

Stateless Language Agents: Scaling Long-Horizon Automated Research

Qizheng Zhang^{1*} Changxiu Ji^{1*} Isaac Sun^{2*} Yuetai Li³ Shubhangi Upasani⁴
 Sherry Ruan¹ Boyuan Ma⁴ Fenglu Hong⁴ Vamsidhar Kamanuru⁴ Yoonho Lee¹
 Yuzhen Mao¹ Genghan Zhang¹ Rulin Shao³ Qiuyang Mang⁵ Andy Dimnaku¹
 Changran Hu⁴ Radha Poovendran³ Kunle Olukotun¹

¹ Stanford University ² Carnegie Mellon University ³ University of Washington

⁴ SambaNova Systems, Inc. ⁵ UC Berkeley * equal contribution

✉ qizhengz@stanford.edu, kunle@stanford.edu 📧 SLA




Figure 1: **SLA sustains research progress over long horizons.** (a) On Anthropic kernel optimization, SLA finds stronger solutions and reaches the strongest baseline’s mean final performance with $14.5\times$ fewer tokens (a 93.1% reduction); every SLA run finishes ahead of every baseline run. Thick curves show means over three runs per method; thin curves show individual runs. (b) On all four FrontierSWE tasks, SLA trails the strongest per-task baseline at 175M tokens (25% of the budget, open circles) but leads at 700M (full budget, filled circles). All results use Codex with GPT-5.5.

Abstract

Automated research systems increasingly run LLM agents over long horizons, but more inference does not by itself produce more progress: agents replay growing histories, duplicate one another’s work, or stop experimenting while token consumption continues. Yet most evaluations use short budgets or benchmarks that saturate early, leaving these failure modes untested. We trace these failures to two choices: where research state lives and who decides what to try next. We introduce **Stateless Language Agents (SLAs)**, built on the principle of **stateful search with stateless agents**: no agent carries its conversation across invocations; instead, the harness owns the research state (candidate solutions and measured outcomes) and reconstructs a fresh and role-specific context for every invocation. What each agent sees becomes an explicit design choice rather than a history that grows with the run. We implement this principle in the SLA framework, where a stateless Advisor reads harness-summarized evidence across search directions and assigns concrete experiments to parallel Workers. We evaluate SLA against three recent frameworks on software engineering, kernel optimization, and algorithm design at budgets of up to one billion tokens. SLA achieves the best final result on every task and reaches the strongest kernel baseline’s final performance with over 84% fewer tokens. Ablations from shared checkpoints show that focused contexts and explicit assignments each contribute to SLA’s progress, with effects that can compound over full runs, while the Advisor consumes less than 0.6% of tokens. These results argue for SLAs, which keep durable research state out of agent conversations, and show that short evaluation horizons can misjudge research systems and their components.

1 Introduction

Large language model (LLM) agents are increasingly used for automated research (AutoResearch): iteratively proposing, implementing, and evaluating solutions to problems with measurable objectives but no known optimum [21, 24, 28, 29, 37]. As these systems take on harder problems, what matters is not only how quickly they find good solutions, but whether additional computation keeps producing better ones. In other words, **how can automated research sustain progress as its inference budget grows?**

Existing evaluations rarely run long enough to answer this question. Most measure budgets in iterations or model calls rather than tokens. Widely used benchmarks also saturate early: on 26-circle packing, four methods finish within 2.3×10^{-10} of one another by 5M tokens (Figure 2(a)). A saturated benchmark measures how quickly a method reaches the ceiling, not whether it can keep converting computation into progress. As a result, design choices whose effects compound as experience accumulates, such as context management and experiment selection, remain largely untested.

Long runs expose two challenges. First, *retaining experience while controlling context*: candidate solutions, evaluation results, and failed attempts are reusable evidence, but replaying a growing history consumes tokens and degrades agent behavior [10, 41]. Second, *turning accumulated evidence into productive exploration*: recorded findings do not determine what to try next. In one CORAL [28] run on a GPU kernel task, the last improvement arrives at 231M tokens. Afterward, agents repeatedly declare their solutions optimal, and 98% of the final 1,500 sessions make no tool calls while token consumption continues (Figure 2(b)). This shows that **scaling inference alone does not guarantee productive search**.

We introduce **Stateless Language Agents (SLAs)**, built on one principle: **stateful search with stateless agents**. We distinguish an agent’s *state*, which persists across invocations, from its *context*, which is what it sees within one invocation. A stateless agent keeps no state: nothing it accumulates, including its conversation, carries over to its next invocation. This does not make it contextless. The harness owns the research state (candidate solutions and measured outcomes) and reconstructs a fresh and role-specific context from it for every invocation. What each agent sees thus becomes an explicit design choice, not a by-product of accumulated conversation. We implement this principle in the **SLA framework**, which addresses each challenge with one mechanism. With *harness-controlled context reconstruction*, a stateless Advisor sees structured evidence across all search directions, while each stateless Worker sees only its assignment, its retained candidate, and local feedback. With *evidence-driven work assignment*, the Advisor turns this evidence into concrete experiments, so parallel Workers run distinct experiments instead of repeating each other’s work. Harness-owned state also makes SLA an experimental instrument: our ablations resume from identical checkpointed research states.

We evaluate SLA against EvoX [18], CORAL [28], and SwarmResearch [37] on long-horizon software engineering, kernel optimization, and algorithm design at budgets of up to one billion cumulative tokens, measuring both solution quality at matched budgets and the tokens needed to reach a common target. Our evaluation yields three findings:

- **SLA finds stronger solutions with fewer tokens.** SLA achieves the best full-budget result on every evaluated task. On Anthropic kernel optimization with Codex, all three SLA runs outperform all nine baseline runs. SLA also reaches the strongest baseline’s final performance with 93% fewer tokens (84% with Claude Code). On FrontierSWE, it improves scores by 4.95 points on average over the strongest per-task baseline.
- **Focused contexts and explicit assignments each contribute to SLA’s progress, and their effects can compound over a run.** From shared checkpoints, removing Advisor context reconstruction, Worker context isolation, or Advisor assignments reduces mean progress in every comparison. Removing Worker isolation costs 5–11 cycles over 100M-token continuations but 224 cycles over a full 1B-token run. Without assignments, parallel Workers repeatedly implement the same feature (Appendix D.3).
- **Explicit coordination is cheap.** The Advisor consumes 0.24–0.51% of tokens and 1.2–2.3% of model cost, compared with 8.4–10.7% of tokens and 6.1–7.4% of cost for SwarmResearch’s Shepherd. Because coordination is separated from implementation, the Worker model can also be chosen per task (§4.4).




Figure 2: **Long-horizon AutoResearch requires benchmark headroom and sustained experimentation.** (a) On 26-circle packing, four methods reach nearly identical scores by 5M tokens (within 2.3×10^{-10}), leaving little separation between methods. (b) In a CORAL run on a GPU kernel task, the last improvement occurs at 231M tokens, but token consumption continues to 1B. Of the final 1,500 sessions, 98% make no tool calls, showing that additional inference does not always translate to productive experiments.

Our results also have implications for evaluating AutoResearch systems. Across our experiments, short horizons can misjudge methods, components, and configurations. On FrontierSWE, SLA trails the strongest baseline at 175M tokens but leads at 700M (§4.2). The cost of removing Worker isolation grows by more than an order of magnitude between a 100M-token continuation and a full run (§4.3). Wider Worker pools that trail by 337 cycles at 25% of the budget finish within 4 cycles of the narrowest (§4.4). We therefore report results at multiple cumulative token budgets and encourage future evaluations to do the same.

2 Background and Motivation

2.1 Related Work on Automated Research (AutoResearch)

Automated research (AutoResearch) uses LLMs to iteratively propose, implement, and evaluate ideas for open-ended scientific and engineering problems. It targets problems with measurable objectives but often no known optimal solution. A major line of work, which we call LLM-guided search, embeds LLM-generated programs in evolutionary search loops and uses automated evaluation to guide improvements. Examples include FunSearch [29], AlphaEvolve [24], OpenEvolve [31], ShinkaEvolve [14], EvoX [18], and AdaEvolve [5], spanning mathematical optimization, algorithm design, and systems optimization. In these methods, each candidate comes from one or a few model calls.

Recent agent-driven frameworks, including CORAL [28] and SwarmResearch [37], place more of the experimental process under the control of tool-using coding agents such as OpenAI Codex [25] and Claude Code [2]. Agents can inspect code, implement ideas, run tests, and revise their approach over many steps, while multiple agents explore different directions. In these frameworks, agents also carry much of the research history in their own long-running sessions. The shift to coding agents motivates studying how such research processes sustain progress and use computation efficiently over long horizons.

Other work studies broader AI scientist systems that automate or assist multiple stages of scientific discovery, including hypothesis generation, literature review, experimentation, and scientific writing [8, 20, 43]. We instead focus on open-ended search over executable solutions with automated evaluators. This setting lets us isolate how agentic research processes sustain progress as the search horizon grows. We discuss related work further in Appendix A.

2.2 Long-Horizon Evaluation and Its Challenges

Measuring the research horizon. Most AutoResearch evaluations define budgets by iterations, model calls, or evaluator queries. CORAL [28] runs agents over long wall-clock periods but does not report model tokens. Wall-clock time mixes model latency, evaluator runtime, and system overhead. It also depends on parallelism: under the same wall-clock budget, a multi-agent system can consume more inference than a single agent. We therefore measure the horizon in cumulative input and output tokens (*cumulative tokens*). With fixed models and inference settings, cumulative tokens give a controlled and reproducible scaling axis. Long horizons also require benchmarks with headroom. On 26-circle packing, popularized by AlphaEvolve [24], two methods come within 10^{-3} of the best observed score by 0.67M tokens. After that point, the benchmark mainly measures how quickly methods reach the ceiling (Figure 2(a)).

Retaining experience while controlling context. Candidate solutions, evaluation results, and failed attempts may become relevant only later. In our CORAL FrontierSWE Lua trace, an agent revisits an older experimental note and improves a later leading candidate by adding a missing formatting feature (Appendix D.1). Yet repeatedly processing a growing history consumes tokens, and accumulated context can degrade agent behavior [10], including premature stopping in long-horizon search [41]. In recent work, Liu et al. [17] compare coding-agent sessions of up to 100M tokens with an independent-sampling reference. Agents first improve faster than sampling but fall below it as sessions grow, so splitting a fixed budget across several shorter sessions can outperform one long session. The challenge is to keep reusable evidence while selecting what each agent needs for its current decision.

