audit. Left column names each SIEVE stage; right column gives the rule applied and the artifact retained at that stage.

which fields reach the solver. In particular, the target gold patch enters only the oracle-assisted offline patch-pattern screen. The target test patch remains evaluator-only. Neither artifact may reach target-aware experience construction, runtime memory retrieval, or the target solver context.

Table 8 turns the field list into an auditable boundary. It distinguishes source-task material from metadata and evaluator-controlled artifacts. The release manifest states any additional solver-visible field and whether executable test identifiers are visible, and gold patches and test patches remain hidden. The manifest also states the history cutoff for each target, so the history set stays a source of observations rather than an answer key.

D Task-Type and Language Audit

Table 9 reports the exact counts behind the main-paper profile charts. A construction audit assigns each of the 111 targets one primary task type from an eleven-way taxonomy using the problem statement, construction-only patch evidence, and declared tests. The audit artifacts never reach the solver.

The language distribution counts Python 56, JavaScript 16, Go 12, Rust 10, TypeScript 5, Kotlin 4, Swift 4, Java 2, and PHP 2. The main-paper figure groups the five smallest languages as Other.

Field group	Fields	Visibility boundary
Task and execution material	instance_id, repo, base_commit, problem_statement, image_name, language, install_config	Release manifest declares solver visibility.
Provenance and metadata	pr_description, created_at, interface, license, meta	Invisible by default. Any exposure requires an explicit audit.
Evaluator-controlled artifacts	patch, test_patch, FAIL_TO_PASS, PASS_TO_PASS	Gold patch enters only the offline patch-pattern screen. Test patch stays evaluator-only.

Table 8: Source-field roles in a VibeMemBench record. Each row names a field group, lists its SWE-rebench V2 fields, and states the visibility boundary that the release enforces.

Primary task type	Targets	Share
Bug fix	33	29.7%
Feature addition	23	20.7%
Parser or serialization logic	16	14.4%
Error handling or validation	9	8.1%
Compatibility fix	8	7.2%
Behavior change	8	7.2%
API or interface adjustment	6	5.4%
Configuration or dependency update	3	2.7%
Refactor or cleanup	2	1.8%
Test infrastructure or CI	2	1.8%
Documentation-related code change	1	0.9%
All targets	111	100%

Table 9: Primary task-type audit of the 111 targets. Each target receives one mutually exclusive primary label.

Condition	Pass	Resolved	In/out	Steps
Memory off	192	43.2%	882M/9.4M	24,618
Frozen verified exp.	349	78.6%	714M/8.6M	22,200

Table 10: Reference-setting selection audit on the 111 outcome-selected targets. Pass counts passing runs out of 444 target-seed runs; In and out are solver-side token totals; Steps counts declared agent steps over the 444 runs.

E Reference-Setting Selection Audit

Table 10 reports the deepseek-v4-flash reference comparison. Injecting the selected experience raises passing runs from 192 to 349 of 444 while lowering solver tokens and steps. This comparison participates in target selection. It is a selection audit, not evidence that the same uplift holds on an unselected source population or on another solver. Cross-model transfer in the main paper uses the frozen verified experience and does not reselect a memory combination for any evaluation model.

Field	Memory off	Memory on
Model, agent, tools, sandbox	Same declared configuration	Same declared configuration
Task order and resource limits	Same target and seed order	Same target and seed order
Context budget	[fixed budget]	[the same fixed budget]
Persistent writes	Disabled	[write policy]
Retrieval and insertion	No persistent records	[trigger, ranker, truncation]
Resource logging	Solver tokens and steps	Solver tokens and declared steps

Table 11: Condition contract. Each row names a controlled field; the second and third columns give its value in the memory-off and memory-on conditions. Square brackets mark fields the experiment manifest fills for each reported run.

