

What Does Multi-Harness RL Learn? Credit Assignment and Portability in Coding Agents

Chenqian Le*
New York University
c16707@nyu.edu

Jiayi Cheng*
New York University
jc10077@nyu.edu

Qijia He
University of Washington
heqj3@uw.edu

Runhao Li
University of Southern California
runhao.li@usc.edu

Yinghao Li
Columbia University
yinghao.li@columbia.edu

Xupeng Chen[†]
Dimension Gate
xupengchen@dimensiongate.cn

Abstract

Agent reinforcement learning (RL) increasingly runs through full execution harnesses, and a multi-harness recipe mixes two choices: exposing the policy to several harnesses, and comparing their rewards inside one relative-advantage group. We isolate the second choice in repository-level coding. From one Qwen3-8B supervised warm start we replay the same frozen task-harness records from Aider, OpenHands, Qwen Code, and SWE-agent, with the same number of updates, under two rules for group-relative policy optimization (GRPO), *Within* (one group per task-harness pair) and *Cross* (harnesses pooled within a task), and score every checkpoint with one sealed SWE-bench Verified oracle on the four source harnesses and on a minimal harness held out of training. The evaluation harness is the dominant variable: across 24,000 sealed evaluations it moves the mean solve rate from 2.14% to 9.27%, a factor of 4.3, where the training recipe moves it by 1.16. The grouping rule is not. On the held-out harness, Cross minus Within is +0.25 percentage points (pp), 95% confidence interval $[-0.48, +1.02]$, at eight attempts per task, and +0.16 $[-0.41, +0.72]$ pooled over three training seeds whose individual estimates change sign. Each rule’s own seed range, 0.42 to 0.45 pp, exceeds the difference between them. Both rules place their largest gains on the same source harness. The pooled advantage carries the harness: an out-of-fold classifier recovers the generating harness from Cross’s advantage +4.48 pp above the shuffled-label baseline and from Within’s not at all, and the two rules still reach the same held-out score and the same action distribution inside each harness. Re-collecting half the training data on-policy does not change this. Cross-harness credit yields configuration adaptation and no more portable capability than within-harness credit. Multi-harness RL reports should state the grouping boundary and test under an unseen harness.

*Equal contribution.

[†]Corresponding author.




Figure 1: Controlled multi-harness training and harness-swap evaluation. Four production harnesses collect trajectories and rewards from the same SWE-Gym task pool; the frozen manifest holds records, tokens, and rewards fixed across the primary arms. Cross pools same-task traces across harnesses when constructing GRPO groups, whereas Within assigns credit separately within each task-harness pair. Checkpoints are graded by the same sealed oracle on the source harnesses and an unseen minimal harness. Source-profile changes combine portable improvement with configuration adaptation; held-out changes isolate the component that survives the harness swap.

1 Introduction

Coding agents act through production harnesses that choose prompts, tools, observations, context-management rules, retries, and control flow [Yang et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2025a, Gauthier, 2024, Qwen Team, 2025a]. Recent systems train policies through these harnesses, sometimes using several harnesses or harness configurations for one policy [Xu et al., 2026, Yu et al., 2026, Kimi Team, 2026, Song et al., 2026]. The phrase *multi-harness RL* does not specify how those harnesses interact during credit assignment.

Exposure does not determine the grouping rule. When several harnesses attempt the same task, their outcomes may be compared directly or normalized separately. HarnessX groups same-task traces across successive harness and model versions, so the traces compete inside one GRPO group [Chen et al., 2026]. ClawGym II treats each task-harness pair as the optimization unit instead: the harnesses share a policy and minibatch, but reward normalization remains separate [Song et al., 2026]. Because these systems also differ in exposure, rollout generation, training regime, and evaluation, their end-to-end results do not isolate the grouping boundary.

We isolate that boundary in repository-level coding (Figure 1). Four production harnesses collect a frozen trajectory corpus on a shared SWE-Gym pool [Pan et al., 2025]. From the same Qwen3-8B [Qwen Team, 2025b] supervised warm start, the two primary RL arms replay identical records, tokens, rewards, loss masks, and update budget. *Within* forms GRPO [Shao et al., 2024] groups inside each task-harness pair. *Cross* (PLAINCROSS in the released artifacts) pools all harnesses for the task. We evaluate every resulting checkpoint with one sealed per-instance oracle on the four source harnesses and on a minimal harness absent from training. The comparison holds experience diversity fixed and changes only cross-harness credit assignment.

The evaluation harness, not the training recipe, is the largest effect in the study. Letting harnesses compete for credit changes which trajectories carry gradient and leaves everything downstream of that in place: the held-out score, and the policy’s action distribution inside each harness. *Seeing several harnesses and comparing them for credit are separate interventions*, and the second does not by itself make the learned policy harness-independent.

Contributions.

- A controlled recipe-by-harness matrix under one sealed oracle. The evaluation harness moves solve rate by a factor of 4.3 where the training recipe moves it by 1.16, and harness strength differs between model families.
- A same-data, same-budget experiment that isolates the GRPO grouping boundary across four production coding harnesses and scores every checkpoint under a harness held out of training. Cross and Within are indistinguishable there, with or without re-collecting the data on-policy, and both place their largest gains on the same source harness.
- A direct measurement of the harness identity each credit rule leaves in the advantage, +4.48 pp above its null under pooling and none under within-harness grouping, and of what that identity changes downstream: the same held-out score and the same action distribution inside each harness either way.

2 Related work

Harnesses as an evaluation variable. Harness-Bench, standardized leaderboards, and configuration-level audits show that agent scores, costs, and failures depend on model–harness pairing [Yao et al., 2026, Zhang et al., 2026, Kapoor et al., 2025, 2024]. The same concern motivates agent suites that fix the interface as part of the benchmark [Liu et al., 2024, Mialon et al., 2023, Zhou et al., 2024a, Yao et al., 2025] and audits of how much of a reported score is a property of the benchmark rather than the model [Liang et al., 2023, Dehghani et al., 2021, Singh et al., 2025, Biderman et al., 2024]. We measure that heterogeneity on our own checkpoints (Section 4) and use it to pose a training question.

Harness-native reinforcement learning. Polar, Tmax, OpenForgeRL, and related systems make policy optimization through production harnesses practical and report substantial native-harness gains [Xu et al., 2026, Iverson et al., 2026, Yu et al., 2026]. For repository-level coding specifically, SWE-RL and SWE-Gym establish the outcome-reward recipe we replay [Wei et al., 2025, Pan et al., 2025], and parallel lines train agents through device, web and search interfaces [Bai et al., 2024, Qi et al., 2025, Jin et al., 2025, Wang et al., 2025b]. They study infrastructure, scaling, and native-harness performance. Our question is how outcomes from several native harnesses should interact in the relative-credit estimator.

Multi-harness training and transfer. Kimi K3, OpenForgeRL, and other frontier recipes vary heterogeneous harness exposure as part of a larger post-training stack [Kimi Team, 2026, Yu et al., 2026, Huang et al., 2026, NVIDIA, 2026]. HarnessX pools same-task traces across evolving harness versions [Chen et al., 2026], ClawGym II normalizes within each task–harness pair before mixed gradient updates [Song et al., 2026], and harness design has begun to be studied as a post-training variable in its own right [Kim et al., 2026, Foundation Model Team, Li Auto Inc., 2026]. That disagreement motivates a comparison in which the trajectory manifest and update budget stay fixed and only the grouping boundary moves, with source-configuration effects separated from held-out portability.

Where credit is assigned. Most work on credit assignment in large language model (LLM) RL refines the resolution of the signal: per-step value estimates [Kazemnejad et al., 2024], hierarchical turn-level objectives [Zhou et al., 2024b, Feng et al., 2025], hindsight reassignment over long horizons [Tan et al., 2026], or process supervision that scores intermediate steps [Uesato et al., 2022, Lightman et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024]. A second line asks what the group-relative baseline itself normalizes away, and corrects its length and difficulty bias [Liu et al., 2025b, Yu et al., 2025, Ahmadian et al., 2024]. Both take the set of trajectories that compete for credit as given. We vary that set instead: the

resolution of the reward is fixed at one binary outcome per episode, and only the boundary of the comparison group moves.