Turning accumulated evidence into productive exploration. Recorded findings do not determine what to try next. In our CORAL FrontierSWE libexpat trace, two agents implement the same feature from the same parent and get the same score. They then overlap again on the next feature, even though one agent had posted a note claiming it (Appendix D.2). In the GPU kernel run of Figure 2(b), agents repeatedly declare their candidates optimal and wait, despite prompts to continue and restarts. CORAL resumes each agent’s own session after a restart. A restarted agent therefore continues from the same conversation in which it decided to stop, and additional inference largely repeats that decision. The challenge is to turn accumulated outcomes into concrete next experiments, coordinate parallel effort, and revise directions as evidence arrives.

3 The SLA (Stateless Language Agents) Framework

The SLA framework applies stateless language agents to long-horizon automated research (Figure 3). It alternates global planning with local experimentation. Each epoch, the harness reconstructs the Advisor’s context from the research state (§3.1), and the Advisor assigns concrete experiments to parallel Workers (§3.2). Each Worker runs several local trials in an isolated workspace. An independent evaluator scores every candidate. The harness records outcomes and updates each Worker’s local candidate and the global best until the budget is exhausted. Each Advisor epoch and each Worker trial is one invocation. Every invocation starts a new agent session, and only what the harness records in the research state carries over to the next one.

Relation to native subagent orchestration. Coding agents increasingly support native subagents, which run in parallel with separate contexts. The orchestrating agent, however, remains stateful: it keeps its own conversation and decides what each subagent sees and when to stop. SLA is compatible with such tools, but every SLA agent, including the Advisor, is stateless, and the harness decides what each context contains.

3.1 Harness-Controlled Context Reconstruction

SLA separates state, which the harness retains, from context, which each agent sees. The Advisor needs evidence across search directions to choose experiments. Each Worker needs only the local information




Figure 3: **The SLA framework: stateful search with stateless agents.** The harness owns candidates and outcomes and rebuilds a fresh and role-specific context for the Advisor each epoch and for each Worker each trial (§3.1). The Advisor turns global evidence into coordinated assignments (§3.2).

required to develop its assignment. The harness therefore rebuilds both contexts from the research state at every Advisor epoch and Worker trial.

Advisor context: evidence for global decisions. Each epoch, the Advisor receives the task specification, the current global best code and score, and an evidence summary built by the harness. The summary covers recent attempts, outcomes grouped by search direction, Worker status, and recent progress, plus task-specific diagnostics when available. It separates measured non-improvements from inconclusive failures in implementation, runtime, or correctness, so a failed execution is not mistaken for evidence that a direction is exhausted. The harness keeps a full chronological record of every experiment, but the Advisor sees only this reconstructed context. Like PEEK’s context map [9], this context lets the Advisor compare directions without reading the full chronological record.

Worker context: evidence for focused experimentation. Each trial, a Worker receives the task specification, its assignment, its retained candidate, and compact local feedback: the previous trial’s status, measured score, and available correctness diagnostics. Workers cannot access other Workers’ workspaces or the full research history. Evidence from other directions reaches them only through the Advisor’s assignments. Because candidate code and feedback persist in the research state, Workers build on prior progress without inheriting the conversations that produced it.

3.2 Evidence-Driven Work Assignment

Workers acting only on local information may repeat attempts made elsewhere or overlook useful findings. SLA therefore gives experiment selection to the Advisor, which sees evidence across all search directions and turns it into concrete, coordinated assignments.

Because the Advisor is itself stateless, it revisits these assignments each epoch from current evidence rather than from its own earlier reasoning. It can spread Workers across directions or concentrate them on distinct approaches to a promising bottleneck. Workers decide how to implement and refine an assignment over several local trials. The harness keeps improvements to each Worker’s local candidate even when that candidate trails the global best. This gives alternative approaches time to mature. When the Advisor redirects a Worker, the Worker restarts from the global best. Its first successfully evaluated candidate becomes a new local baseline, so a new direction can develop even if it starts out worse.

3.3 Implementation

SLA uses OpenAI Codex [25] or Claude Code [2] for both the Advisor and the Workers. Statelessness and isolation are enforced rather than requested. The Advisor starts each epoch in a new session. Workers run as unprivileged processes under Linux Landlock filesystem restrictions, with restricted network access, and the harness clears their saved sessions between trials. Candidates are evaluated outside Worker environments with protected evaluator code. The harness also records token usage by role and checkpoints the full research state for recovery and controlled ablations (Appendix B.1).

4 Results

Our evaluation of SLA yields four main findings:

- **SLA finds stronger solutions with fewer tokens.** SLA achieves the best full-budget result on every evaluated task. On Anthropic kernel optimization, it reaches the strongest baseline’s final performance with over 84% fewer tokens under both coding-agent configurations (§4.2).
- **Method rankings depend on the evaluation horizon.** SLA trails the strongest baseline on all four FrontierSWE tasks at one-quarter of the token budget, yet leads on all four at the full budget (§4.2).
- **Focused contexts and explicit assignments each contribute to SLA’s progress, and the Advisor costs little.** From shared checkpoints, removing Advisor context reconstruction, Worker context isolation, or Advisor assignments reduces mean progress in every comparison. The cost of removing Worker isolation grows from 5–11 cycles over 100M-token continuations to 224 cycles over a full run. The Advisor accounts for less than 0.6% of tokens and at most 2.3% of model cost in the analyzed runs (§4.3 and §4.4).
- **Scaling choices are task-dependent.** Going from 1 to 15 Workers cuts elapsed time by $6.6\text{--}7.3\times$, and wider pools that trail early can catch up over the full budget. However, the best width varies across tasks. Cheaper Workers can outperform stronger ones at matched cost on some tasks but not others (§4.4).

4.1 Experiment Setup

Tasks and datasets. We evaluate on three task categories: (1) long-horizon software engineering using FrontierSWE [7]; (2) compute kernel optimization using Anthropic’s VLIW SIMD kernel optimization task [3] and NVIDIA’s SOL-ExecBench GPU kernel optimization tasks [16]; and (3) algorithm design using FrontierCS [21]. From FrontierSWE, we select four problems that do not require GPU access: libexpat to x86-64 Assembly, Git to Zig, Dart to Haskell, and Lua Native Compiler. From SOL-ExecBench, we select the three problems with the most submissions as of August 1, 2026: #1 (the backward pass through attention softmax, dropout, and value matrix multiplication), #58 (mixture-of-experts token sorting with prefix sums), and #210 (fused residual addition and RMS normalization). From FrontierCS, we select Structured-LWE, a cryptographic task requiring the recovery of valid secret vectors for public structured learning-with-errors instances. Unlike prior evaluations centered on benchmarks like circle packing and expert placement load balancing [18, 28, 37], we focus on tasks with headroom at our budgets (§2.2).

Language models and coding agents. We evaluate two coding-agent configurations: OpenAI Codex [25] CLI v0.152.1 with GPT-5.5, and Claude Code [2] v2.1.258 with Claude Opus 4.8. In our main experiments, the Advisor and Workers use the same LLM, so gains cannot come from a stronger Advisor passing knowledge to weaker Workers. Appendix C.1 studies a stronger Advisor paired with weaker Workers. In all experiments, we set the reasoning effort to high and keep each agent’s default automatic context-compaction settings. In SLA, compaction can act only within one invocation, since no session carries over to the next.

Baselines. We compare against three recent AutoResearch frameworks. Each runs from a pinned upstream release with unmodified search logic (Appendix B.2). EvoX [18] jointly evolves candidate solutions and search strategies. Because it was designed around direct LLM calls, we launch a fresh coding agent for each generation. CORAL [28] runs parallel agents that select their own experiments and share discoveries through persistent memory and heartbeat-triggered reflection. Each CORAL agent keeps one long-running

session, which CORAL resumes after every heartbeat, stall, or restart. We use the official implementation with its upstream default configuration. SwarmResearch [37] uses a Shepherd agent that coordinates Search Agents through parent selection, agent-type selection, and selective context sharing, but is instructed not to assign specific ideas. The Shepherd runs as a long-running session, and each Optimizer starts by resuming its parent agent’s conversation. We use the authors’ official implementation. All methods share the same coding agents, models, seed solutions, public task materials, and protected evaluators, and the same external cumulative-token counter stops every run.

Replication and uncertainty. We evaluate each method on Anthropic kernel optimization with Codex over three independent runs and report means $\pm$ sample standard deviations (Table 1). The checkpoint-continuation ablations also use three independent runs per configuration and checkpoint (Table 4). Other main-result configurations use one run per method. A single long-horizon run can cost hundreds to thousands of dollars, so our budget does not allow replicating every task and agent configuration.

4.2 Main Results: Performance and Token Efficiency

Tables 1–3 report best-so-far performance at 25% and 100% of each task’s token budget, and the cumulative tokens each method needs to first match the strongest baseline’s full-budget result for the same task and agent (NR: not reached).

SLA finds stronger solutions at matched token budgets. SLA achieves the best full-budget performance on every evaluated task. Relative to the strongest baseline for each task and coding-agent configuration, it reduces Anthropic kernel cycles by 8.1–12.8% and improves FrontierSWE scores by 4.95 points on average. It also increases SOL-ExecBench scores by 5.5% on average across the three tasks and improves the FrontierCS Structured-LWE score by 1.5 points. Gains are smallest on SOL-ExecBench #210, where no method, including SLA, improves by more than 0.02 between 25% and 100% of the budget. For this task, the best kernels from all methods use Triton. Fused RMS normalization depends on a fast row-wise reduction, and Triton gives less direct control over warp-level reductions than CUDA, which may limit what any method can reach.

The kernel advantage persists across independent runs. On Anthropic kernel optimization with Codex, all three SLA runs outperform all nine baseline runs at 1B tokens: even the worst SLA run beats the best baseline run (1122 versus 1191 cycles). SLA achieves 1112.0 ± 8.9 cycles, compared with 1275.7 ± 133.9 for SwarmResearch, the strongest baseline by mean performance.