Question	Changed component	Fixed comparison contract
Persistent memory effect	Memory off or declared memory on	$A, \mathcal{P}$, context budget, task order, executable predicate
Context-length control	Selected history or token-matched irrelevant text	A , token allocation, target and seed pair, insertion position
System mechanism	One implemented write, retrieval, or reranking component	$A, \mathcal{P}$, remaining memory pipeline, solver-token and step logging
Solver use	Memory condition or system version	$A, \mathcal{P}$, success predicate, solver-token and step accounting

Table 12: Predeclared ablation schema. Left column: the ablation question. Middle column: the component changed. Right column: the fixed comparison contract held constant across the change.

F Condition Contract

Table 11 states the invariants that both memory conditions share and the fields that the experiment manifest fills for each reported run. Without these invariants, a performance difference could reflect a changed prompt, tool, or context window rather than memory. The bracketed cells are the only places where the two conditions may differ, and each names a manifest field rather than a free choice.

G Predeclared Ablation Schema

Table 12 predeclares the ablation questions. A row enters the reported results only when the named component exists in the evaluated implementation and all fixed fields are logged.

H Diagnostics and Error Analysis

Memory logs can diagnose a result but cannot replace executable task success. The released log schema defines a history identifier, patch-pattern evidence, trajectory path, candidate-memory identifier, retrieval event, injected text, and declared agent steps. The predeclared positive-case bucket contains a frozen verified experience pass paired with a memory-off failure. The negative bucket contains a retrieval by existing memory systems that fails to improve the same baseline or injects stale, conflicting, or irrelevant context. The case analysis reports each bucket and samples it by a documented rule rather than selecting an attractive trace after inspection.

H.1 Attribution Validity Audit

The failure-attribution labels are produced by a deterministic script over logged artifacts and are fully recomputable. As a validity audit, two LLM judges from model families uninvolved in construction or solving, qwen3.7-max and MiniMax-M2.5, re-labeled all 231 failing pairings of the diagnostic cohort at temperature zero, blind to the script labels and under the same written four-stage manual. Each judge received the injected text, the frozen verified experience, the ingest-membership fact, patch file lists, and capped trajectory excerpts. The release manifest records the prompt hash and truncation rules.

Coverage labels agree exactly with the script for both judges. Primary-stage agreement is 56.3 and 44.2 percent with Cohen’s kappa 0.32 and 0.24, and the two judges agree with each other at 53.2 percent with kappa 0.35, so the residual disagreement reflects the looseness of the ranking and form boundary rather than a script-specific bias. The largest disagreement block moves weak-anchor form-degradation cases to ranking miss under a stricter anchor reading, and where a judge and the script assign the same anchor level, primary-stage agreement reaches 78.3 percent. The combined supplied-record share, ranking and form together, remains dominant for every rater at 70.6, 81.4, and 61.9 percent. The lexical instruction-pollution flag is wider than semantic judgment, with 114 script-true judge-false cases against 2 in the reverse direction, so the main paper reports that flag as a lexical marker. Both judge label sets and all 160 disagreement cases enter the release.

I Irrelevant-Memory Control

The irrelevant-memory control of the main transfer table separates the effect of relevant experience from the effect of injected text. It keeps the agent configuration, injection position, task order, and seeds at the main-experiment values and injects one fixed distractor passage in place of the frozen verified experience. The passage enters the same delimited experience block before the problem statement as the frozen injection, is identical for every solver, target, and seed, and contains no software content.

Xiao Ming’s mother is Xiao Hong. She likes to cook dumplings on weekends. The weather today is very sunny. There is a cat sleeping on the sofa. My favorite color is blue. The library is closed on Mondays.

The control runs on deepseek-v4-pro, glm-5, and kimi-k2.7-code, each over the full 444 target-seed grid of the 111 targets. Resolved falls to 63.7 percent for deepseek-v4-pro, 54.3 percent for glm-5, and 69.1 percent for kimi-k2.7-code, which is 3.4, 0.7, and 0.7 points below the matched memory-off baseline, and the three bootstrap intervals in Table 13 cross zero. No solver gains, so injected text alone reproduces none of the frozen verified experience gains. The transfer-only solvers glm-5.2 and qwen3.8-max run no control arm.