What RL adds over the starting policy. Whether outcome-reward RL creates capability or reweights what the base model already does is contested [Yue et al., 2025, Chu et al., 2025, Zeng et al., 2025, Liu et al., 2025a, Guo et al., 2025], and the answer depends on how capability is measured. Spurious or misspecified rewards can move a score without moving the underlying skill [Shao et al., 2025, Skalse et al., 2022], and RLHF narrows diversity while raising the headline number [Kirk et al., 2024, Singhal et al., 2023]. Our setting adds a second axis to that question. Even granting that a gain is real on the harness that produced the data, it may be a property of the model–harness pair rather than of the model. Evaluating under an unseen harness separates the two, and that measurement is what the rest of this paper is built around.

3 Separating exposure from credit assignment

Let an episode be indexed by task x , harness h , and rollout i , with sealed-oracle reward $r_{x,h,i} \in \{0, 1\}$. Both primary arms train on the same frozen manifest. They differ only in where the relative-credit boundary is drawn:

$$A_{x,h,i}^{\text{Within}} = \frac{r_{x,h,i} - \mu_{x,h}}{\sigma_{x,h} + \varepsilon}, \quad G_{x,h}^{\text{Within}} = \{\tau_{x,h,i}\}_i, \quad (1)$$

$$A_{x,h,i}^{\text{Cross}} = \frac{r_{x,h,i} - \mu_x}{\sigma_x + \varepsilon}, \quad G_x^{\text{Cross}} = \{\tau_{x,h,i}\}_{h,i}. \quad (2)$$

Both rules are group-relative in the sense of GRPO [Shao et al., 2024]: the advantage is a standardized reward within a group of sampled trajectories. It sits with the baseline-subtracting policy-gradient methods [Williams, 1992, Ahmadian et al., 2024] rather than with the learned-critic objectives used in earlier reinforcement-learning-from-human-feedback (RLHF) pipelines [Schulman et al., 2017, Ouyang et al., 2022]. That standardization is not neutral. Its mean and scale terms are known to introduce composition-dependent bias, which motivates the length and difficulty corrections proposed for single-harness training [Liu et al., 2025b, Yu et al., 2025]. A harness-heterogeneous group changes exactly that composition, which is why we isolate the boundary experimentally instead of assuming it away.

Within uses heterogeneous harnesses as parallel sources of experience without comparing their rewards. Cross uses the same records but makes outcomes from different harnesses compete.

For a trained arm a relative to the common supervised fine-tuned (SFT) warm start θ_{SFT} , we report two profiles:

$$G_{\text{source}}(a) = \mathbb{E}_{h \in H_{\text{train}}, x} [Y(\theta_a, h, x) - Y(\theta_{\text{SFT}}, h, x)], \quad (3)$$

$$G_{\text{heldout}}(a) = \mathbb{E}_{h \notin H_{\text{train}}, x} [Y(\theta_a, h, x) - Y(\theta_{\text{SFT}}, h, x)]. \quad (4)$$

The source profile can contain portable model change as well as adaptation to source configurations. The held-out profile tests portability.

Both arms start from the same checkpoint, replay the same experience, use the same reward and loss definitions, receive the same number of updates, and are scored by the same evaluation. The grouping boundary is the only component that changes, from `task × harness` under Within to `task, pooling harnesses` under Cross. The coverage-matched and residualized arms of Section 6 reuse the same corpus and update budget. They change what enters the pooled group rather than where its boundary lies.

The primary crossed campaign evaluates six checkpoints on four source harnesses over 500 SWE-bench Verified [Jimenez et al., 2024, Chowdhury et al., 2024] tasks at two attempts per task, or 24,000 attempted episodes, of which 99.1% returned a usable sealed-oracle verdict. It evaluates the same six checkpoints on the held-out weak-ReAct interface over the same roster at $k=4$, and the SFT, Within and Cross checkpoints again at $k=8$, the three checkpoints the primary held-out contrasts need. Both profiles in Equation 4 come from one set of weights per arm, so the split decomposes each checkpoint rather than comparing training runs. The Within and Cross arms were also re-trained under two further seeds, and one further Cross arm re-collected its second half of training data on-policy. All of these are scored on the held-out interface at $k=4$. The six held-out contrasts were fixed before any



Figure 2: Solve rate for every training recipe under every source harness, over the same 24,000 sealed-oracle evaluations; shading encodes the number printed in the cell and harnesses are ordered by column mean. Columns darken from left to right while rows stay flat. Harness means run from 2.14% to 9.27%, a 7.13 pp span; the recipe means in the right-hand margin span only 5.55% to 6.46%, or 0.91.

checkpoint existed, and all contrasts are task-paired. Infrastructure failures are quarantined rather than scored as model failures. Appendices D, F, and L give the design, version pins, and completeness gates.

4 The evaluation harness dominates the training recipe

Across evaluation harnesses, the mean solve rate varies by a factor of 4.3; across training recipes, it varies by 1.16 (Figure 2). Harness means run from 2.14% to 9.27% over the same 24,000 sealed evaluations, while the six recipe means sit between 5.55% and 6.46%. Recent evaluations document the same model–harness dependence [Yao et al., 2026, Zhang et al., 2026, Kapoor et al., 2025], and smaller configuration choices move scores the same way: which scaffold is used [Xia et al., 2024], how the prompt is formatted [Sclar et al., 2024], and how the leaderboard itself is built [Liang et al., 2023, Singh et al., 2025].

The harnesses differ in success priors, observation streams, reachable states, tool vocabularies, and control flow, and the spread they produce is not a fixed property of the interface. On the same 500 tasks, Seed-Coder-8B scores alike with Qwen3-8B under the minimal harness, yet Aider and SWE-agent, neutral for Qwen3-8B, each cost it about 4 pp against its own minimal-harness score, and two further harnesses cannot run for it at all (Table 5). Harness strength is not one model-independent scalar that could be subtracted from every model’s score. Under Cross, then, rewards from contexts that are not exchangeable in the usual same-prompt GRPO sense compete for credit.

5 Cross-harness credit adds no detectable portability

On the interface excluded from training, the six recipes span 4.01% to 4.73% (Figure 3a, Table 2). That range is narrower than the smallest difference any of the six held-out contrasts can detect at 80% power, and nearly an order of magnitude below the 7.13 pp that the choice of harness moves the same checkpoints. No recipe, the supervised warm start included, separates from the untrained base here. At eight attempts per task, Cross minus Within is +0.25 pp [−0.48, +1.02]. Relative to the common supervised warm start, Within is −0.03 pp [−0.64, +0.59] and Cross is +0.13 [−0.65, +0.92]. Every interval includes zero. With exposure held fixed, letting outcomes from different harnesses compete leaves the held-out score where within-harness credit leaves it.




Figure 3: **(a)** Under the harness excluded from training, no recipe separates from any other. Solve rate on the held-out weak-ReAct interface, SWE-bench Verified, four attempts per task on the 499 tasks gradeable in every arm, recipes in the order of Figure 2. The axis is truncated and every bar is broken, so bar height is not proportional to the score. The ruler is the smallest difference the narrowest of the six held-out contrasts can detect, and it is taller than the spread of the six recipes. Doubling the budget shrinks the two re-run gaps to Cross – Within = +0.25 pp and Cross – SFT = +0.13 pp. Levels are in Table 2, contrasts in Table 3. **(b)** Harness identity recoverable from each arm’s advantage on the training manifest, in percentage points above that arm’s own shuffled-label null, with 95% intervals from resampling tasks. Within sits at its null by construction, pooling carries +4.48 pp, coverage matching retains about a quarter of that, and the residualized arm as assembled retains all of it. Accuracies and slopes are in Table 9.

On the four training harnesses, Cross is +0.77 pp above SFT, with non-negative point estimates in all four columns (+0.73 / +1.81 / 0.00 / +0.51). Those column differences are the Cross and SFT rows of Figure 2 subtracted, and are tabulated in Table 1. This is the largest estimate in the study. Its 95% interval is [+0.03, +1.52], and the 99% interval corrected for five recipe comparisons is [−0.21, +1.75]. OpenHands contributes +1.81 pp to the pooled estimate.