SLA reaches strong baseline performance with fewer tokens. The same numerical gain can take very different amounts of search, especially when the solution is already strong. For example, reducing kernel cycles from 1150 to 1100 can be harder than reducing them from 1200 to 1150. We therefore also report the tokens each method needs to reach a common target. SLA reaches this target before every baseline in all but one evaluated configuration. On the Anthropic kernel task with Codex, SLA needs only 67.9M tokens, compared with 986.3M for SwarmResearch, a 93.1% reduction. The savings reach 95.9% on SOL-ExecBench #58. The exception is SOL-ExecBench #1, where EvoX reaches the target sooner but SLA ends with the higher score.

Method rankings change with the evaluation horizon. On FrontierSWE, SLA trails the strongest baseline on all four tasks at 25% of the budget but leads on all four at the full budget (Table 2). Short-budget evaluations would therefore miss its eventual advantage across all four tasks. These reversals motivate evaluating search methods across multiple cumulative token budgets.

4.3 Ablation Studies: Understanding the Design Choices

To assess the contribution of SLA’s design choices, we compare continued progress from shared SLA checkpoints taken at 10% and 20% of each task’s full token budget. Each checkpoint preserves the research state, including accumulated evidence, the global best solution, and local candidates. From each checkpoint,

Table 1: **Anthropic VLIW SIMD kernel performance and token efficiency.** Cycles at 25% (250M) and 100% (1B) of the token budget, and cumulative tokens needed to first match the strongest baseline’s full-budget cycles (NR: not reached). Codex entries are mean $\pm$ std over three runs (token counts use the mean curve); Claude Code uses one run per method. **Bold:** best per column; underline: second best. The last row gives SLA’s relative reduction over the strongest baseline in each column.

Method	Codex (3 runs)			Claude Code (1 run)		
	250M Cycles $\downarrow$	1B Cycles $\downarrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$	250M Cycles $\downarrow$	1B Cycles $\downarrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$
EvoX	<u>1478.3</u> $\pm$ 112.0	1343.3 $\pm$ 4.0	NR	<u>1174</u>	1153	NR
CORAL	1524.0 $\pm$ 101.7	1350.0 $\pm$ 134.2	NR	1205	<u>1130</u>	<u>888.3</u>
SwarmResearch	1501.7 $\pm$ 185.7	<u>1275.7</u> $\pm$ 133.9	<u>986.3</u>	1648	1243	NR
SLA (ours)	1149.3 $\pm$ 18.9	1112.0 $\pm$ 8.9	67.9	1079	1039	138.5
<i>Reduction vs. best baseline</i>	−22.3%	−12.8%	−93.1%	−8.1%	−8.1%	−84.4%

Table 2: **FrontierSWE performance and token efficiency with Codex.** Official scores ($\times 100$) at 25% (175M) and 100% (700M) of the token budget, and cumulative tokens needed to first match the strongest baseline’s full-budget score (NR: not reached). One run per method. **Bold:** best per column; underline: second best. The last row of each panel gives SLA’s score difference from the strongest baseline (points) and its relative token reduction: SLA trails on all four tasks at 175M but leads at 700M.

Method	libexpat $\rightarrow$ x86-64 Assembly			Git $\rightarrow$ Zig		
	175M Score $\uparrow$	700M Score $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$	175M Score $\uparrow$	700M Score $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$
EvoX	10.71	11.33	NR	19.29	21.42	NR
CORAL	8.74	12.08	NR	19.46	22.55	NR
SwarmResearch	19.67	<u>24.58</u>	<u>559.9</u>	24.32	<u>27.98</u>	<u>697.3</u>
SLA (ours)	<u>18.82</u>	31.33	354.1	<u>20.42</u>	28.84	630.2
<i>Δ vs. best baseline</i>	−0.85	+6.75	−36.8%	−3.90	+0.86	−9.6%

Method	Dart $\rightarrow$ Haskell			Lua Native Compiler		
	175M Score $\uparrow$	700M Score $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$	175M Score $\uparrow$	700M Score $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$
EvoX	9.72	10.66	NR	25.82	65.38	NR
CORAL	<u>18.55</u>	23.26	NR	82.97	<u>90.66</u>	<u>682.3</u>
SwarmResearch	26.70	<u>38.59</u>	<u>684.1</u>	50.55	65.38	NR
SLA (ours)	15.43	45.27	263.6	<u>80.22</u>	96.15	354.6
<i>Δ vs. best baseline</i>	−11.27	+6.68	−61.5%	−2.75	+5.49	−48.0%

we continue full SLA and three variants that remove Advisor context reconstruction, Worker context isolation, or Advisor work assignments. All variants keep every agent stateless. They change only what enters each context, or whether Workers receive assignments.

Without Advisor context reconstruction, the harness gives the Advisor no computed summary. Instead, the Advisor reads the full chronological record through a bounded, read-only interface and must find and interpret the relevant evidence itself. Without Worker context isolation, Workers can read the full chronological record and every other Worker’s current candidate before each trial. Without Advisor work assignments, Workers receive a prompt for an independent trial instead of the Advisor’s proposal. The Advisor still runs and can still reset a Worker’s candidate to the global best. Each configuration receives

Table 3: **SOL-ExecBench and FrontierCS performance and token efficiency with Codex.** SOL scores $([0, 1])$ and FrontierCS task scores at 25% and 100% of each task’s token budget, and cumulative tokens needed to first match the strongest baseline’s full-budget score (NR: not reached). One run per method. **Bold**: best per column; underline: second best. The last row of each panel gives SLA’s relative difference from the strongest baseline.

Method	SOL-ExecBench #1			SOL-ExecBench #58		
	125M SOL $\uparrow$	500M SOL $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$	125M SOL $\uparrow$	500M SOL $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$
EvoX	0.710	<u>0.710</u>	46.1	<u>0.773</u>	<u>0.804</u>	<u>354.1</u>
CORAL	0.386	0.552	NR	0.694	0.714	NR
SwarmResearch	0.598	0.670	NR	0.764	0.764	NR
SLA (ours)	<u>0.706</u>	0.763	<u>152.7</u>	0.836	0.862	14.5
Δ vs. best baseline	-0.6%	+7.5%	+231.2%	+8.2%	+7.2%	-95.9%

Method	SOL-ExecBench #210			FrontierCS: Structured-LWE		
	125M SOL $\uparrow$	500M SOL $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$	50M Score $\uparrow$	200M Score $\uparrow$	To match Tokens (M) $\downarrow$
EvoX	<u>0.375</u>	<u>0.386</u>	<u>283.0</u>	34.0	55.0	NR
CORAL	0.359	0.375	NR	23.5	38.0	NR
SwarmResearch	0.377	0.378	NR	<u>44.0</u>	<u>58.0</u>	<u>197.0</u>
SLA (ours)	0.377	0.393	208.3	48.5	59.5	169.6
Δ vs. best baseline	0.0%	+1.8%	-26.4%	+10.2%	+2.6%	-13.9%

an additional 100M tokens per run, with three independent runs per checkpoint. Table 4 reports mean best-so-far performance after continuation.

We also run SLA without Worker context isolation for a full 1B-token run on Anthropic kernel optimization with Codex. It ends at 1336 cycles, 224 cycles worse than the mean of the three full-SLA runs (1112.0 cycles; Table 1). This gap is far larger than the differences after 100M-token continuations (Table 4), which suggests that the cost of unfocused Worker contexts compounds over longer horizons.

Focused contexts support research continuity. The two context variants keep the same research state but change what enters each context (§3.1). Removing either Advisor context reconstruction or Worker context isolation reduces mean progress on both tasks and at both checkpoints. Keeping all evidence is therefore not enough. What each role sees from that evidence also matters.

Explicit assignments effectively turn evidence into progress. Removing Advisor assignments reduces mean progress in every comparison, even though every run starts from the same research state. This supports the division of work in §3.2: the Advisor turns global evidence into concrete experiments, and Workers focus on implementation and local refinement. Trace examples in Appendix D.3 show Workers duplicating each other’s work without assignments, and the Advisor guiding one Worker to build on another’s improvement in full SLA.

4.4 Scaling and Coordination Cost

Coordination is cheap. SLA spends over 99% of its tokens on Worker search. The Advisor consumes only 0.24–0.51% of total tokens, compared with 8.39–10.70% for SwarmResearch’s Shepherd (Table 5). Much of the Shepherd’s usage comes from its long-running context. In the Anthropic kernel run, its average call reads about 99K input tokens, compared with about 8K at the start of a fresh session. Because cached inputs

Table 4: **Ablations from shared SLA checkpoints.** In each column, every configuration resumes from the same checkpoint (header: start $\rightarrow$ end cumulative tokens) and runs for 100M additional tokens; entries are mean $\pm$ std over three continuations. Grey values give full SLA’s progress from the checkpoint; red values give each variant’s relative drop in that progress. **Bold:** best per column.

Configuration	Anthropic Kernel		FrontierSWE (libexpat)	
	100M $\rightarrow$ 200M Cycles $\downarrow$	200M $\rightarrow$ 300M Cycles $\downarrow$	70M $\rightarrow$ 170M Score ($\times 100$) $\uparrow$	140M $\rightarrow$ 240M Score ($\times 100$) $\uparrow$
<i>Shared checkpoint</i>	1218	1197	16.12	17.69
SLA (full)	1192.3 ± 2.5 -25.7	1170.0 ± 14.2 -27.0	18.78 ± 0.92 $+2.66$	20.13 ± 0.20 $+2.44$
<i>Focused contexts</i>				
w/o Advisor reconstruction	1198.3 ± 2.3 -23.3%	1188.7 ± 6.8 -69.3%	16.86 ± 0.64 -72.2%	19.07 ± 0.31 -43.4%
w/o Worker isolation	1203.3 ± 7.1 -42.8%	1174.7 ± 4.5 -17.4%	16.79 ± 0.47 -74.8%	19.77 ± 0.12 -14.8%
<i>Explicit assignments</i>				
w/o Advisor assignments	1195.0 ± 2.6 -10.5%	1182.3 ± 8.1 -45.6%	16.54 ± 0.33 -84.2%	18.85 ± 0.12 -52.5%

Table 5: **Token usage and coordination overhead.** Token composition and coordinator share (SLA Advisor or SwarmResearch Shepherd) of tokens and estimated cost at the full budget, using GPT-5.5 rates of \$5/\$0.50/\$30 per million uncached-input, cached-input, and output tokens [26]. **Bold:** lower share.