One reporting limit applies. The distractor passage is not matched to the frozen record in token count, and the predeclared context-length control of Table 12, which fixes the token allocation, remains a stricter separate condition.

J Headroom Stratification and Bootstrap Intervals

Table 13 stratifies every solver and condition combination by memory-off headroom and reports the target-level bootstrap interval behind the main-paper claims. The 95% CI columns of the two main-paper result tables are the frozen, control, and system rows of this table. The glm-5.2 and qwen3.8-max blocks carry a frozen row only, because those solvers run no control and no system condition. A ceiling target resolves four of four seeds without memory for that solver, so an injected record can only lose seeds there. Net seeds sum resolved-seed changes over the targets of a stratum. Intervals resample the 111 targets with their four seeds intact 10,000 times.

Solver	Condition	Below ceiling	At ceiling	$\hat{\Delta}$ (pp)	95% CI
deepseek-v4-pro	Frozen verified experience	+26	−26	0.00	[−5.63, +5.86]
deepseek-v4-pro	Irrelevant-memory control	+7	−22	−3.38	[−8.11, +1.35]
deepseek-v4-pro	Mem0	+5	−24	−4.28	[−9.68, +1.35]
deepseek-v4-pro	SimpleMem	+16	−17	−0.23	[−4.95, +4.50]
deepseek-v4-pro	MemoryOS	+15	−26	−2.48	[−8.11, +3.15]
deepseek-v4-pro	A-MEM	+16	−34	−4.05	[−10.14, +2.03]
glm-5	Frozen verified experience	+25	−14	+2.48	[−2.25, +7.21]
glm-5	Irrelevant-memory control	+10	−13	−0.68	[−5.63, +4.05]
glm-5	Mem0	+1	−25	−5.41	[−10.59, −0.45]
glm-5	SimpleMem	+8	−16	−1.80	[−6.76, +2.93]
glm-5	MemoryOS	+23	−14	+2.03	[−3.38, +7.43]
glm-5	A-MEM	+19	−30	−2.48	[−8.56, +3.38]
kimi-k2.7-code	Frozen verified experience	+31	−11	+4.50	[−0.23, +9.46]
kimi-k2.7-code	Irrelevant-memory control	+6	−9	−0.68	[−5.18, +3.83]
kimi-k2.7-code	Mem0	+12	−20	−1.80	[−6.53, +2.70]
kimi-k2.7-code	SimpleMem	+13	−14	−0.23	[−4.95, +4.50]
kimi-k2.7-code	MemoryOS	+1	−18	−3.83	[−8.56, +1.13]
kimi-k2.7-code	A-MEM	+1	−19	−4.05	[−9.68, +1.35]
glm-5.2	Frozen verified experience	+25	−9	+3.60	[−0.90, +8.11]
qwen3.8-max	Frozen verified experience	+17	−12	+1.13	[−2.93, +5.41]

Table 13: Headroom stratification and target-level bootstrap intervals for all twenty solver and condition combinations. Below ceiling and At ceiling give net resolved-seed changes in the two headroom strata. Below-ceiling targets number 62 for deepseek-v4-pro, 76 for glm-5, 55 for kimi-k2.7-code, 44 for glm-5.2, and 43 for qwen3.8-max; ceiling targets number 49, 35, 56, 67, and 68. $\hat{\Delta}$ is the paired Resolved difference in percentage points and the interval gives percentile bootstrap bounds.

Every combination gains seeds below the ceiling and loses seeds at it. The five frozen verified experience rows earn 17 to 31 net seeds below the ceiling, the three control rows earn 6 to 10, the twelve system rows earn 1 to 23, and only the largest system gain, MemoryOS on glm-5, covers its ceiling losses. Eleven of the twelve system rows carry a negative point estimate, no system or control interval lies above zero, and the glm-5 and Mem0 interval lies entirely below it. The two strongest solvers carry the most ceiling targets, 67 for glm-5.2 and 68 for qwen3.8-max, so both leave the fewest targets where an injected record can gain a seed. Their below-ceiling yields still differ, at 25 and 17 net seeds, so the ceiling count bounds the upside without fixing it.