Within behaves the same way. Subtracting the same two rows of Figure 2 puts it +0.48 pp above SFT on the training harnesses, again with its largest single-column gain on OpenHands (+1.71 pp against Cross’s +1.81). The two arms differ there by 0.28 pp, a fifth of the width of the Cross interval. Both arms concentrate their gains on the source configurations, a property of reinforcement learning on this corpus rather than of the grouping rule.

Doubling attempts from four to eight lowers the smallest detectable difference from 1.19–1.42 to 0.88–1.14 pp, while Cross–Within moves from +0.58 to +0.25 and Within–SFT from +0.16 to −0.03 (Table 4). Both estimates move toward zero as precision improves. Pooling three training seeds at $k=4$ narrows the Cross–Within interval to 1.14 pp, a smallest detectable difference near 0.8 pp, and the estimate there is +0.16.

The single-seed estimate sits at the top of its own seed distribution. Re-training Within and Cross under two further seeds and scoring all three at $k=4$ on the 499 tasks common to every run gives Cross minus Within of +0.62, +0.05 and −0.20 pp for seeds 17, 29 and 41 (Table 2). The sign flips between seeds of one design on one roster. Pooled, the contrast is +0.16 pp [−0.41, +0.72], with 42 tasks favoring Cross, 38 favoring Within and 419 tied, and each arm’s own seed range, 0.45 pp for Within and 0.42 for Cross, exceeds the difference between the arms.

Re-collecting the data on-policy does not change this. A further Cross arm spends the same 81,216 updates from the same warm start, replays the frozen records for the first half only, and then re-runs

the training tasks with the half-trained policy to collect the second half (Appendix D). On the held-out harness it sits +0.13 pp $[-0.85, +1.10]$ from offline Cross and +0.75 pp $[-0.10, +1.65]$ from Within (Table 3).

6 The pooled advantage carries harness identity, without detectable consequence

Pooling puts each harness’s own solve rate into the group mean. Under Equation 2 a rollout from a strong harness carries a positive offset that is predictable from h alone, and if that offset drove learning, Cross would be crediting the policy for help the harness supplied. An outcome reward that is partly a property of the environment is the kind of misspecified signal that has been shown to move scores without tracking the intended quantity [Skalse et al., 2022, Gao et al., 2023, Shao et al., 2025]. We measure how much of the offset each arm’s advantage retains. A classifier is trained out of fold to recover the generating harness from the advantage alone, with tasks hashed into five folds so that no task’s episodes sit in both train and test. Chance is 25% over four harnesses, and each arm is scored against its own null, its accuracy after shuffling harness labels within each task on the same folds (Appendix I).

Within’s advantage carries nothing the classifier can use: +0.02 pp above its null, with an interval spanning zero, as its construction requires (Figure 3b, Table 9). Cross’s carries +4.48 pp $[+3.22, +5.83]$, and its advantage rises with the harness’s training-time solve rate at a slope of 2.4. Coverage matching, which zeroes the advantage on 55% of traces and leaves the pooled comparison unchanged on the rest, retains +1.17 pp $[+0.20, +2.16]$. The contamination that pooling introduces is real and measurable, and Section 5 shows the two rules reaching the same held-out score. Harness identity in the credit signal leaves no mark on what the policy learns there.

The residualized arm was built to remove the offset by subtracting a per-harness baseline before the pooled standardization, with each task’s own outcomes excluded from the baseline applied to it:

$$b_h^{(-x)} = \text{mean}\{r_{e'} : h(e') = h, x(e') \neq x\}, \quad (5)$$

$$z_e = r_e - b_{h(e)}^{(-x(e))}, \quad (6)$$

$$A_e^{\text{Resid}} = \frac{z_e - \bar{z}_x}{\sigma_x^z + \varepsilon}. \quad (7)$$

As assembled, it removed 9% of that offset. Every arm realized the same 81,200 optimizer steps at an effective-sample-size share of 0.993 or above (Table 7); what differed was the population behind the baseline. It was estimated on the full graded pool of 1,008 tasks, most of them failed by every harness, while training used the 183 tasks on which harnesses disagree, where per-harness solve rates are an order of magnitude higher. The arm’s advantage accordingly retains +4.54 pp $[+3.24, +5.90]$ of recoverable harness identity, the same as Cross, and its endpoints match Cross’s: +0.18 pp over SFT on the training harnesses and $-0.03 [-1.03, +0.95]$ relative to Cross on the held-out harness. A baseline estimated on the training population itself, and finer-grained credit that reaches the channels a scalar offset cannot (per-step value estimates, hierarchical or hindsight assignment, process supervision [Kazemnejad et al., 2024, Zhou et al., 2024b, Feng et al., 2025, Tan et al., 2026, Uesato et al., 2022, Lightman et al., 2024, Wang et al., 2024]), are the next interventions this design can host.

The policy’s actions show the same pattern from the behavioural side. Labelling every assistant turn in the evaluation transcripts with one action (search, inspect, edit, write a file, test, run a script, version control, planning tool, submit) gives each checkpoint an action distribution under each harness (Figure 4, Appendix J). Moving a checkpoint between harnesses changes that distribution by 0.17 to 0.35 bits of Jensen–Shannon divergence. Swapping SFT for Cross inside a harness changes it by 0.0003 to 0.0029 bits, a factor of at least 59 smaller. On the held-out harness, Cross writes fewer whole files than SFT (-1.35 pp $[-2.30, -0.40]$), runs scripts more often ($+0.66$ pp $[+0.29, +1.01]$) and checks version control more ($+1.28$ pp $[+0.24, +2.40]$). Search, inspection, editing and testing are unchanged. Inside OpenHands, Cross spends a few more turns inspecting and editing before it submits; inside Qwen Code and SWE-agent no category differs between the two checkpoints. The harness sets the action repertoire, and the credit rule does not change it.




Figure 4: Action composition of the SFT and Cross checkpoints inside each harness. Each bar is the distribution of action labels over an episode’s assistant turns, averaged over the 500 SWE-bench Verified tasks, from the same evaluation episodes as Tables 1 and 2. Within a harness the SFT and Cross bars are near-identical, with the Jensen–Shannon divergence between them at the right. Moving the same checkpoint between harnesses reorders the distribution: search and editing dominate under weak-ReAct, inspection under OpenHands, editing and the planning tool under Qwen Code, search and script execution under SWE-agent. Aider is not shown because its transcript is plain chat with no tool calls to label. A spot check of the labeller on 160 turns found 11 mislabelled, 8 of them under SWE-agent.

7 Discussion

What multi-harness RL learns here. Cross-harness credit changes which trajectories carry signed gradient and puts the harness’s solve rate into the advantage. Neither change reaches the held-out score or the action distribution inside a harness, and for both rules the largest positive point estimate sits on the harness family that produced the data. The pattern, whichever grouping boundary is used, is *configuration adaptation without portable capability*: gains of the kind a deployment on the source configurations can use, and which only a harness swap distinguishes from internalization.

Scope of the result. The design asks one question: with exposure held fixed, what does comparing rewards across harnesses add? Systems that report multi-harness gains also use larger task pools [Yang et al., 2025], train longer [Liu et al., 2025a], combine supervision stages [Lambert et al., 2024], or co-evolve the harness [Iverson et al., 2026, Yu et al., 2026, Kimi Team, 2026, Chen et al., 2026, Song et al., 2026]. Each is a separate intervention from the one isolated here.

Evaluation recommendation. A multi-harness RL report should state which harnesses generated experience, whether advantage normalization crosses harness boundaries, the source-harness deltas, and the deltas under at least one unseen harness. The first two specify the algorithm; the latter two separate source adaptation from portable capability.

8 Conclusion

The harness a coding agent runs through moves its solve rate by a factor of 4.3; the recipe that trained it moves it by 1.16. Multi-harness exposure and cross-harness credit assignment are distinct interventions. Holding the first fixed while varying the second alters the learning signal, and the harness identity it carries, but not the held-out score, even when half the training data is re-collected on-policy. The policy’s action distribution is set by the harness it runs in, not by the credit rule. The gains that replaying multi-harness experience does produce sit on the training harnesses, not on the held-out one, and comparing harnesses for credit does not change that. Multi-harness RL studies should report the grouping boundary and test portability under an unseen interface.