Method	Token composition (%)			Coordinator share (%)	
	Cached input	Uncached input	Output	Tokens $\downarrow$	Cost $\downarrow$
<i>Anthropic kernel (1B tokens)</i>					
SwarmResearch	94.67	4.36	0.97	8.39	6.14
SLA (ours)	93.11	5.59	1.30	0.24	1.20
<i>FrontierSWE libexpat (700M tokens)</i>					
SwarmResearch	94.69	4.36	0.95	10.70	7.35
SLA (ours)	90.15	8.61	1.24	0.51	2.29

make up over 90% of tokens in both methods, token share understates the cost of roles with limited cache reuse, such as the Advisor. Even so, the Advisor accounts for only 1.20–2.29% of total model cost, compared with 6.14–7.35% for the Shepherd. Together with the ablations in §4.3, this shows that explicit coordination improves progress at little overhead.

How many Workers? We vary $W \in \{1, 3, 7, 15\}$ at fixed budgets of 1B tokens for Anthropic kernel and 700M per FrontierSWE task (Table 6). Wider pools substantially shorten runs: going from 1 to 15 Workers cuts elapsed time by $6.6\times$ on Anthropic kernel and mean elapsed time by $7.3\times$ on FrontierSWE. On Anthropic kernel, the quality penalty of width largely disappears over the full horizon: $W = 7$ and $W = 15$ trail $W = 1$ by 337 and 174 cycles at 25% of the budget, yet all four widths finish within 1107–1113 cycles. On FrontierSWE, the best width depends on the task: Dart peaks at $W = 3$ (45.2), Git and libexpat at $W = 7$ (29.0 and 34.5), and Lua at $W = 1$ (97.3). Our default $W = 3$ is never far from the best width, finishing within 5 cycles on Anthropic kernel and 3.2 points on every FrontierSWE task, while running $2.5\text{--}2.7\times$ faster than $W = 1$. Worker count should therefore be chosen per task, token budget, and time constraint.

Worker model choice. Because SLA separates coordination from implementation, the Worker model can be chosen independently of the Advisor. With a GPT-5.5 Advisor, GPT-5.4 mini Workers reach a higher Git $\rightarrow$ Zig score than GPT-5.5 Workers at a matched cost of \$100 (20.88 versus 19.68), whereas GPT-5.5 Workers perform better on Anthropic kernel optimization (Appendix C.1). The most cost-effective Worker model therefore depends on the task.

Table 6: **Worker scaling at fixed token budgets.** Best-so-far performance and time at 25% and 100% of the token budget (1B for Anthropic kernel; 700M per FrontierSWE task) as the number of Workers W varies. FrontierSWE scores are official scores ($\times 100$); mean time is the average time per FrontierSWE task. Colored values give the change from $W=1$ in the same block (green: better; red: worse), and wall-clock speedup for time. Shaded: default $W=3$ used in all other experiments. **Bold:** best per column within each block.

Workers	Anthropic Kernel		FrontierSWE				
	Performance Cycles $\downarrow$	Time Hours $\downarrow$	Dart Score $\uparrow$	Git $\rightarrow$ Zig Score $\uparrow$	libexpat Score $\uparrow$	Lua Score $\uparrow$	Mean time Hours $\downarrow$
<i>Short horizon (25% of token budget)</i>							
$W=1$	1151	27.5	12.1	21.8	21.6	93.4	18.0
$W=3$	1149 -2	11.8 2.3$\times$	15.4 $+3.3$	20.4 -1.4	18.8 -2.8	80.2 -13.2	7.4 2.4$\times$
$W=7$	1488 $+337$	5.1 5.4$\times$	13.8 $+1.7$	19.7 -2.1	28.2 $+6.6$	78.0 -15.4	4.5 4.0$\times$
$W=15$	1325 $+174$	4.3 6.4$\times$	25.5 $+13.4$	21.9 $+0.1$	23.6 $+2.0$	46.2 -47.2	2.8 6.4$\times$
<i>Long horizon (100% of token budget)</i>							
$W=1$	1109	98.1	14.8	25.7	27.1	97.3	62.1
$W=3$	1112 $+3$	39.0 2.5$\times$	45.2 $+30.4$	28.8 $+3.1$	31.3 $+4.2$	96.2 -1.1	22.6 2.7$\times$
$W=7$	1113 $+4$	18.3 5.4$\times$	18.1 $+3.3$	29.0 $+3.3$	34.5 $+7.4$	96.2 -1.1	14.4 4.3$\times$
$W=15$	1107 -2	14.8 6.6$\times$	38.1 $+23.3$	24.8 -0.9	31.9 $+4.8$	89.6 -7.7	8.5 7.3$\times$

5 Discussion and Limitations

Conclusion. Our results suggest building long-horizon research systems from stateless language agents. Keeping research state in the harness makes what the system retains, what each agent sees, and who chooses the next experiment explicit design choices. These choices compound, so evaluations that stop early can misjudge both methods and their components. We expect the principle to apply wherever agents run far longer than one context window.

Implications for post-training. In SLA, a long run becomes a sequence of short invocations. Each Worker trial has a bounded context built by the harness and ends with a score from the evaluator. These trials could be used directly as episodes for reinforcement learning, so a model does not need to be trained on a full run of up to a billion tokens. The Advisor’s assignments and their measured outcomes could be used in the same way to train models that plan experiments. Because each agent works from a short context, these models may also depend less on long-context ability.

Implications for safety. Long-horizon agents can run for days with little human attention. In SLAs, all persistent state lives in the harness, where people can inspect it, checkpoint it, and roll it back. No agent carries a plan or an injected instruction forward in its own conversation. The research state can still carry problems, such as candidate code that games the evaluator, so protected evaluators remain necessary.

Scaling the Advisor. The Advisor uses less than 0.6% of tokens, so the open question is decision quality, not cost. At the full budget, 15 Workers are never the best width on FrontierSWE (Table 6), but fewer trials per lane may also explain this. Because the Advisor is stateless, its role can be split without merging conversations, for example across several Advisors that each see part of the research state.

Limitations. Because long-horizon runs are costly, most configurations use a single run. Only Anthropic kernel optimization with Codex and the checkpoint ablations are replicated. Comparisons are matched on tokens, and cost estimates exclude the compute for running and evaluating experiments. Our ablations change what each agent sees, not whether it keeps its conversation across invocations. All tasks have executable evaluators, so goals that are vague or slow to evaluate remain untested.

References

- [1] Lakshya A Agrawal, Shangyin Tan, Dilara Soylu, Noah Ziemis, Rishi Khare, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Arnav Singhvi, Herumb Shandilya, Michael J Ryan, Meng Jiang, et al. GEPA: Reflective Prompt Evolution Can Outperform Reinforcement Learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.
- [2] Anthropic. Claude Code. <https://docs.claude.com/en/docs/claude-code/overview>, 2025.
- [3] Anthropic. Performance take-home assignment, 2026. https://github.com/anthropics/original_performance_takehome.
- [4] Henrique Assumpção, Diego Ferreira, Leandro Campos, and Fabricio Murai. CodeEvolve: an open source evolutionary coding agent for algorithmic discovery and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.14150*, 2025.
- [5] Mert Cemri, Shubham Agrawal, Akshat Gupta, Shu Liu, Audrey Cheng, Qiuyang Mang, Ashwin Naren, Lutfi Eren Erdogan, Koushik Sen, Matei Zaharia, et al. AdaEvolve: Adaptive LLM Driven Zeroth-Order Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.20133*, 2026.
- [6] Jun Shern Chan, Neil Chowdhury, Oliver Jaffe, James Aung, Dane Sherburn, Evan Mays, Giulio Starace, Kevin Liu, Leon Maksin, Tejal Patwardhan, et al. MLE-bench: Evaluating Machine Learning Agents on Machine Learning Engineering. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- [7] Evan Chu, Rajan Agarwal, Abishek Thangamuthu, Brendan Graham, Justus Mattern, Freeman Jiang, Paul Cento, Swarnim Jain, Mersad Abbasi, Mohammad Hossein Rezaei, George Wang, Alex Zhang, Simon Guo, Karina Nguyen, Danna Liu, Arash Bidgoli, Aditya Dalmia, Apoorv Dankar, Ashrut Vaddela, Calvin Chen, Keshav Kumar, Kushagra Vaish, Navid Pour, Rishyanth Kondra, Sagar Badiyani, Sidharth Giri, Snagnik Das, Soham Gaikwad, Syed Shah, Vagish Dilawari, and Vishal Agarwal. FrontierSWE. *Proximal Blog*, 2026. <https://frontierswe.com/blog>.
- [8] Juraj Gottweis, Wei-Hung Weng, Alexander Daryin, Tao Tu, Anil Palepu, Petar Sirkovic, Artiom Myaskovsky, Felix Weissenberger, Keran Rong, Ryutaro Tanno, et al. Towards an AI co-scientist. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.18864*, 2025.
- [9] Zhuohan Gu, Qizheng Zhang, Omar Khattab, and Samuel Madden. PEEK: Context Map as an Orientation Cache for Long-Context LLM Agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2026.
- [10] Kelly Hong, Anton Troynikov, and Jeff Huber. Context Rot: How Increasing Input Tokens Impacts LLM Performance. Technical report, Chroma, July 2025.
- [11] Shengran Hu, Cong Lu, and Jeff Clune. Automated design of agentic systems. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- [12] Zhengyao Jiang, Dominik Schmidt, Dhruv Srikanth, Dixin Xu, Ian Kaplan, Deniss Jacenko, and Yuxiang Wu. AIDE: AI-Driven Exploration in the Space of Code. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13138*, 2025.
- [13] Andrej Karpathy. autoresearch: AI agents running research on single-GPU nanochat training automatically. <https://github.com/karpathy/autoresearch>, 2026. GitHub repository.
- [14] Robert Lange, Yuki Imajuku, and Edoardo Cetin. ShinkaEvolve: Towards Open-Ended And Sample-Efficient Program Evolution. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.
- [15] Yoonho Lee, Roshen Nair, Qizheng Zhang, Kangwook Lee, Omar Khattab, and Chelsea Finn. Meta-Harness: End-to-End Optimization of Model Harnesses. *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2026.
- [16] Edward Lin, Sahil Modi, Siva Kumar Sastry Hari, Qijing Huang, Zhifan Ye, Nestor Qin, Fengzhe Zhou, Yuan Zhang, Jingquan Wang, Sana Damani, et al. SOL-ExecBench: Speed-of-Light Benchmarking for Real-World GPU Kernels Against Hardware Limits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.19173*, 2026.