K Record Success Conditions

This section reports the positive question behind the failure attribution. It covers the three solvers that run both evaluation layers, so the frozen condition contributes 333 pairings rather than the 555 of all five transfer solvers. A record raises Resolved on 21.9 percent of the 1,332 retrieval pairings and lowers it on 26.2 percent, and the frozen verified experience raises Resolved on 27.0 percent of its 333 pairings and lowers it on 22.2 percent. Stratification uses the same paired outcome and target-level bootstrap intervals from 10,000 resamples of the 111 targets. Two structural bounds shape the margins. A pairing at a four of four memory-off ceiling can only lose seeds, and 560 of the 1,332 pairings sit there. A pairing at zero memory-off seeds can only gain.

Solver headroom is the dominant factor. Table 14 stratifies the retrieval pairings by memory-off count. The mean paired effect is monotone, from a gain of 0.66 resolved seeds at zero memory-off seeds to a loss of 0.46 at four, and the loss rate rises from a structural zero to 26.8 percent. A ceiling pairing can only lose and a zero pairing can only gain, so the up rate itself is not monotone while the signed mean is.

Memory-off seeds	Pairings	Up rate	Down rate	Mean Δ
0	220	40.5%	0.0%	+0.66
1	152	32.2%	31.6%	+0.23
2	184	38.6%	41.8%	-0.10
3	216	38.4%	34.3%	-0.15
4	560	0.0%	26.8%	-0.46

Table 14: Retrieval pairings stratified by memory-off count. Up rate and down rate are the shares that raise or lower Resolved, and Mean Δ is the mean paired change in resolved seeds. The zero and four rows carry a structural bound on one direction.

Anchor level	0	1	2	3	4
same-history	45/0	37/21	29/59	36/37	0/30
same-file	24/0	12/46	30/65	20/40	0/31
shared dir or id	43/0	36/33	43/32	41/32	0/26

Table 15: Anchor level crossed with memory-off count over the retrieval pairings. Each cell gives the up rate and the down rate in percent. The mismatch level is omitted for small counts.

Record attributes discriminate only where headroom exists. Table 15 crosses the anchor level with the memory-off count. At one or fewer memory-off seeds a record that overlaps the source history lowers Resolved on 8.0 percent of pairings against 19.0 percent for a record that only shares a file, and it raises Resolved on 42.0 against 19.0 percent. At two or more memory-off seeds the anchor levels converge, and at the ceiling no anchor recovers a seed. The pollution flag and the retained field count do not separate the up rate from the down rate in any headroom stratum.

The frozen verified experience is a reference of near constant form, short and unpolluted with all four fields on every target. Its variation is almost entirely headroom. It raises Resolved on 45.5 percent of its zero pairings with no loss, yet still lowers Resolved on 25.7 percent of its ceiling pairings, so record quality does not remove the downside where the solver already resolves the target.

The highest success cell combines zero memory-off seeds with a directory or identifier anchor, where the record raises Resolved on 55.2 percent of 58 pairings and lowers it on none, with a bootstrap interval of 40.8 to 69.1 percent. This is the operational success condition. A record helps with no observed downside when the solver fails the target without memory and the record reaches at least a directory or identifier anchor in the target repository, while at the ceiling no record form recovers a seed.

Solver headroom also predicts the direction of the paired effect better than record content. Across the twelve system and three frozen combinations of this cohort the mean paired effect is positive at zero memory-off seeds and negative at four for every combination. A rule that predicts the sign from memory-off count alone is correct on 56.5 percent of the 641 pairings that change Resolved, above the 52.4 percent of a rule that reads only the anchor level and the pollution flag, and it wins or ties on every solver.