9 Limitations

Every estimate other than the Within and Cross held-out levels rests on one checkpoint, and the source harnesses were evaluated at two attempts per task. Absolute solve rates are low (1–10%) and the endpoint is binary. Training covers one model family [Qwen Team, 2025b, Hui et al., 2024], one budget, four source harnesses, one round of on-policy re-collection, and Python-only tasks. The second-model comparison uses one untrained checkpoint per model, under context budgets that differ between the two families, and a training comparison on Seed-Coder-8B would pool over the two source harnesses that can drive it. Multilingual, test-generation and contamination-hardened variants of the benchmark [Zan et al., 2025, Mündler et al., 2024, Aleithan et al., 2024], and the function-level regime that preceded it [Chen et al., 2021], lie outside the study. The design resolves differences of about 1 pp and larger. The six held-out contrasts were fixed before the checkpoints existed and not registered externally [van Miltenburg et al., 2021].

References

- Rishabh Agarwal, Max Schwarzer, Pablo Samuel Castro, Aaron Courville, and Marc G. Bellemare. Deep reinforcement learning at the edge of the statistical precipice. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021.
- Arash Ahmadian, Chris Cremer, Matthias Gallé, Marzieh Fadaee, Julia Kreutzer, Olivier Pietquin, Ahmet Üstün, and Sara Hooker. Back to basics: Revisiting REINFORCE-style optimization for learning from human feedback in LLMs. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024.
- Reem Aleithan, Haoran Xue, Mohammad Mahdi Mohajer, Elijah Nnorom, Gias Uddin, and Song Wang. SWE-bench+: Enhanced coding benchmark for LLMs, 2024.
- Hao Bai, Yifei Zhou, Mert Cemri, Jiayi Pan, Alane Suhr, Sergey Levine, and Aviral Kumar. DigiRL: Training in-the-wild device-control agents with autonomous reinforcement learning, 2024.
- Stella Biderman, Hailey Schoelkopf, Lintang Sutawika, Leo Gao, Jonathan Tow, Baber Abbasi, Alham Fikri Aji, Pawan Sasanka Ammanamanchi, Sidney Black, Jordan Clive, et al. Lessons from the trenches on reproducible evaluation of language models, 2024.
- Xavier Bouthillier, Pierre Delaunay, Mirko Bronzi, Assya Trofimov, Brennan Nichyporuk, Justin Szeto, Naz Sepah, Edward Raff, Kanika Madan, Vikram Voleti, et al. Accounting for variance in machine learning benchmarks. In *Machine Learning and Systems (MLSys)*, 2021.
- A. Colin Cameron and Douglas L. Miller. A practitioner’s guide to cluster-robust inference. *Journal of Human Resources*, 50(2):317–372, 2015.
- Dallas Card, Peter Henderson, Urvashi Khandelwal, Robin Jia, Kyle Mahowald, and Dan Jurafsky. With little power comes great responsibility. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2020.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, et al. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- Tingyang Chen et al. HarnessX: A composable, adaptive, and evolvable agent harness foundry, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.14249v3.
- Neil Chowdhury, James Aung, Chan Jun Shern, Oliver Jaffe, Dane Sherburn, Giulio Starace, Evan Mays, Rachel Dias, Marwan Aljubei, Mia Glaese, Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Kevin Liu, and Aleksander Madry. SWE-bench verified: A human-validated subset of SWE-bench. OpenAI, 2024. URL <https://openai.com/index/introducing-swe-bench-verified/>.
- Tianzhe Chu, Yuexiang Zhai, Jihan Yang, Shengbang Tong, Saining Xie, Dale Schuurmans, Quoc V. Le, Sergey Levine, and Yi Ma. SFT memorizes, RL generalizes: A comparative study of foundation model post-training, 2025.

- Mostafa Dehghani, Yi Tay, Alexey A. Gritsenko, Zhe Zhao, Neil Houlsby, Fernando Diaz, Donald Metzler, and Oriol Vinyals. The benchmark lottery, 2021.
- Jesse Dodge, Suchin Gururangan, Dallas Card, Roy Schwartz, and Noah A. Smith. Show your work: Improved reporting of experimental results. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 2019.
- Bradley Efron and Robert J. Tibshirani. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1994.
- Lang Feng, Zhenghai Xue, Tingcong Liu, and Bo An. Group-in-group policy optimization for LLM agent training, 2025.
- Foundation Model Team, Li Auto Inc. Mach-Mind-4-Flash technical report, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.09375v1.
- Leo Gao, John Schulman, and Jacob Hilton. Scaling laws for reward model overoptimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2023.
- Paul Gauthier. Aider: AI pair programming in your terminal. <https://github.com/Aider-AI/aider>, 2024.
- Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Shirong Ma, Xiao Bi, et al. DeepSeek-R1 incentivizes reasoning in LLMs through reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 645:633–638, 2025.
- Sture Holm. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 6(2):65–70, 1979.
- Bo Huang et al. KAT-Coder-V2.5 technical report, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.05471v1.
- Binyuan Hui, Jian Yang, Zeyu Cui, Jiaxi Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Lei Zhang, Tianyu Liu, Jiajun Zhang, Bowen Yu, Keming Lu, et al. Qwen2.5-coder technical report, 2024.
- Hamish Ivison, Junjie Oscar Yin, Rulin Shao, Teng Xiao, Nathan Lambert, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. Tmax: A simple recipe for terminal agents, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.23321v1.
- 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 (ICLR)*, 2024.
- Bowen Jin, Hansi Zeng, Zhenrui Yue, Jinsung Yoon, Sercan Arik, Dong Wang, Hamed Zamani, and Jiawei Han. Search-R1: Training LLMs to reason and leverage search engines with reinforcement learning, 2025.
- Sayash Kapoor, Benedikt Stroebl, Zachary S. Siegel, Nitya Nadgir, and Arvind Narayanan. AI agents that matter, 2024.
- Sayash Kapoor, Benedikt Stroebl, Peter Kirgis, Nitya Nadgir, Zachary S. Siegel, Boyi Wei, et al. Holistic agent leaderboard: The missing infrastructure for AI agent evaluation, 2025.
- Amirhossein Kazemnejad, Milad Aghajohari, Eva Portelance, Alessandro Sordoni, Siva Reddy, Aaron Courville, and Nicolas Le Roux. VinePPO: Refining credit assignment in RL training of LLMs, 2024.
- Kyungmin Kim, Youngbin Choi, Seoyeon Lee, Suhyeon Jun, Dongwoo Kim, and Sangdon Park. The interplay of harness design and post-training in LLM agents, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.25447v1.
- Kimi Team. Kimi K3: Open frontier intelligence, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.24653v2.
- Robert Kirk, Ishita Mediratta, Christoforos Nalmpantis, Jelena Luketina, Eric Hambro, Edward Grefenstette, and Roberta Raileanu. Understanding the effects of RLHF on LLM generalisation and diversity. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.

- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. Efficient memory management for large language model serving with PagedAttention. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, 2023.
- Nathan Lambert, Jacob Morrison, Valentina Pyatkin, Shengyi Huang, Hamish Ivison, Faeze Brahman, Lester James V. Miranda, Alisa Liu, Nouha Dziri, Shane Lyu, et al. Tulu 3: Pushing frontiers in open language model post-training, 2024.
- Percy Liang, Rishi Bommasani, Tony Lee, Dimitris Tsipras, Dilara Soylu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yan Zhang, Deepak Narayanan, Yuhuai Wu, Ananya Kumar, et al. Holistic evaluation of language models. In *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)*, 2023.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harri Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- Mingjie Liu, Shizhe Diao, Ximing Lu, Jian Hu, Xin Dong, Yejin Choi, Jan Kautz, and Yi Dong. ProRL: Prolonged reinforcement learning expands reasoning boundaries in large language models, 2025a.
- Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, et al. AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- Zichen Liu, Changyu Chen, Wenjun Li, Penghui Qi, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Wee Sun Lee, and Min Lin. Understanding R1-zero-like training: A critical perspective, 2025b.
- Lovish Madaan, Aaditya K. Singh, Rylan Schaeffer, Andrew Poulton, Sanmi Koyejo, Pontus Stenertorp, Sharan Narang, and Dieuwke Hupkes. Quantifying variance in evaluation benchmarks, 2024.
- Grégoire Mialon, Clémentine Fourrier, Craig Swift, Thomas Wolf, Yann LeCun, and Thomas Scialom. GAIA: A benchmark for general AI assistants, 2023.
- Evan Miller. Adding error bars to evals: A statistical approach to language model evaluations, 2024.
- Niels Mündler, Mark Niklas Mueller, Jingxuan He, and Martin Vechev. SWT-bench: Testing and validating real-world bug-fixes with code agents. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024.
- NVIDIA. Nemotron 3 Super: Open, efficient mixture-of-experts hybrid Mamba-transformer model for agentic reasoning, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.12374v1.
- Long Ouyang, Jeff Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- Jiayi Pan, Xingyao Wang, Graham Neubig, Navdeep Jaitly, Heng Ji, Alane Suhr, and Yizhe Zhang. Training software engineering agents and verifiers with SWE-gym. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2025.
- Baolin Peng et al. Orchard: An open-source agentic modeling framework, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.15040v3.
- Zehan Qi, Xiao Liu, Iat Long Iong, Hanyu Lai, Xueqiao Sun, Wenyi Zhao, Yu Yang, Xinyue Yang, Jiadai Sun, Shuntian Yao, et al. WebRL: Training LLM web agents via self-evolving online curriculum reinforcement learning, 2025.
- Qwen Team. Qwen code: Command-line coding agent for Qwen models. <https://github.com/QwenLM/qwen-code>, 2025a.
- Qwen Team. Qwen3 technical report, 2025b.