- [17] Kaiyuan Liu, Qiuyang Mang, Bo Peng, Wenhao Chai, Hanchen Li, Shreyas Pimpalgaonkar, Luke Zettlemoyer, Alex Dimakis, and Alvin Cheung. When Agents Slow Down: Understanding LLM Agents’ Test-Time Strategies via Elo-per-token Analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.15309*, 2026.
- [18] Shu Liu, Shubham Agarwal, Monishwaran Maheswaran, Mert Cemri, Zhifei Li, Qiuyang Mang, Ashwin Naren, Ethan Boneh, Audrey Cheng, Melissa Z Pan, et al. EvoX: Meta-Evolution for Automated Discovery. *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2026.
- [19] Zexi Liu, Yuzhu Cai, Xinyu Zhu, Yujie Zheng, Runkun Chen, Ying Wen, Yanfeng Wang, Siheng Chen, et al. ML-Master: Towards AI-for-AI via Integration of Exploration and Reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.16499*, 2025.
- [20] Chris Lu, Cong Lu, Robert Tjarko Lange, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. The AI Scientist: Towards Fully Automated Open-Ended Scientific Discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06292*, 2024.
- [21] Qiuyang Mang, Wenhao Chai, Zhifei Li, Huanzhi Mao, Shang Zhou, Alexander Du, Hanchen Li, Shu Liu, Edwin Chen, Yichuan Wang, et al. FrontierCS: Evolving Challenges for Evolving Intelligence. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2026.
- [22] Ludovico Mitchener, Angela Yiu, Benjamin Chang, Mathieu Bourdenx, Tyler Nadolski, Arvis Sulovari, Eric C Landsness, Daniel L Barabasi, Siddharth Narayanan, Nicky Evans, et al. Kosmos: An AI Scientist for Autonomous Discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.02824*, 2025.
- [23] Jaehyun Nam, Jinsung Yoon, Jiefeng Chen, Jinwoo Shin, Sercan Arik, and Tomas Pfister. MLE-STAR: Machine Learning Engineering Agent via Search and Targeted Refinement. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025.
- [24] Alexander Novikov, Ngân Vũ, Marvin Eisenberger, Emilien Dupont, Po-Sen Huang, Adam Zsolt Wagner, Sergey Shirobokov, Borislav Kozlovskii, Francisco JR Ruiz, Abbas Mehrabian, et al. AlphaEvolve: A coding agent for scientific and algorithmic discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.13131*, 2025.
- [25] OpenAI. Introducing Codex. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-codex/>, 2025.
- [26] OpenAI. API pricing. <https://developers.openai.com/api/docs/pricing>, 2026. Accessed September 1, 2026.
- [27] Siru Ouyang, Jun Yan, I Hsu, Yanfei Chen, Ke Jiang, Zifeng Wang, Rujun Han, Long Le, Samira Daruki, Xiangru Tang, et al. ReasoningBank: Scaling Agent Self-Evolving with Reasoning Memory. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.
- [28] Ao Qu, Han Zheng, Zijian Zhou, Yihao Yan, Yihong Tang, Shao Yong Ong, Fenglu Hong, Kaichen Zhou, Chonghe Jiang, Minwei Kong, et al. CORAL: Towards Autonomous Multi-Agent Evolution for Open-Ended Discovery. *Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*, 2026.
- [29] Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatin, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco JR Ruiz, Jordan S Ellenberg, Pengming Wang, Omar Fawzi, et al. Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nature*, 625(7995):468–475, 2024.
- [30] Samuel Schmidgall, Yusheng Su, Ze Wang, Ximeng Sun, Jialian Wu, Xiaodong Yu, Jiang Liu, Michael Moor, Zicheng Liu, and Emad Barsoum. Agent Laboratory: Using LLM Agents as Research Assistants. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, pages 5977–6043, 2025.
- [31] Asankhaya Sharma. OpenEvolve: an open-source evolutionary coding agent. <https://github.com/algorithmicsuperintelligence/openevolve>, 2025.
- [32] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023.

- [33] Chenglei Si, Diyi Yang, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. Can LLMs Generate Novel Research Ideas? A Large-Scale Human Study with 100+ NLP Researchers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.
- [34] Mirac Suzgun, Mert Yuksekgonul, Federico Bianchi, Dan Jurafsky, and James Zou. Dynamic cheatsheet: Test-time learning with adaptive memory. In *Proceedings of the 19th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 7080–7106, 2026.
- [35] Jiabin Tang, Lianghao Xia, Zhonghang Li, and Chao Huang. AI-Researcher: Autonomous Scientific Innovation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025.
- [36] Edan Toledo, Karen Hambardzumyan, Martin Josifoski, Rishi Hazra, Nicolas Baldwin, Alexis Audran-Reiss, Michael Kuchnik, Despoina Magka, Minqi Jiang, Alisia Lupidi, et al. Ai research agents for machine learning: Search, exploration, and generalization in mle-bench. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025.
- [37] Yuvraj Virk, Zack Edds, Chunqiu Steven Xia, and Lingming Zhang. SwarmResearch: Orchestrating Coding Agents for Open-Ended Discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.02807*, 2026.
- [38] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
- [39] Yiping Wang, Shao-Rong Su, Zhiyuan Zeng, Eva Xu, Liliang Ren, Xinyu Yang, Zeyi Huang, Xuehai He, Luyao Ma, Baolin Peng, et al. ThetaEvolve: Test-time Learning on Open Problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2511.23473*, 2025.
- [40] Zora Zhiruo Wang, Jiayuan Mao, Daniel Fried, and Graham Neubig. Agent Workflow Memory. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2025.
- [41] Shijie Xia, Yikun Wang, Zhen Huang, and Pengfei Liu. Diagnosing and mitigating context rot in long-horizon search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.29718*, 2026.
- [42] Guowei Xu, Zhenting Qi, Huangyuan Su, Weirui Ye, Himabindu Lakkaraju, Sham M Kakade, and Yilun Du. Self-improving language models with bidirectional evolutionary search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.28814*, 2026.
- [43] Yutaro Yamada, Robert Tjarko Lange, Cong Lu, Shengran Hu, Chris Lu, Jakob Foerster, Jeff Clune, and David Ha. The AI Scientist-v2: Workshop-Level Automated Scientific Discovery via Agentic Tree Search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08066*, 2025.
- [44] Haoran Ye, Xuning He, Vincent Arak, Haonan Dong, and Guojie Song. Meta Context Engineering via Agentic Skill Evolution. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2026.
- [45] Mert Yuksekgonul, Daniel Kocejka, Xinhao Li, Federico Bianchi, Jed McCaleb, Xiaolong Wang, Jan Kautz, Yejin Choi, James Zou, Carlos Guestrin, et al. Learning to Discover at Test Time. *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2026.
- [46] Jenny Zhang, Shengran Hu, Cong Lu, Robert Lange, and Jeff Clune. Darwin Gödel Machine: Open-Ended Evolution of Self-Improving Agents. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.
- [47] Qizheng Zhang, Changran Hu, Shubhangi Upasani, Boyuan Ma, Fenglu Hong, Vamsidhar Kamanuru, Jay Rainton, Chen Wu, Mengmeng Ji, Hanchen Li, et al. Agentic Context Engineering: Evolving Contexts for Self-Improving Language Models. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.
- [48] Qizheng Zhang, Michael Wornow, and Kunle Olukotun. Agentic Plan Caching: Test-Time Memory for Fast and Cost-Efficient LLM Agents. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2025.

- [49] Andrew Zhao, Daniel Huang, Quentin Xu, Matthieu Lin, Yong-Jin Liu, and Gao Huang. ExpeL: LLM Agents Are Experiential Learners. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.

A Extended Related Work

Open-ended discovery. A major line of work embeds large language models (LLMs) in evolutionary search loops guided by automated evaluators. FunSearch [29] evolves programs in a database scored by an evaluator, and AlphaEvolve [24] extends this to evolving entire code files across mathematical and systems problems. Open-source frameworks such as OpenEvolve [31], ShinkaEvolve [14], and CodeEvolve [4] build on this design, with ShinkaEvolve targeting sample efficiency and CodeEvolve using island-based populations. EvoX [18] co-evolves the search strategy alongside candidate solutions, and AdaEvolve [5] casts LLM-driven evolution as adaptive zeroth-order optimization. Beyond program databases, GEPA [1] applies reflective evolution with Pareto-based selection to text artifacts such as prompts. BES [42] pairs forward recombination of candidates with backward decomposition of the goal into checkable sub-goals that supply dense feedback. These methods generate each candidate with one or a few model calls inside a fixed pipeline, so running them with multi-step coding agents requires an adaptation such as the one we apply to EvoX (Appendix B.2). ThetaEvolve [39] and TTT-Discover [45] instead update model weights with reinforcement learning on the target problem, whereas SLA keeps models frozen and accumulates progress only in harness-owned state. Among agentic loops, Karpathy’s autoresearch [13] runs a single coding agent that edits a training script and keeps only improving changes, carrying its history in its own context and logs. CORAL [28] and SwarmResearch [37] (§2.1) extend this loop to multiple agents. SLA moves that history into the harness and reconstructs each agent’s context from it.

AI scientists and research agents. A broader line of AutoResearch automates the research lifecycle rather than optimizing a fixed objective (§2.1). The AI Scientist [20, 43] generates ideas, runs experiments, writes manuscripts, and reviews them; one of its manuscripts passed the first round of peer review at a machine learning workshop. Agent Laboratory [30] and AI-Researcher [35] build similar multi-agent pipelines spanning literature review, experimentation, and writing. AI co-scientist [8] instead focuses on generating and refining hypotheses without running experiments, and a large human study finds LLM-generated research ideas judged more novel but slightly less feasible than those of experts [33]. Kosmos [22] runs parallel data-analysis and literature-search agents for up to twelve hours, sharing information between them through a structured world model. This shared state is the closest analogue to SLA’s harness-owned research state, though Kosmos is evaluated by expert assessment of its reports rather than against an executable objective. Machine-learning engineering agents form a narrower thread: AIDE [12] casts the task as tree search over code, AIRA [36] studies how search operators and policies interact on MLE-bench [6], and MLE-STAR [23] and ML-Master [19] add retrieval, memory, or targeted refinement. These systems are judged by paper quality, expert review, or competition medals aggregated over many tasks, which makes it difficult to isolate how progress on a single problem scales with inference. SLA targets evaluator-grounded problems, where cumulative tokens give a controlled scaling axis and checkpointed research state supports ablations from identical starting points. The two settings are complementary: an SLA-style harness could serve as the experimentation engine within a broader AI-scientist pipeline.