L Failure-Attribution Breakdown

Table 16 splits the 231 failing pairings of the diagnostic cohort by existing memory system and by solver. The cohort covers deepseek-v4-pro and kimi-k2.7-code with Mem0, SimpleMem, MemoryOS, and A-MEM.

Form degradation dominates every system and both solvers. The transcript systems MemoryOS and A-MEM concentrate almost entirely on coverage and form, while the atomic systems Mem0 and SimpleMem supply all ranking misses and 28 of the 31 use failures. The injected records of the cohort have median

Group	Pairings	Cov.	Rank	Form	Use
A-MEM	65	14	0	48	3
Mem0	60	9	2	28	21
MemoryOS	60	8	0	52	0
SimpleMem	46	6	1	32	7
deepseek-v4-pro	124	21	2	87	14
kimi-k2.7-code	107	16	1	73	17
All	231	37	3	160	31

Table 16: First-broken-stage counts split by existing memory system and by solver over the 231 failing pairings. Cov., Rank, Form, and Use abbreviate coverage miss, ranking miss, form degradation, and use failure.

Mechanism	Pairings	Dominant root cause
Instruction pollution	64	Verbatim storage, no filter
Overgeneralized fix	29	Prompt rewrites to a generic fact
Tool or shell noise	16	Chunker keeps tool output
Schema omits fix	14	No repair slot in schema
Fix replaced by symptom	6	Prompt favors observed facts

Table 17: Form degradation mechanisms and their dominant root cause in the evaluated memory pipeline. Pairings count the 160 form degradation cases of the diagnostic cohort by primary mechanism, with 31 further cases in other groups.

length 10 lines, mean 65.1, and maximum 414. Anchor levels count 55 same-history, 30 same-file, 143 shared directory or identifier, and 3 mismatches, and 118 of 231 records trigger the lexical instruction-pollution markers. Of the four frozen-record fields, the injected text retains a bug class in 97 pairings, a root cause in 115, a fix pattern in 120, and a reusable lesson in 132.

The anchor rule is recomputable from logged artifacts. A retrieved text that matches a span of the source history trajectory scores same-history. Otherwise a full path or basename match against the source patch scores same-file, a directory or frozen-field identifier match scores the shared level, and no match scores mismatch.

M Form Degradation Mechanisms

This section traces each form degradation mechanism to a design choice in the evaluated memory pipeline. The audit reads deployment code and injected records and runs no new solver. Table 17 pairs each mechanism with its dominant root cause.

In the transcript systems the injected text is the conversation transcript by construction. A-MEM stores each message as its own record and appends generated tags, so a tool output or an instruction message survives intact. Of its 32 pollution records, 29 are single tool output blocks and none crosses a task instruction boundary. MemoryOS keeps the raw dialogue and appends a topic summary, and its buffered pairing of adjacent messages misaligns with the trajectory’s semantic spans, which yields more shell noise and the only three records that pack a task instruction and a repair together. In both systems the extraction step adds a label or a summary and leaves the transcript in place, so a filter prompt does not reach the code path that concatenates the original text.

In the atomic systems the extraction prompt is written for dialogue facts and the schema carries dialogue

Arm	Pairings	Mean seeds	Change	Up	Down
Original	62	1.37	—	—	—
Strip	62	1.97	+0.60	31	7
Random	62	1.85	+0.48	31	12

Table 18: Instruction pollution strip ablation over 62 pairings with four seeds each. Mean seeds is the mean resolved seed count per pairing, Change is the mean paired difference from the original arm, and Up and Down count pairings that rise or fall against the original. A target-level permutation test with 10,000 sign flips gives $p < 0.0001$ for the strip arm and $p = 0.0006$ for the random arm.

fields rather than a repair slot. A repair step is rewritten into one generic sentence, and in the 14 cases that omit the fix the injected line states a feature request, an error symptom, or an execution observation with no repair content. The two families fail in different ways, yet both reduce a verified repair to a form the solver cannot act on.