- John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms, 2017.
- Melanie Sclar, Yejin Choi, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Alane Suhr. Quantifying language models’ sensitivity to spurious features in prompt design. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024.
- Rulin Shao, Shuyue Stella Li, Rui Xin, Scott Geng, Yiping Wang, Sewoong Oh, Simon Shaolei Du, Nathan Lambert, Sewon Min, Ranjay Krishna, Yulia Tsvetkov, Hannaneh Hajishirzi, Pang Wei Koh, and Luke Zettlemoyer. Spurious rewards: Rethinking training signals in RLVR, 2025.
- Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models, 2024.
- Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.
- Shivalika Singh, Yiyang Nan, Alex Wang, Daniel D’Souza, Sayash Kapoor, Ahmet Üstün, Sanmi Koyejo, Yuntian Deng, Shayne Longpre, Noah A. Smith, et al. The leaderboard illusion, 2025.
- Prasann Singhal, Tanya Goyal, Jiacheng Xu, and Greg Durrett. A long way to go: Investigating length correlations in RLHF, 2023.
- Joar Skalse, Nikolaus H. R. Howe, Dmitrii Krasheninnikov, and David Krueger. Defining and characterizing reward hacking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022.
- Huatong Song, Fei Bai, Ming Yang, Renyuan Li, Jia Deng, Jujie He, Zhange Zhang, Daixuan Cheng, Yan Xing, Qi Yun, Xuxing Chen, Danyang Li, Feng Chang, Chuan Hao, Ran Tao, Jian Yang, Bryan Dai, Wayne Xin Zhao, Mingjie Tang, and Ji-Rong Wen. ClawGym II: Exploring black-box RL on agent harness, 2026.
- Hui-Ze Tan et al. Hindsight credit assignment for long-horizon LLM agents, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.08754v1.
- Jonathan Uesato, Nate Kushman, Ramana Kumar, Francis Song, Noah Siegel, Lisa Wang, Antonia Creswell, Geoffrey Irving, and Irina Higgins. Solving math word problems with process- and outcome-based feedback, 2022.
- Emiel van Miltenburg, Chris van der Lee, and Emiel Krahmer. Preregistering NLP research. In *North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*, 2021.
- Peiyi Wang, Lei Li, Zhihong Shao, Runxin Xu, Damai Dai, Yifei Li, Deli Chen, Yu Wu, and Zhifang Sui. Math-shepherd: Verify and reinforce LLMs step-by-step without human annotations. In *Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL)*, 2024.
- Xingyao Wang, Boxuan Li, Yufan Song, Frank F. Xu, Xiangru Tang, Mingchen Zhuge, Jiayi Pan, Yueqi Song, Bowen Li, Jaskirat Singh, Hoang H. Tran, Fuqiang Li, Ren Ma, Mingzhang Zheng, Bill Qian, Yanjun Shao, Niklas Muennighoff, Yizhe Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Junyang Lin, Robert Brennan, Hao Peng, Heng Ji, and Graham Neubig. OpenHands: An open platform for AI software developers as generalist agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025a.
- Zihan Wang, Kangrui Wang, Qineng Wang, Pingyue Zhang, Linjie Li, Zhengyuan Yang, Kefan Yu, Minh Nguyen, Licheng Liu, Eli Gottlieb, et al. RAGEN: Understanding self-evolution in LLM agents via multi-turn reinforcement learning, 2025b.
- Yuxiang Wei, Olivier Duchenne, Jade Copet, Quentin Carbonneaux, Lingming Zhang, Daniel Fried, Gabriel Synnaeve, Rishabh Singh, and Sida I. Wang. SWE-RL: Advancing LLM reasoning via reinforcement learning on open software evolution, 2025.

- Ronald J. Williams. Simple statistical gradient-following algorithms for connectionist reinforcement learning. *Machine Learning*, 8:229–256, 1992.
- Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, et al. AutoGen: Enabling next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversation, 2023.
- Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. Agentless: Demystifying LLM-based software engineering agents, 2024.
- Binfeng Xu et al. Polar: Agentic RL on any harness at scale, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.24220v1.
- 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 *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024.
- John Yang, Kilian Leret, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kabir Khandpur, Yanzhe Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Ofir Press, Ludwig Schmidt, and Diyi Yang. SWE-smith: Scaling data for software engineering agents, 2025.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan. τ -bench: A benchmark for tool-agent-user interaction in real-world domains. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- Yilun Yao, Xinyu Tan, Chao-Hsuan Liu, Yaoming Li, Zhengyang Wang, Wenhan Yu, Zhewen Tan, Yuxuan Tian, Guangxiang Zhao, Lin Sun, Xiangzheng Zhang, and Tong Yang. Harness-bench: Measuring harness effects across models in realistic agent workflows, 2026.
- Qiyang Yu, Zheng Zhang, Ruofei Zhu, Yufeng Yuan, Xiaochen Zuo, Yu Yue, Tiantian Fan, Gaohong Liu, Lingjun Liu, Xin Liu, et al. DAPO: An open-source LLM reinforcement learning system at scale, 2025.
- Xiao Yu et al. OpenForgeRL: Train harness-native agents in any environment, 2026. arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.21557v3.
- Yang Yue, Zhiqi Chen, Rui Lu, Andrew Zhao, Zhaokai Wang, Yang Yue, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. Does reinforcement learning really incentivize reasoning capacity in LLMs beyond the base model?, 2025.
- Daoguang Zan, Zhirong Huang, Wei Liu, Hanwu Chen, Linhao Zhang, Shulin Xin, Lu Chen, Qi Liu, Xiaojian Zhong, Aoyan Li, et al. Multi-SWE-bench: A multilingual benchmark for issue resolving, 2025.
- Weihao Zeng, Yuzhen Huang, Qian Liu, Wei Liu, Keqing He, Zejun Ma, and Junxian He. SimpleRL-Zoo: Investigating and taming zero reinforcement learning for open base models in the wild, 2025.
- Yunbei Zhang, Janet Wang, Yingqiang Ge, Weijie Xu, Jihun Hamm, and Chandan K. Reddy. Stop comparing LLM agents without disclosing the harness, 2026.
- Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, et al. WebArena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2024a.
- Yifei Zhou, Andrea Zanette, Jiayi Pan, Sergey Levine, and Aviral Kumar. ArCHer: Training language model agents via hierarchical multi-turn RL, 2024b.

A AI use statement

We used generative AI tools (Claude, Anthropic; and ChatGPT, OpenAI, for review-style critique of drafts) to refine hypotheses, review methods and analysis plans, check interpretations, edit prose, generate and refactor code, design figures, and support literature searches. The authors reviewed all AI-assisted analysis code. Released artifact scripts emit every reported number from result files. No result was transcribed from AI output. We verified AI-suggested citations against the cited sources and did not use generative AI to fabricate, select, or alter experimental data or verdicts. The authors take responsibility for the final text, claims, code, and artifacts.