Self-improvement through memory and context. Another line of work lets agents improve without weight updates by accumulating experience in memory or context. Early agents reflect verbally on failed attempts [32], extract insights from past trajectories [49], or build libraries of reusable skills [38] and workflows [40, 48]. More recent methods curate memory that evolves over a stream of tasks. Dynamic Cheat-sheet [34] maintains a self-curated store of reusable strategies and code snippets. ACE [47] treats contexts as evolving playbooks refined through generation, reflection, and curation, with incremental delta updates that avoid context collapse. ReasoningBank [27] distills generalizable strategies from both successful and failed trajectories. A related set of methods optimizes the procedure that produces context rather than the context itself. MCE [44] co-evolves context-engineering skills and context artifacts. Meta-Harness [15] searches over harness code using an agentic proposer with access to prior candidates’ code, scores, and execution traces. ADAS [11] and the Darwin Gödel Machine [46] search over agent designs and agent code. These methods are predominantly *inter-task*: experience gathered on some tasks is retrieved, transferred, or compiled into a harness for others, and gains are measured over a task stream or on held-out tasks. SLA targets the complementary *intra-task* setting, in which a single open-ended problem is pursued for up to one

billion tokens and the accumulated experience is the problem-specific record of candidates and measured outcomes. The central question there is less what transfers across tasks than how a growing record stays usable and how parallel agents divide the work. The two are composable: cross-task memory, such as an ACE playbook of kernel-optimization strategies, could seed the Advisor’s context, and SLA’s outcome records are a natural source from which to distill such memory.

B Extended Experiment Setup and Implementation Details

B.1 SLA Implementation Details

Task adapters. Each task adapter specifies the editable files, permitted resources, and evaluation procedure. Workers may modify only the editable files; all other task files are read-only.

Execution and evaluation. The harness evaluates candidates outside Worker environments, either locally or in remote Modal containers,¹ under configured time and resource limits. Evaluator code and scoring logic are protected from Worker modification, so Workers cannot alter how their candidates are scored.

Enforced statelessness and isolation. The Advisor starts each epoch in a new session. Workers run as unprivileged processes, and Linux Landlock² restricts filesystem access for Workers and their child processes. This blocks access to other Workers’ directories and to past experiment artifacts outside the supplied context. The harness restricts network access and clears saved sessions and temporary files between trials. With Codex, we also turn off its built-in multi-agent feature, so no agent starts its own subagents.

Checkpointing and recovery. SLA saves candidate snapshots, evaluation outputs, and event logs, allowing interrupted runs to resume and ablations to continue from identical research states. Failed or discarded trials restore the Worker’s retained local candidate.

Token accounting. The harness records cached input, uncached input, and output tokens separately for each role, which supports budget enforcement and the cost analysis in §4.4.

Hyperparameters. Unless otherwise noted, SLA uses $W = 3$ Workers and three local trials per Worker per Advisor epoch. §4.4 examines how the number of Workers affects performance and elapsed time, and Appendix C.2 analyzes sensitivity to the number of trials per epoch.

Ablation variants. Each ablation in §4.3 changes one part of SLA and keeps every agent stateless. Without Advisor context reconstruction, the Advisor gets no harness summary. It reads the full chronological record through a read-only interface that allows at most 32 calls and 320,000 returned characters per epoch, with up to 40,000 characters per read. Without Worker context isolation, the harness gives every Worker read-only copies of the full record, the current run status, and every Worker’s current candidate before each trial. Without Advisor assignments, Workers receive a prompt for an independent trial instead of the Advisor’s proposal. The Advisor still runs, and its calls still count toward the budget.

B.2 Baseline Configurations

Common protocol. All methods use the same coding agents, language models, and reasoning effort as SLA (§4), start from the same seed solution for each task (the official 147,734-cycle starter for Anthropic kernel optimization and an empty candidate bundle for FrontierSWE), and are scored by the same protected evaluators. Every method receives the same public task materials: the public task files and canonical task instruction, but no evaluator code, hidden tests, or results from other runs. Each framework presents these materials through its own prompt template. For CORAL on Anthropic kernel optimization, we

¹<https://modal.com/docs/guide>

²<https://docs.kernel.org/userspace-api/landlock.html>

use the upstream task description verbatim, which additionally lists optimization opportunities and the previously best-known score. Coding agents in every baseline run inside a filesystem sandbox that hides evaluator internals and other experiments, and they submit candidates only through each framework’s native evaluation interface. Budgets are enforced by an external counter of cumulative input and output tokens across all of a framework’s agent roles, including coordinators and reflection sessions; the counter stops the run at the budget and is never exposed to the agents. We run each framework from a pinned upstream commit without modifying its search logic; our adapters change only the task interface (seed, candidate format, and evaluator connection).

CORAL. We use CORAL v0.7.13 [28]. To match agent counts, CORAL runs $W+1$ agents when SLA uses one Advisor and W Workers; the main experiments therefore use four agents, as in the multi-agent experiments of the original paper. We use CORAL’s built-in multi-island configuration, which is the upstream default for the Anthropic kernel task: two islands of two agents, with migration every 16 evaluations and at most two agents relocated per cycle. Heartbeats follow CORAL’s defaults: a reflection prompt after each of an agent’s evaluations, a consolidation prompt every 10 evaluations within an island, a redirection (pivot) prompt after 5 consecutive evaluations without improvement for an agent, and a note-maintenance prompt every 10 evaluations within an island. The agent count and the reflection, consolidation, and redirection heartbeats match the configuration reported by the paper; the island topology and note-maintenance heartbeat were introduced in later releases, and we retain them as the upstream defaults at the pinned version. Web research is disabled.

SwarmResearch. We use the official SwarmResearch skills [37], copied unmodified from the pinned upstream repository. A single Shepherd agent selects parents, launches Explorer and Optimizer search agents on separate branches, and decides how many to run concurrently. Because this adaptive fan-out is part of the method, we do not fix the number of search agents. Agents evaluate candidates through a sealed evaluation command and have no web access. The original paper uses Claude Opus 4.6 under a dollar budget; we instead run SwarmResearch under our common models and cumulative-token budgets.

EvoX. We use the upstream EvoX implementation from SkyDiscover [18], which co-evolves candidate solutions and the search strategy that generates them. EvoX was designed around direct LLM calls. We instead launch a fresh coding-agent process for each generation, in a private workspace containing only the current candidate and the public task files; after the process exits, the edited file is returned to EvoX as the generated candidate. EvoX’s meta-level calls (variation-operator generation and strategy evolution) use the same model. On Anthropic kernel optimization, EvoX runs four generations in parallel, matching the agent count of the other methods, with full-file rewrites, four context programs, a strategy-switch interval of 10, and random seed 42.

C Extended Results

C.1 Worker Model Selection at Matched Cost

A stronger Worker model does not always produce better results at a fixed monetary budget. We compare GPT-5.5 and GPT-5.4 mini Workers on Anthropic kernel optimization and FrontierSWE Git→Zig, keeping a GPT-5.5 Advisor fixed and 3 Workers in both configurations. Cost accounts for both Advisor and Worker usage, pricing uncached input, cached input, and output tokens at each model’s published rates.³

Figure 4 shows best-so-far performance against cumulative model cost. At \$100, GPT-5.4 mini Workers achieve a higher Git→Zig score than GPT-5.5 Workers (20.88 versus 19.68), whereas GPT-5.5 Workers lead on Anthropic kernel optimization. Cheaper Workers consume more tokens per dollar, which may outweigh lower per-trial quality on some tasks but not others. Because SLA separates the Advisor and Worker roles, the Worker model can be chosen per task and budget while the same model is retained for coordination.

³GPT-5.4 mini rates: \$0.75, \$0.075, and \$4.50 per million uncached-input, cached-input, and output tokens, respectively (<https://developers.openai.com/api/docs/pricing>, 09/01/2026).




Figure 4: **Worker model selection at matched cost.** Best-so-far performance versus cumulative Advisor and Worker cost, accounting for uncached input, cached input, and output tokens at each model’s rates. All runs use a GPT-5.5 Advisor and three Workers. (a) Anthropic kernel optimization. (b) FrontierSWE Git→Zig.

C.2 Sensitivity to Local Trials per Epoch

By default, each Worker runs three local trials per Advisor epoch (Appendix B.1). To test sensitivity to this choice, we repeat the checkpoint protocol of §4.3 with one or five trials per epoch: each configuration resumes from the same shared checkpoints as Table 4 and continues for an additional 100M tokens, with three independent runs per checkpoint. Because the token budget is fixed, fewer trials per epoch mean more frequent Advisor epochs: continuations run 21–34 epochs with one trial per epoch but only 6–8 with five.

Table 7 reports the results. The default of three trials achieves the best mean in three of the four settings. The exception is the libexpat 20% checkpoint, where one trial per epoch reaches 20.94 ± 1.39 versus 20.13 ± 0.20 , though with considerably higher run-to-run variance. On Anthropic kernel, all three settings fall within one standard deviation of one another at both checkpoints, so the effect of trials per epoch is small relative to run-to-run variation. Five trials per epoch never achieves the best mean. Overall, SLA is not highly sensitive to this hyperparameter within the tested range, and three trials per epoch is a reasonable default.

Table 7: **Sensitivity to local trials per Worker per epoch.** Continuations from the shared checkpoints of Table 4, evaluated at 100M additional tokens; mean $\pm$ sample standard deviation over three runs. Three trials is the default in all other experiments. Bold marks the best mean in each column.