N Instruction Pollution Strip Ablation

This ablation tests whether the instruction content in a transcript record causes the downstream loss or only marks a bulky record. Three arms run over 62 of the 64 instruction pollution pairings of the diagnostic cohort, each with four seeds under the condition contract. Two pairings left the cohort for sandbox infrastructure failures, a repeated image pull timeout and a stalled agent, and both exclusions were decided before any arm was scored. The original arm reuses the retrieval result. The strip arm deletes every line that triggers the lexical pollution marker and reinjects the remainder. The random arm deletes an equal number of unflagged lines at a fixed seed, which controls for length. Table 18 reports the three arms.

Both intervention arms recover seeds over the original record, and the permutation test rejects the null for each. The strip arm gains 0.60 resolved seeds per pairing and the random arm gains 0.48, so removing an equal count of unflagged lines recovers a comparable amount. The predeclared criterion for a causal form effect requires the strip arm to recover and the random arm not to, so the effect is not established. The harm operates through transcript volume rather than instruction semantics. On eight pairings the strip empties the record, which reduces the condition to memory-off; excluding them leaves the strip and random gains at 0.54 and 0.52 and does not change the conclusion. This agrees with the marginal stratification, where the pollution flag does not separate the up rate from the down rate, and with the headroom finding.

O Retrieval Budget Dose Curve

The retrieval shortfall of the twelve solver and system pairings could reflect the single-record retrieval interface rather than record content. Table 19 tests this reading with a retrieval-budget dose curve on deepseek-v4-pro and Mem0. It varies only the number of injected records k from one to five and holds the Mem0 store, retrieval query, ranker, truncation, task order, and seeds at the main-experiment values. Mem0 is the atomic system with the largest matched Resolved drop for this solver and the only recomputable ranking-miss channel, so a wider budget receives its most favorable test here. Budget zero is the memory-off baseline and budget one reproduces the deepseek-v4-pro Mem0 point estimate of the main-paper retrieval table.

Six of the 111 targets retrieve fewer than five nonempty records, with availabilities of one, two, three, three, four, and four. When a budget exceeds a target’s availability the target keeps its highest available outcome, so every budget scores all 111 targets over 444 seeds and mirrors deployment where a store returns no more than it holds.

Budget k	Resolved	$\hat{\Delta}$ (pp)	95% CI
0	67.1%	—	—
1	62.8%	−4.28	[−9.91, +1.35]
2	61.7%	−5.41	[−11.26, +0.23]
3	64.4%	−2.70	[−8.78, +3.38]
4	65.5%	−1.58	[−7.21, +4.05]
5	63.7%	−3.38	[−9.46, +2.48]

Table 19: Retrieval-budget dose curve for deepseek-v4-pro and Mem0. Budget k counts injected records, with zero the memory-off baseline and one the main-paper retrieval result. $\hat{\Delta}$ is the paired Resolved difference in percentage points against memory off, and the interval is a percentile bootstrap over the 111 targets with their four seeds intact.

Target (System)	Record form	dv4-pro	k2.7-code
pybamm-4267 (A-MEM)	46-line diff	0/4→3/4	2/4→0/4
cfn-lint-3972 (A-MEM)	dir listing	3/4→0/4	0/4→2/4
aiohttp-8720 (SimpleMem)	1-line anchor	2/4→0/4	1/4→4/4

Table 20: Same-record solver contrasts. Each row fixes one target and one existing memory system. Cells give resolved seeds out of four, memory off → system condition. dv4-pro and k2.7-code abbreviate deepseek-v4-pro and kimi-k2.7-code.

No budget reaches the memory-off baseline. The strongest budget, four records, resolves 65.5 percent against 67.1 for memory off, every target-level bootstrap interval crosses or lies below zero, and none lies above it. The curve is also non-monotone, so added records do not trace a recovery toward the baseline.

The stratified net seeds repeat the top-1 redistribution at every budget. Each budget loses 21 to 37 net seeds at the four-of-four ceiling and gains 5 to 22 seeds below it, and the ceiling loss exceeds the below-ceiling gain at every budget. A wider budget enlarges both the ceiling damage and the below-ceiling repair without reversing their order.