B Broader impacts and ethics

Agent benchmark scores inform model ranking, procurement, deployment, and safety evaluation, yet leaderboards often leave the harness configuration underspecified. In our matrix, the same policy scores 2.1% or 9.3% depending on the harness. A deployment measured with a strong scaffold may therefore be integrated behind a weaker one, while a safety estimate may miss what the model can do with a better scaffold. We did not identify a harm pathway created by publishing this analysis. Reports should specify the harness, task set, grader, and rollout count, and should separate same-harness from held-out gains. Held-out evaluation requires additional rollout and grading compute, but no new evaluation concept.

C Reproducibility

Every number in this paper was emitted by an artifact script. The source matrix, held-out $k=4$ levels, held-out $k=8$ recheck, seed variance, re-collected arm, second-model harness comparison, advantage-identity diagnostic, action composition and manifest statistics are committed as JSON artifacts under `results/postfreeze_2026q3/`, each recomputed from the graded episode pools by one verdict classifier. The $k=8$ file is the unmodified output of `pf_t4_report.py -k8 -common-rows`. The six held-out $k=4$ contrasts and the smallest differences they can detect come from `pf_phase1_verdicts.py -eval v500` and are carried from the append-only run log with the command that produced them. The analysis plan, per-contrast decision rules, the grading oracle and the full validity-audit timeline are part of the release. Rollout generation is not bit-reproducible (continuous-batching nondeterminism), so all statistics are task-clustered and paired, with $k \geq 4$ wherever the rollout level matters. Internal artifact identifiers map to paper names as `crossdown = coverage-matched` and `residmatched = residualized`.

D The crossed study: design and full tables

Design. Four RL arms branch from a single supervised warm start trained on 8,841 trajectory records drawn from 186 tasks across the four production harnesses. Each arm replays the same 81,216 records drawn from 183 tasks under the same optimizer, batching, token budget, reward, and loss masking; they differ in how advantages are grouped and in what enters the group: within-harness, pooled cross-harness, pooled with coverage matching, or pooled after subtracting an out-of-fold per-harness baseline. Each arm has one RL seed, and the Within and Cross arms two further seeds scored on the held-out profile only. Evaluation uses SWE-bench Verified under a sealed per-instance oracle with four-state verdicts, infrastructure failures excluded rather than scored zero.

Re-collected arm. One further Cross arm tests whether replaying frozen records limits what the grouping rule can do. It starts from the same warm start and spends the same 81,216 updates, but replays the frozen manifest only for the first half. The half-trained policy then re-runs the 183 training tasks through the four harnesses; 131 of them still produce a mix of outcomes and form the groups for the second half. The importance ratio at the first step of that half was 1.000 with an effective-sample-size share of 1.000, so the second half trained on its own rollouts. Its held-out level at $k=4$ is 4.85% on the 500 tasks gradeable in it and in the offline Cross, Within and SFT arms; the contrasts are in Table 3.

Table 1: Solve rate (%) by training recipe and evaluation harness. SWE-bench Verified, avg@2 (the mean over two attempts per task), oracle verdicts only, 24,000 attempted episodes at 99.1% verdict coverage; each column is restricted to the tasks scoreable in all six rows. Row means average the four columns.

Training recipe	Aider	OpenHands	Qwen Code	SWE-agent	Row mean
Base (no training)	2.59	8.13	7.44	4.04	5.55
SFT warm start	1.97	8.53	7.44	4.85	5.70
Within-harness RL	1.66	10.24	6.94	5.86	6.18
Pooled cross-harness RL	2.70	10.34	7.44	5.35	6.46
+ coverage matching	1.76	9.04	6.54	5.76	5.77
+ residualization	2.18	9.34	7.55	4.44	5.88
Column mean	2.14	9.27	7.23	5.05	
Tasks in column	482	498	497	495	

Table 2: Held-out solve *levels* by training recipe, on the interface excluded from training, and the source data for Figure 3a. weak-ReAct $\times$ SWE-bench Verified, oracle-only. Each entry is the mean over tasks of the task’s solve rate across its graded attempts, the same quantity the contrasts in Table 3 average, so at $k=4$ a difference of two levels here reproduces the paired contrast there to within 0.01 pp. The $k=4$ levels are on the 499 tasks gradeable in all six arms and the $k=8$ levels on the 500 tasks gradeable in the three re-run arms, at 98.0–99.7% and 98.6–99.3% verdict coverage. The seed column re-trains the two primary arms under two further seeds and scores all three at $k=4$ on the 499 tasks gradeable in every seed run; the seed ranges are 0.45 pp for Within and 0.42 for Cross.

Training recipe	avg@4 (%)	avg@8 (%)	avg@4 by seed 17 / 29 / 41 (%)
Base (no training)	4.07	—	—
SFT warm start	4.01	4.38	—
Within-harness RL	4.11	4.28	4.11 / 4.26 / 4.56
Pooled cross-harness RL	4.73	4.38	4.73 / 4.31 / 4.36
+ coverage matching	4.44	—	—
+ residualization	4.69	—	—

E Training objectives

The four RL arms train from the same frozen multi-harness trajectory manifest; the two controls alter the signal or its source (Base applies no update, SFT uses only successful trajectories under a supervised loss). The re-collected Cross arm of Appendix D shares everything below except the data for its second half. All four arms share identical data, tokenizer and chat template, token-faithful replay of engine-sampled ids, loss-masked observation tokens, a learning rate of 3×10^{-7} , KL coefficient 0.01, one epoch, and a matched GPU-allocation budget, and each realized the same 81,200 optimizer steps (Table 7).

Notation and the four credit-assignment rules. Write an episode as $e = (x, h, j)$ with task x , harness h and rollout index j , sealed-oracle reward $r_e \in \{0, 1\}$, and let $G(e)$ be the advantage group e belongs to. Within and PlainCross are the standard GRPO advantage [Shao et al., 2024] under two group definitions; Coverage-matched and Resid change what enters the pooled group, in the spirit of the bias corrections proposed for single-harness training [Liu et al., 2025b, Yu et al., 2025].

Within. Groups are formed inside a harness, $G_w(x, h, j) = \{(x, h, j') : \forall j'\}$, and the advantage is the group-standardized reward

$$A_e^{\text{Within}} = \frac{r_e - \bar{r}_{G_w(e)}}{\sigma_{G_w(e)} + \varepsilon}. \quad (8)$$

Because every member shares a harness, any harness-level offset cancels by construction.

PlainCross. Groups pool harnesses within a task, $G_c(x, h, j) = \{(x, h', j') : \forall h', j'\}$, and $A_e^{\text{PlainCross}}$ is the same group-standardized reward over G_c . The group mean now contains each harness’s own solve rate, which is the offset measured in Section 6.

Coverage-matched. PlainCross’s groups and advantages, with the number of traces carrying non-zero advantage subsampled down to Within’s count and the dropped traces retained at advantage zero. The

Table 3: Every contrast in the crossed study. Each is a mean of per-task differences with a bootstrap interval from resampling tasks. The $k=4$ held-out block is the six comparisons the analysis plan fixed before these checkpoints existed. The corrected 99% interval for the seen contrast uses Bonferroni over the five recipe comparisons. The $k=8$ rows first intersect the three densified rows at seven or more of eight gradeable rollouts (486 tasks), then pair strictly on tasks with all eight rollouts in both arms, so each $k=8$ contrast rests on its own subset of that intersection and the three are not additive. The three-seed row pools the seed-17 checkpoints with two re-trainings of each arm; the per-seed contrasts, +0.62, +0.05 and -0.20 pp, are single checkpoint pairs and carry no interval. The re-collected rows compare the Cross arm whose second half of updates trained on rollouts from the half-trained policy (Appendix D) with the offline arms, on the 500 tasks gradeable in all four. Levels are in Table 2.