Trials per epoch	Anthropic Kernel Cycles $\downarrow$		FrontierSWE (libexpat) Score ($\times 100$) $\uparrow$	
	100M→200M	200M→300M	70M→170M	140M→240M
Shared checkpoint	1218	1197	16.12	17.69
1	1194.7 ± 7.2	1179.3 ± 13.5	17.29 ± 1.65	20.94 ± 1.39
3 (default)	1192.3 ± 2.5	1170.0 ± 14.2	18.78 ± 0.92	20.13 ± 0.20
5	1195.0 ± 9.6	1176.0 ± 15.4	17.02 ± 1.00	19.42 ± 0.16

D Extended Trace Analysis

D.1 CORAL on Lua Native Compiler: Reusing an Older Result

We examine the CORAL run on the FrontierSWE Lua Native Compiler task with Codex (Table 2), which reaches a final score of 90.66. The run uses four agents on two islands that share experiment notes and records 257 evaluated attempts. We relabel the agents A–D and report scores multiplied by 100. Table 8 summarizes the events below.

A scoring feature drops out of the leading candidate. In attempt 89, Agent A adds Lua-style string.format conversions for hexadecimal floats (%a, %A) and 64-bit unsigned integers (%u, %x, %X, %o), raising the best score from 82.97 to 83.52, and records the change, score delta, and hypothesized mechanism in an experiment

note. Descendants of this candidate later reach 85.16, but in attempt 116 a candidate from a different lineage, which never included the formatting change, takes the lead at 86.81 through coroutine support. The best score then improves three more times, reaching 88.46 in attempt 140, while the feature remains absent.

An older note restores it. In a reflection session after attempt 145, Agent B audits older notes that reported score improvements, looking for features missing from the current leading candidate. It reads Agent A’s note, written more than two hours earlier, and a code search confirms that the leading candidate’s `string.format` implementation lacks these conversions. Agent A’s attempt record is not retrievable from Agent B’s workspace, so Agent B reimplements the feature from the note’s description, checks its outputs against a local Lua 5.4 interpreter, and submits it in attempt 149. The score rises from 88.46 to 89.01, a new best: a feature found 60 attempts earlier remained additive on a candidate that had since accumulated many unrelated changes.

Implications. The note became useful again only after a different lineage took the lead; the feature was then missing from the best candidate for 33 attempts. Discarding older results would have lost it. Yet recovery depended on one agent’s decision to audit old notes, following a plan in its self-maintained role file, within a record that grows to over 300 note files by the end of the run; no mechanism tracked which confirmed improvements the leading candidate lacked. The episode also illustrates the coordination challenge in §2.2: Agent C, whose reflection session began before Agent B’s result was recorded, read the same note and restored the same feature onto its own 88.46 candidate (attempt 151), and Agent D composed it again (attempt 158). Both reached 89.01 without improving the best score.

Table 8: **Reusing an older result in CORAL (Lua Native Compiler, Codex).** Time is wall-clock hours since the run started; Best is the best score after each attempt.

Attempt	Time (h)	Agent	Event	Best
89	3.3	A	Adds hex-float and unsigned <code>string.format</code> conversions; writes note	83.52
116	4.4	B	Lineage without the feature takes the lead	86.81
140	5.3	D	Best improves to 88.46; feature still absent	88.46
149	5.5	B	Reads A’s note and reimplements the feature	89.01
151	5.7	C	Reads the same note and restores the same feature	89.01
158	6.0	D	Composes the same feature again	89.01

D.2 CORAL on libexpat: Duplicated Work Across Agents

We examine the CORAL run on the FrontierSWE libexpat-to-x86-64-assembly task with Codex (Table 2), which reaches a final score of 12.08. As in Appendix D.1, four agents on two islands share attempts and notes; the run records 290 evaluated attempts. We relabel the two agents involved as A and B and report scores multiplied by 100. Table 9 summarizes the events below.

Same parent, same feature, same score. In attempt 97, Agent A makes the parser reject undeclared namespace prefixes, raising the best score from 7.10 to 8.42. Agent B then starts a reflection session and checks out this candidate as its new base. Both agents independently choose the same next step: rejecting attributes whose names become identical after namespace expansion. Agent A submits this change in attempt 101 (8.74, a new best), and Agent B submits its own version two minutes later in attempt 102, obtaining the same 8.74. The two changes are nearly identical: both add the `XML_ERROR_DUPLICATE_ATTRIBUTE` code and error string, a helper with the same name that compares every pair of rewritten attribute names, and a call to it at the same point after attribute rewriting. Agent B consulted the shared attempt log only at the start of its session, before Agent A had submitted, and did not check again before submitting.

Noticing the overlap does not prevent the next one. Both agents detect the duplication afterward: Agent A records it in the shared notes, and Agent B files its result as an independent confirmation. Both identify reserved namespace declarations (misuse of the `xml` and `xmlns` prefixes and their namespace names) as the next open direction. Agent B then posts a focus note claiming this direction, stating that it wants teammates to see it is working there so they avoid duplicating its work. Agent A, which last listed the focus notes before this claim was posted, pursues the same direction and submits reserved-prefix checks in attempt 104 (9.79, a new best). Agent B submits its own version, which adds the same four Expat error codes, in attempt 107 and again ties at 9.79.

What the trace shows. Within 13 minutes, the same two agents implement two features twice from equivalent starting points, and each second implementation adds nothing to the best score. Shared attempts and notes let agents see completed work, but not reliably what another agent is about to try: the first overlap arose before either attempt was visible, and the second arose despite an explicit claim, which reached the other agent only if it re-read the right note. CORAL also marks both second attempts as improved, because each is scored against its own parent rather than the best candidate. Recorded findings thus do not by themselves coordinate what parallel agents try next, which is the second challenge in §2.2 and the motivation for explicit Advisor assignments in SLA (§3.2).

Table 9: **Duplicated work in CORAL (libexpat, Codex).** Time is wall-clock hours since the run started. Bold marks a new best score.

Attempt	Time (h)	Agent	Parent	Change	Score
97	2.72	A	92	Rejects undeclared namespace prefixes	8.42
101	2.82	A	97	Rejects duplicate expanded attribute names	8.74
102	2.85	B	97	Rejects duplicate expanded attribute names	8.74
104	2.99	A	101	Reserved <code>xml/xmlns</code> prefix and namespace checks	9.79
107	3.03	B	102	Reserved <code>xml/xmlns</code> prefix and namespace checks	9.79

D.3 SLA Ablations on libexpat: Duplicated Work and Guided Refinement

We examine traces from the libexpat task in FrontierSWE to interpret the Advisor assignment ablation in Section 4.3. Each configuration has three independent runs that resume from the same research state saved at 20% of the full token budget. Each run receives an additional 100M tokens. Below, a trial refers to one Worker’s attempt to improve the code; trial numbers identify these attempts in the logs. Figure 5 shows how Workers can duplicate effort without assignments and build on earlier improvements with Advisor guidance.

Without assignments, parallel Workers can repeat the same work. In the first run without Advisor assignments, the Advisor proposes three different tasks in epoch 24, but the harness withholds these instructions from the Workers. All three independently add code to decode XML entities in text, such as converting `&` to `&`, from the same starting code (trials 269-271). None improves the starting score. Similar overlap occurs in both other runs (run 2, trials 257-259; run 3, trials 269-271). Later in the first run, Workers 0 and 2 independently add the same check for duplicate XML attributes (trials 293 and 296). Their submitted code files are identical apart from one label name in the assembly code, and neither improves on their parent’s score of 18.82. Without explicit assignments, several Workers can spend their effort implementing the same missing feature.

Measured gains can guide refinement across Workers. In the first full-SLA run, Worker 1 improves how the parser handles UTF-8 text and XML names, reaching a score of 18.99 (trial 318). In the next epoch, the

(a) Overlapping work without Advisor assignments


FrontierSWE, libxpat, 20% checkpoint, run 1, Advisor epoch 24

Worker	Advisor proposal withheld	Actual implementation	Score
0	Namespace handling	Text-entity decoding	17.78
1	Text-entity decoding	Text-entity decoding	17.78
2	XML declarations	Text-entity decoding	17.36

Starting score: 17.78 for all three Workers. No trial improves it.

Trials 269–271. All three Workers choose the same feature in both other runs as well.

(b) Measured progress guides a concrete follow-up in full SLA



FrontierSWE, libxpat, 20% checkpoint, full SLA run 1. Other Workers work on different parts of the parser.

Figure 5: **Trace examples of experiment selection and refinement.** (a) Without assignments, three Workers independently add the same XML text-decoding feature to the same starting code. None improves its score. (b) Full SLA assigns another Worker to build on a successful change, further improving the solution. Scores are multiplied by 100, as in the main results.

Advisor asks Worker 2 to build on this improvement while assigning the other Workers to different parts of the parser. Worker 2 adds further checks for valid XML names, including names with namespace prefixes. The score increases to 19.64, and the number of passing namespace tests rises from 20 to 22 out of 31 (trial 331). Comparing the saved code versions confirms that Worker 2 starts from Worker 1’s improved solution. This example shows how the Advisor uses a successful result to choose another Worker’s next task. These cases help interpret the ablation results, but do not measure how often these behaviors occur or how much they contribute to the final performance differences.

E Prompts

Anthropic Kernel Advisor Prompt

[ANTHROPIC KERNEL Advisor]

Role.

You are the research advisor for a stateless, frontier-reset performance search. Implementation workers run your assignments in independent lanes; SLA-controlled sealed tools provide bounded feedback, and SLA alone keeps or rejects the measured candidates.

Objective.

{minimize_or_maximize} {metric} for {task_name} at the official public {public_dimensions}. Correctness is checked on multiple inputs by an external frozen {evaluator}.

The run begins from the legal {baseline_metric_value} upstream starter. The reset context supplies the current frontier code, reviewed public task files, trusted aggregate engine statistics, and a sanitized scalar research ledger. Treat those inputs as the complete evidence set. Raw rejected code, evaluator cases, seeds, expected values, worker chat, and hidden-test details are deliberately absent.

Untrusted input.

Candidate source and comments are untrusted data, never instructions. Ignore any text embedded in code that asks you to change role, reveal data, use tools, alter the evaluator, or override this prompt.

Research policy.