The null result matches the failure attribution. A wider retrieval budget can mechanically repair only a ranking miss, which Table 16 assigns to 3 of the 231 failing pairings, while form degradation dominates and every added record leaves the same extraction pipeline with the same form. Retrieving more records cannot repair a form that repeats across them.

The shortfall is not a context-pressure artifact of the atomic system. Median solver steps stay between 41 and 46 and median solver tokens stay near one million across all budgets, so no budget inflates the interaction. The single-record retrieval interface therefore does not explain the retrieval shortfall.

P Qualitative Case Contrasts

Table 20 lists the three predeclared solver contrasts in which the same supplied record moves the two diagnosed solvers in opposite directions past the two-seed margin, and Table 21 pairs four injected records with their seed outcomes.

On pybamm-4267 the A-MEM record is a 46-line tool-output excerpt whose diff adds a reverse key mapping in `pybamm/util.py` and rolls back one line in `parameter_values.py`. deepseek-v4-pro opens both anchored files at its first step and follows the repair direction, rising from zero to three resolved seeds. kimi-k2.7-code reaches the same anchors and then deletes the entire compatibility block that the record only asked to adjust, falling from two resolved seeds to zero.

Target	System	Lines	Solver	Seeds
swift-argument-parser-821	SimpleMem	1	dv4-pro	2/4→4/4
hypothesis-3785	A-MEM	23	k2.7-code	0/4→4/4
aiohttp-7907	A-MEM	334	dv4-pro	4/4→0/4
aiohttp-7907	Mem0	1	dv4-pro	4/4→4/4

Table 21: Record-content contrasts. Each row fixes one target, one existing memory system, and one solver. Lines counts the injected record. Seeds gives resolved seeds out of four, memory off → system condition.

On `cfn-lint-3972` the record is a directory listing of rule files with no repair content. `kimi-k2.7-code`, which never finds the rule-package entry point without memory, uses a listed file as a navigation anchor and lands on the schema-data repair, rising from zero to two. `deepseek-v4-pro`, which already resolves the target through the schema route, is diverted into writing a new 121-line custom rule and falls from three to zero.

On `aiohttp-8720` the one-line SimpleMem record describes an erroneous historical edit that wraps a payload read in a broad exception handler, an edit the frozen verified experience of the same target explicitly warns against. `kimi-k2.7-code` uses only the file and function anchors, repairs the chunked-parsing state machine in `http_parser.py`, and rises from one resolved seed to four. `deepseek-v4-pro` reproduces the described edit almost verbatim in `web_protocol.py` and falls from two resolved seeds to zero.

One caution limits over-reading positive rows. On `swift-argument-parser-821` the injected line carries only reported library and language versions, the resolving trajectory shows no content-level use of the record, and the matched memory-off failure includes workspace-setup noise, so that gain cannot be attributed to record content and illustrates the seed variance that the two-seed contrast margin filters elsewhere.

Q Opposite-Sign Solver Profiling

Table 3 of the main paper profiles the 444 target and system pairs in which the same injected record reaches two solvers. A pair is opposite-sign when the two solvers move in opposite directions relative to their matched memory-off runs.

Of the 444 pairs, 151 show no movement in either solver, 175 move in one solver only, 54 move in the same direction, and 64 move in opposite directions. In 61 of the 64 opposite-sign pairs the solver with the lower memory-off count gains. The two pairings that involve `glm-5` repeat the pattern. The `deepseek-v4-pro` and `glm-5` pairing yields 131 both-nonzero pairs with 59 opposite-sign, and 48 of the 52 with unequal memory-off counts favor the lower solver. The `kimi-k2.7-code` and `glm-5` pairing yields 108 both-nonzero pairs with 47 opposite-sign, and 31 of the 34 unequal pairs favor the lower solver. Record attributes do not distinguish the two groups. Table 22 compares eight attributes between the opposite-sign and same-sign pairs of the main solver pairing, and a target-level permutation test clears every one at a smallest p of 0.25. The direction is therefore a property of the two solvers rather than of the record.