Profile	Contrast	Δ pp	95% CI	Tasks
Seen, four harnesses corrected, five comparisons	Pooled cross – SFT	+0.77	[+0.03, +1.52] [-0.21, +1.75]	500, avg@2 99% CI
Held-out, $k=4$	SFT – Base	-0.07	[-0.92, +0.80]	500
	Within – SFT	+0.10	[-0.80, +0.95]	500
	Pooled cross – SFT	+0.72	[-0.25, +1.72]	500
	Pooled cross – Within	+0.62	[-0.33, +1.62]	500
	Coverage matched – Pooled cross	-0.28	[-1.27, +0.65]	499
	Residualized – Pooled cross	-0.03	[-1.03, +0.95]	500
Held-out, $k=4$, three seeds	Pooled cross – Within	+0.16	[-0.41, +0.72]	499
Held-out, $k=4$, re-collected	Re-collected – Pooled cross	+0.13	[-0.85, +1.10]	500
	Re-collected – Within	+0.75	[-0.10, +1.65]	500
	Re-collected – SFT	+0.85	[-0.15, +1.85]	500
Held-out, $k=8$	Pooled cross – SFT	+0.13	[-0.65, +0.92]	strict pairs
	Within – SFT	-0.03	[-0.64, +0.59]	strict pairs
	Pooled cross – Within	+0.25	[-0.48, +1.02]	strict pairs

Table 4: Doubling the held-out evaluation budget. Point estimates on the common-task basis, with the smallest detectable difference implied by each budget. Precision improved and every estimate moved toward zero.

Held-out contrast	$k=4$	$k=8$
Pooled cross – Within	+0.58	+0.25
Within – SFT	+0.16	-0.03
Pooled cross – SFT	—	+0.13
Smallest detectable difference	1.19–1.42	0.88–1.14

two arms then update on the same number of traces, and the pooled comparison is unchanged on the traces that remain.

Resid. A per-harness baseline is subtracted from the reward before the pooled standardization. The baseline for harness h applied to task x is the mean reward of h over every other graded task, so a task’s own outcomes never enter the baseline used on it:

$$b_h^{(-x)} = \text{mean}\{r_{e'} : h(e') = h, x(e') \neq x\}, \quad z_e = r_e - b_{h(e)}^{(-x(e))}, \quad (9)$$

$$A_e^{\text{Resid}} = \frac{z_e - \bar{z}_x}{\sigma_x^z + \varepsilon}.$$

The baseline is subtracted at unit coefficient, with no slope fitted. As assembled, the mean runs over the full graded pool of 1,008 tasks, most of them failed by every harness, while training used the 183 tasks on which harnesses disagree, so the baseline subtracted was 9% of the offset present in the training population (Section 6).

Table 9 also gives the slope of each arm’s advantage on the training-time harness solve rate; the out-of-fold classifier is the primary diagnostic.

Base The untrained Qwen3-8B policy; anchor for all contrasts.

Table 5: Harness effects under a second model family (untrained checkpoints; the 500 held-out SWE-bench Verified tasks, $k=4$ under the minimal harness and $k=2$ under Aider and SWE-agent; task-mean solve rates over the n tasks gradeable in both cells of each row, which is why the Qwen3-8B column need not match Table 1 entry for entry). Harness effects are estimated within each model against that model’s own minimal-harness score, so they do not depend on the two models being equally strong. OpenHands and Qwen Code never produced a patch for Seed-Coder-8B: all 1,000 episodes under each ended in the harness error that Qwen3-8B meets on 61 of 1,000 OpenHands episodes and 287 of 999 Qwen Code episodes. Both cells are recorded as not measurable rather than scored zero. Seed-Coder-8B’s context limit is 32,768 tokens against 40,960 for Qwen3-8B; 32 of its 2,000 minimal-harness episodes overflowed and are scored as zeros.

Harness	Seed-Coder-8B	Qwen3-8B	Δ_{pp}	95% CI	n
weak-ReAct (minimal)	5.00	4.07	+0.93	[-0.22, +2.13]	500
Aider	0.62	2.59	-1.97	[-3.32, -0.83]	482
SWE-agent	0.60	4.03	-3.43	[-4.94, -2.12]	496
<i>Gain of each real harness over the same model’s minimal harness</i>					
Seed-Coder-8B, Aider			-4.41	[-5.86, -3.06]	499
Seed-Coder-8B, SWE-agent			-4.40	[-5.85, -3.05]	500
Qwen3-8B, Aider			-1.42	[-3.08, +0.24]	482
Qwen3-8B, SWE-agent			-0.07	[-1.63, +1.51]	496

SFT Supervised fine-tuning on the resolved trajectories of the same scaffolded collection (success-only distillation). This arm inherits the RL learning rate (3×10^{-7}) and the matched-compute budget, one to two orders of magnitude below a tuned distillation recipe, so it is a matched-hyperparameter ablation of the *objective*, not a tuned distillation recipe (cf. Pan et al., 2025).

Within GRPO with advantage groups formed within a single harness.

PlainCross GRPO with groups pooled across harnesses, the incumbent practice under study.

Coverage-matched PlainCross with its non-zero-advantage trace count subsampled to Within’s. It tests whether Cross’s wider gradient support, rather than its comparison, carries any effect.

Resid PlainCross with a leave-one-task-out per-harness baseline subtracted from the reward before standardization.

F Harness and runtime version pins

A paper arguing that harnesses must be reported as first-class variables has to report its own. Table 6 pins every harness [Gauthier, 2024, Wang et al., 2025a, Qwen Team, 2025a, Yang et al., 2024], the minimal ReAct loop it is compared against [Yao et al., 2023], and the serving and grading runtime [Kwon et al., 2023, Jimenez et al., 2024] to an installed version.

Table 6: Harness and runtime version pins (frozen for the whole campaign).

Component	Package	Version
Aider	aider-chat	0.86.2
OpenHands	openhands-sdk (V1 API)	1.0.0a6
	openhands-ai (co-installed)	0.62.0
Qwen Code	qwen-code	0.19.3
SWE-agent	sweagent / swe-rex	1.1.0 / 1.4.0
weak-ReAct	this work	single-loop ReAct, released with the artifacts
Serving	vllm	0.8.5.post1
Training	torch / transformers / verl	2.6.0 / 4.51.3 / 0.4.1
Grading oracle	swebench / udocker	4.1.0 / 1.3.17

Table 7: Training signal audit. All four arms replay the identical 81,216-record manifest (5,543 episodes over 183 tasks) and realize the same 81,200 logged optimizer steps, so nothing below reflects a difference in data exposure or update count. *ESS* is the mean effective-sample-size share of the importance-weighted replay, read from each arm’s training diagnostics; at 0.993 or above, with mean importance ratios between 0.996 and 0.999, the replay was healthy in every arm. Groups follow each arm’s own grouping, one per task–harness pair for Within and one per task for the pooled family. Pooling leaves every task group with non-zero reward variance; splitting by harness pushes 55% of Within’s groups into all-pass or all-fail degeneracy, which is its zero-advantage fraction. Coverage matching zeroes the same share of the pooled stream’s traces by construction. From `results/postfreeze_2026q3/manifest_stats_crossed.json`.

arm	groups	non-zero var.	adv. RMS	zero-adv. %	steps	ESS
Within	698	44.8%	0.670	55.1	81,200	0.996
Pooled cross	183	100.0%	1.000	0.0	81,200	0.995
Coverage-matched	183	100.0%	0.685	55.1	81,200	0.993
Residualized	183	100.0%	1.000	0.0	81,200	0.994

G Training corpus and regime

Source and disjointness. All training trajectories are collected on SWE-Gym [Pan et al., 2025] tasks; every headline evaluation number in this paper is computed on SWE-bench Verified. The two benchmark families are disjoint by construction, so no evaluation task appears in any arm’s training data.

Where the cross-harness signal lives. Pooled cross-harness GRPO can only carry gradient on tasks where the harnesses disagree, so that the pooled group has non-zero reward variance. If every harness fails a task, or every harness solves it, the group advantage is zero and the task contributes nothing to the pooled comparison, exactly as an all-correct or all-incorrect prompt does under single-harness GRPO [Yu et al., 2025]. The variance here comes from harness identity rather than from sampling noise. The 183 emitted tasks are exactly this set, and the diagnostic of Section 6 is computed over them. Their training-time harness solve rates are Aider 6.9%, SWE-agent 9.8%, Qwen Code 20.9%, OpenHands 27.0%. This spread is the harness offset the residualized arm was built to remove.

Regime. The four arms train for a single epoch of offline replay over one frozen manifest with precomputed advantages, so there is no training-time reward curve; the non-zero-variance task count above plays that role. The re-collected arm (Appendix D) is the exception and collects its second half of data on-policy.

Table 8: Task-set registry. Training and evaluation draw from disjoint benchmark families, SWE-Gym for training and SWE-bench Verified for every reported number.

Set	Size	Role
Training pool	SWE-Gym	Source of all training trajectories; disjoint from SWE-bench Verified
SFT corpus	186 tasks	Resolved trajectories from the four harnesses, 8,841 records
RL manifest	183 tasks	Training tasks where the harnesses disagree; the only tasks carrying cross-harness advantage contrast (Appendix G)
Verified eval pool	500	SWE-bench Verified; every headline number in this paper

H Detected infrastructure failure modes

Each failure mode below was detected by a fail-closed check, fixed, and re-verified; each would otherwise have biased results silently. We list them because several would have *increased* apparent effects and none is specific to our stack.

1. **Eval-container cross-condition contamination.** Shared container stores let one condition’s edits leak into another’s evaluation. Fix: job-private container stores, created per rollout job.

2. **Silent episode death (served-model race).** A registration race returned 404s that were booked as permanent per-task skips, dropping $\sim 20\%$ of episodes in affected waves with no error raised, a non-random missingness pattern. Fix: registration-aware readiness probes, quarantine and re-collection of affected episodes.
3. **Grading crashes as verdicts.** UTF-8 strict-decode crashes in the grader were initially booked as infra errors, deflating denominators. Fix: replace-decoding plus the four-state verdict discipline (infra errors never enter statistics).
4. **Container git corruption.** Three modes (missing HEAD, damaged refs, truncated pack index, the last invisible to `rev-parse`) made task repos unbuildable. Fix: in-container checkout verification and rebuilds.
5. **Hollow image cache.** A partially populated image cache made every collection job top out at the same 25 tasks, a uniform-looking but non-random truncation. Fix: cache-integrity preflight before any wave.

I Harness identity in the advantage

Table 9 reports the out-of-fold test of how much harness identity each arm’s advantage carries, on the training manifest the arms replayed.

Table 9: Harness identity recoverable from the advantage, on the training manifest (183 tasks, 5,543 episodes). A classifier is trained out of fold on the advantage alone to recover the generating harness; tasks are hashed into five folds, chance is 25%, and each arm is scored against its own permutation null from shuffling harness labels within task on the same folds. Excess is accuracy minus null, with a task-clustered 95% bootstrap interval over 10,000 draws. Slope is the regression of the arm’s advantage on the training-time harness solve rate, the same raw-reward quantity for every arm. From `results/postfreeze_2026q3/advantage_identity_crossed.json`.

arm	OOF acc. (%)	perm. null (%)	excess (pp)	95% CI	slope
Within	26.41	26.39	+0.02	[-0.38, +0.46]	-0.00
Coverage-matched	27.46	26.29	+1.17	[+0.20, +2.16]	+0.94
Pooled cross	30.63	26.15	+4.48	[+3.22, +5.83]	+2.38
Residualized	30.65	26.12	+4.54	[+3.24, +5.90]	+2.05

J Action composition under each harness

Every assistant turn in the evaluation transcripts behind Tables 1 and 2 is given one primary label by a rule-based parser (priority submit, edit, write, test, run, search, inspect, version control, planning tool, other), and each episode’s label shares are averaged over tasks. Compound shell commands take the highest-priority label, so a turn that edits and then runs the tests counts as an edit; under a multi-label count the test share on the held-out harness is 3.2% for SFT and 2.9% for Cross against the 0.6% primary share of both. Aider is not covered: its transcript is plain chat with no tool calls or shell commands to label. Three tasks whose framework container wrote empty files into the working tree are included; excluding them moves no share by more than 0.2 pp. From `results/postfreeze_2026q3/action_mix_v500.json`.

Table 10: Jensen–Shannon divergence between action distributions, in bits, with 95% intervals from resampling tasks. Within-harness rows compare the SFT and Cross checkpoints under one harness on 500 paired tasks; across-harness rows give the range over the six harness pairs for one checkpoint.

Comparison	Harness or checkpoint	JSD	95% CI
SFT vs Cross, same harness	weak-ReAct	0.0015	[0.0009, 0.0033]
	OpenHands	0.0029	[0.0016, 0.0077]
	Qwen Code	0.0005	[0.0004, 0.0027]
	SWE-agent	0.0003	[0.0003, 0.0029]
Same checkpoint, harness pairs	SFT	0.177–0.344	
	Cross	0.174–0.350	

K Reported multi-harness results and what they identify

The systems below differ in how much structure they add around the model: a single ReAct loop [Yao et al., 2023], retry-and-reflect and multi-agent designs [Shinn et al., 2023, Wu et al., 2023], and the full frameworks pinned in Table 6. They also differ in what their designs can identify, because each varies harness exposure together with the rest of its training recipe. OpenForgeRL reports held-out gains of +9.5 and +20.3 pp under a three-harness recipe on ClawEval, a personal-assistant and tool-use benchmark rather than a software-engineering benchmark. The compared recipes vary the harnesses used for both SFT distillation and RL rollouts, so the marginal contribution of multi-harness RL is not isolated [Yu et al., 2026]. Orchard’s SFT-only 2×2 shows strong full-harness lock-in (53.5–57.9% matched versus 19.0–28.0% mismatched). Its widely quoted 45.0% under unseen Kimi-CLI is an absolute score from a bundled SFT recipe, not an isolated base-relative RL effect [Peng et al., 2026]. Polar finds harness-native GRPO gains strongly harness-indexed (+0.6 to +22.6 pp), each checkpoint evaluated on its own training harness [Xu et al., 2026].

L Statistical protocol details

Estimator. For each contrast, per-task solve indicators are averaged over rollouts, the paired per-task difference is bootstrapped by resampling tasks (10,000 draws, fixed seeds), and two-sided 95% percentile intervals are reported [Efron and Tibshirani, 1994]. Resampling the task rather than the episode is the cluster-robust choice for repeated measurements on the same task [Cameron and Miller, 2015, Agarwal et al., 2021]. **Multiplicity.** The six held-out contrasts were ordered and frozen before the checkpoints existed, and the seen contrast carries a Bonferroni-corrected 99% interval over the five recipe comparisons (Table 3) [Holm, 1979]. **Completeness gate.** A cell enters analysis only at $\geq 95\%$ graded coverage. The analysis aborts (exit nonzero) rather than degrades below the gate. The source matrix attempted 24,000 episodes at 99.1% verdict coverage, and the held-out rows reach 98.0–99.7% at $k=4$ and 98.6–99.3% at $k=8$ (Tables 1 and 2). **Run variance.** Identical reruns flip $\sim 6\%$ of per-task outcomes (continuous-batching nondeterminism, with episode seeds marking provenance rather than determinism), motivating $k=4$ on the weak-ReAct probe and task-clustered paired inference throughout. A flat “ ± 6 pp” discount would be wrong in both directions: the aggregate impact of rerun noise shrinks as $\sim \sqrt{0.06/n}$ with benchmark size, so what the flip rate rules out is specifically single-run, small- n comparisons, not any difference under six points. Benchmark-level variance of this kind is well documented [Bouthillier et al., 2021, Madaan et al., 2024, Miller, 2024], as is the subset-selection effect that follows from it [Dehghani et al., 2021]. Every reported number therefore uses the frozen 500-task roster rather than any subset of it.

Seed variation. Re-training Within and Cross under two further seeds moved each arm’s held-out level by 0.42 to 0.45 pp (Table 2); the pooled three-seed contrast is in Table 3.

Detection floors. MDE_{80} figures recovered from the interval widths under a normal approximation are 1.19–1.42 pp at $k=4$ and 0.88–1.14 pp at $k=8$ (Table 4), and about 0.8 pp for the pooled three-seed contrast, so the nulls bound the effect from above without establishing equivalence [Card et al., 2020, Dodge et al., 2019].

Grading. The sealed oracle re-executes every candidate patch in a per-instance container against hidden tests disjoint from any feedback tests a harness shows the model. The gate experiment

measured 2.58% inline-vs-oracle disagreement (all optimistic), above the 1% tolerance, freezing oracle-only reads for all reported numbers.