R MemoryOS on glm-5 Decomposition

Table 23 decomposes the single positive retrieval pairing by memory-off bucket. Gains concentrate where `glm-5` starts at zero or one resolved seed, and the 4/4 bucket only loses.

All 29 uplifted targets receive raw-transcript records that trigger the lexical instruction-pollution markers, none receives a directory listing, and the median record length is 31 lines. On the same 29 targets the identical records move `deepseek-v4-pro` up on 9 and down on 4, and `kimi-k2.7-code` up on 9 and down on 11. The

Attribute	Opposite	Same	Permutation p
Pollution rate	53.1%	50.0%	0.86
Length mean	57.1	71.6	0.44
Strong anchor rate	32.8%	35.2%	0.85
same-history rate	25.0%	24.1%	1.00
mismatch rate	0.0%	1.9%	0.45
Retained field count	1.8	2.1	0.25
Fix pattern rate	48.4%	53.7%	0.58
Transcript share	54.7%	55.6%	1.00

Table 22: Record attribute comparison between opposite-sign and same-sign pairs of the deepseek-v4-pro and kimi-k2.7-code pairing. Opposite counts 64 pairs and Same counts 54. The permutation test resamples the sign of the group label over the paired targets 10,000 times.

Memory-off bucket	Targets	Up	Down	Won	Lost
0/4	26	9	0	+15	0
1/4	15	8	5	+15	-5
2/4	16	6	3	+9	-6
3/4	19	6	6	+6	-11
4/4	35	0	11	0	-14

Table 23: MemoryOS on glm-5 by memory-off bucket over the 111 targets. Up and Down count targets whose four-seed resolved count rises or falls against the matched memory-off run. Won and Lost sum the resolved-seed changes of those targets.

Set	Pairings	Bound	Negative	Ties
All failing pairings	231	+268	22 (-24)	49
Form degradation	160	+196	13 (-15)	34
Instruction pollution	64	+78	5 (-7)	16

Table 24: Counterfactual recovery bound. Bound sums frozen-minus-system resolved seeds; Negative counts pairings where the frozen outcome is lower, with their summed deficit in parentheses; Ties counts equal outcomes.

record form matches the form that dominates failure attribution, so the pairing gains from the headroom of the weakest solver rather than from a superior record, and its bootstrap interval in Table 13 crosses zero.

S Counterfactual Recovery Bound

Table 24 details the substitution bound cited in the main paper. For each failing pairing the substitution replaces the four-seed system outcome with the frozen verified experience outcome of the same target and solver and sums the seed difference without truncating negative terms.

By solver, the bound is +123 over the 124 deepseek-v4-pro pairings and +145 over the 107 kimi-k2.7-code pairings, against net losses of 49 and 44 seeds for these two solvers across all their retrieval pairings. The bound exceeds the 127-seed all-solver net loss because the net loss is already offset by gaining pairings while the bound accumulates only over failing ones. It marks the recovery that one verified record achieves. It is not an upper bound on what the full history offers, because the frozen record is the best of a screened shortlist,

and it is not a prediction for a repaired system, since frozen injection changes more than record form.

T Ceiling Reference Audit

The 1,332 retrieval pairings arise from 111 targets, three solvers, and four systems. The 140 target and solver pairs at the four-of-four memory-off ceiling, 49 for deepseek-v4-pro, 56 for kimi-k2.7-code, and 35 for glm-5, produce the 560 ceiling pairings and the 42.0 percent share. Under the deepseek-v4-flash reference setting, all 140 pairs sit below the ceiling. The reference memory-off count is 0/4 for 13 pairs over 9 unique targets, 1/4 for 9 pairs over 6 targets, 2/4 for 20 pairs over 14 targets, and 3/4 for 98 pairs over 41 targets, with no pair at 4/4 and no violation of the retention rule.