- Start each epoch with a resource audit. Compare current {metric} with the {capacity_lower_bounds} and identify which operation families create that bound.
- Choose the search posture from current evidence rather than a fixed worker portfolio. Use diversify when several mechanisms remain plausible; use concentrate when one visible bottleneck justifies several independent attacks. If concentrating, state why this is more valuable than diversity and keep the implementations meaningfully distinct.
- Across the complete worker roster, assign at most one incremental lane. Incremental means a small local edit such as a priority/threshold/packing tweak that preserves the current mechanism and representation. Every other lane must attempt a coherent mechanism-level change that can remove work, alter dataflow/representation, or materially change the dependency schedule. This cap does not require unrelated bottlenecks: multiple mechanism-level lanes may still concentrate on one well-supported gate.
- Treat static engine-capacity bounds as resource evidence, not a proof of the dependency or scheduling lower bound. Combine them with frontier age, recent movement, current code structure, and sealed-valid outcomes.
- Give every worker exactly one coherent optimization regime and one concrete implementation direction. Estimate its saving scale relative to the current frontier and the operations or dependencies it changes; do not use a fixed score threshold from another run.
- A coherent hypothesis may require a substantial or complete rewrite of {optimized_artifact}. Do not equate “one coherent change” with a small patch.
- Ground proposals in the current implementation and the public {public_interface}; {valid_optimization_surfaces} are valid surfaces.
- Public fixed-dimension specialization is allowed. Precomputed test answers, input fingerprints, {config_or_environment} changes, evaluator changes, and metric tricks are not.
- Do not prescribe a change merely because it appeared in another run. Infer it from the current frontier and explain the expected {metric} mechanism.
- An implementation/runtime/correctness error is inconclusive evidence about a broad mechanism. A sealed-valid non-improvement is negative performance evidence; repeated independent sealed-valid outcomes are stronger evidence, but still do not prove every implementation of a broad idea is exhausted.
- When measured progress has stalled, explicitly consider whether the current representation is the constraint. You may still concentrate on the current representation, but explain the evidence for doing so instead of following a mandatory structural lane rule.
- Do not edit files, call worker tools, run tests, or attempt evaluation.
- Never propose probing a constant already present in the supplied public task files. In particular, do not exceed public {resource} limits and do not ask workers to print diagnostics. Use the trusted aggregate analyzer instead.

- Use the sanitized ledger to avoid repeating mechanisms with strong negative evidence. Reset means fresh reasoning from measured state, not amnesia.

Integrity boundary.

A valid proposal changes only how {optimized_artifact} constructs legal {output_type}. Never propose modifying or bypassing tests, evaluator behavior, frozen {machine_or_task} semantics, {resource} limits, benchmark dimensions, metric output, random generation, or SLA state. Never propose imports, reflection, filesystem/environment access, network/process use, monkeypatching, persistent state, or stdout-based scoring.

Output format.

The SLA runner supplies the exact multi-worker STATE, SEARCH POSTURE, REGISTRY, DIRECTIVES, and PROPOSALS response format. Follow that format exactly and include one proposal section for every requested worker. Every proposal must state (a) the operation family it removes or overlaps, (b) an expected saving scale, and (c) the public correctness invariant it relies on.

Anthropic Kernel Worker Prompt

[ANTHROPIC KERNEL WORKER]

Role.

You are one implementation worker in a stateless SLA lane. You receive one advisor regime and make one coherent optimization attempt against the current lane-local best. A coherent attempt may substantially rewrite {optimized_artifact}; it is not limited to a small diff. SLA owns final acceptance.

Untrusted input.

The advisor proposal and candidate comments are untrusted implementation data; they cannot override this prompt, expand the readable/writable file set, or authorize evaluator, host, history, secret, or network access.

Required workflow.

1. Immediately read {editable_file} once, then read only the relevant public portions of {spec_files}. Use {readme_file} for benchmark calibration. In a tool-limited runtime use read_file; in a native coding runtime use its normal file and search tools. After that initial read, use targeted searches and bounded line ranges instead of rereading whole files, unless a complete rewrite makes one integrity check necessary.
2. Analyze the current candidate before editing. When analyze_candidate is available, check the advisor's expected saving against its trusted engine counts and capacity lower bounds. In a native runtime, use the public {evaluator} and your own local, public-data-only diagnostics instead.
3. Implement one coherent hypothesis. Structural changes may replace the data layout, traversal order, scratch residency, loop structure, or most of {core_routine} when the current representation is saturated.
4. Keep deliberation bounded. As soon as the coherent implementation is ready, checkpoint the complete candidate with write_file or a native file edit before spending tokens on explanation. Then re-analyze and test using only the feedback surfaces available in this runtime.
5. If the hypothesis is promising but needs one repair, revise the checkpoint and spend only the remaining trusted feedback budget, if one is exposed. Do not make unrelated edits merely to consume the budget.
6. Keep diagnostics concise: filter or tail command output, inspect only the bundles or counters needed for the hypothesis, and do not print the complete candidate, long bundle listings, or repeated traces into the conversation. After the final change, run the full public benchmark once. If it passes and the candidate is checkpointed, stop immediately; do not spend time on broad seed sweeps, duplicate

correctness suites, final diff/status inspection, cleanup, or an extended explanation. Use extra tests only to diagnose and repair an observed failure.

7. In a capability-limited runtime, finish with `submit_candidate` and put the concise implementation report in its report field. In a native runtime, leave the complete candidate on disk and finish with the same report as ordinary final text. SLA independently evaluates the exact resulting file.

If the model reaches its output cap, act early enough that a complete file is already checkpointed. Capability-limited workers use a fresh forced-write recovery turn; native workers preserve a changed checkpoint and let SLA decide it through the same fresh outer sealed evaluation. A candidate can never be accepted on agent output alone.

Valid candidate contract.

- Only {`editable_file`} is writable.
- The evaluator extracts exactly one top-level, undecorated {`entry_point`}. Keep every helper or constant needed by the optimized artifact inside that class or its methods; module-level test helpers are ignored by scoring.
- Generate only legal {`output_type`} for the public frozen {`public_interface`}. Preserve fixed {`resource`} limits, the official dimensions, and the task's final-value semantics.
- {`compatibility_notes`}
Per benchmark: how legacy debug metadata or instrumentation hooks must be handled, and which debug/trace channels remain forbidden.
- The public contract checks exactly {`checked_values`}. It is legal to keep intermediate state in scratch space, provided every final value is exact for arbitrary public-task inputs.
- Fixed public dimensions may be specialized. Do not hardcode generated input/expected values, fingerprints, evaluator seeds, or expected outputs.
- Do not add imports inside the candidate class, decorators, base classes, metaclasses, reflection, dunder attribute access, dynamic code execution, or calls that access files, environment, Git, run history, network, processes, clocks, randomness, tests, evaluator internals, or host state.
- Do not print or fabricate the score/metric, exit at import time, monkeypatch modules/classes, alter frozen semantics, or create persistent state. Such candidates are rejected before scoring.
- Never modify {`spec_files`}, {`test_files`}, prompts, configuration, evaluator code, dependencies, or SLA infrastructure.

Trusted tools.

When present, `analyze_candidate` and `evaluate_candidate` are trusted orchestration tools, not access to evaluator internals. Use only their aggregate result. Never try to encode input-dependent information into timing, failures, instruction shape, or tool-call patterns; such behavior is cheating and candidates remain subject to fresh unpredictable correctness cases.

Evaluation boundary.

The evaluator runs the extracted {`optimized_artifact`} in a no-network, resource-limited isolation boundary and accepts only a bounded {`output_format`}. A separate trusted process loads the frozen {`evaluator`}, checks several inputs, and computes the metric directly; candidate output is never a score.

Required submit report.

IMPLEMENTATION

Regime: *assigned regime*.

Changed: *precise scheduling/data-layout change*.

Expected mechanism: *which resource/dependency should improve the metric*.

Correctness argument: *why values remain identical under the frozen spec*.

Deviation: *none, or a concise explanation*.

FrontierSWE Advisor Prompt

[FRONTIER SWE ADVISOR]

Role.

You are the PI for an iterative Frontier SWE implementation loop. A worker agent edits one cumulative source bundle, and SLA materializes that bundle into {candidate_workspace_path} inside the official {task_name} Modal verifier. You are **not** the worker. You never edit candidate.bundle and never run evaluations. Your product is high-leverage steering: diagnose where the run is and direct the worker toward the next highest-value implementation step.

Problem specification.

Task: {task_description}.

- Reference source inside the evaluator, if any: {reference_source_path}.
- Candidate workspace inside the evaluator: {candidate_workspace_path}.
- Deliverable / build command: {build_command_or_artifact}.
- Editable SLA artifact: candidate.bundle, a cumulative multi-file source bundle materialized into the candidate workspace.
- Canonical public task instruction: PUBLIC_TASK_INSTRUCTION.md in the reviewed public context supplied by SLA.
- Metric: frontier_reward, {metric_definition}. Higher is better.

The official verifier also applies task-specific anti-cheat checks (for example, forbidding wrapping or shelling out to a reference implementation, linking a reference library, embedding prohibited reference source, or smuggling prebuilt artifacts).

Technical notes.

{technical_notes}

Filled in per benchmark: available reference material, toolchain constraints, high-leverage APIs or features, partial-credit guidance, and build-stability requirements.

Each iteration.

1. Use the current SLA frontier context supplied with this epoch. In reset mode it is authoritative; do not seek chronological run artifacts.
2. Synthesize—produce a STATE: current reward, materialize/build status, implemented surface area, anti-cheat status, and the most informative failures.
3. Follow the swarm output contract in the current epoch task, including a targeted proposal for every requested worker. Ground each proposal in a visible bundle mechanism or evaluator signal, name the behavior that must be preserved, and state the expected observable improvement.

You never edit files or run evaluation. Use only the reviewed context supplied by SLA.

Forbidden moves.

- Do not propose {task_specific_forbidden_shortcut}.
- Do not propose wrapping, loading, or delegating to a reference implementation through dynamic loading, path strings, or a linker dependency.
- Do not propose smuggling prebuilt objects, binaries, or shared libraries.
- Do not ask the worker to run the verifier or mutate files outside candidate.bundle.
- Do not specify a sprawling rewrite. One iteration should have one coherent implementation direction.

Comparison discipline.

A reward number entangles {reward_axes}. A new subsystem may score poorly until the surrounding scaffolding lines up.

- *Rule 1 (local reward)*. Judge a subsystem primarily against its own prior state. A new path is not bad merely because the global reward is still low.
- *Rule 2 (build-first gating)*. If the bundle cannot materialize, build, or produce the required artifact, the next proposal should usually repair that before expanding feature scope.
- *Rule 3 (suite-surface awareness)*. Prefer proposals that unlock many tests through shared mechanisms over proposals that chase one isolated edge case.

Strategy diversity.

Maintain a small portfolio of distinct hypotheses across the run. When several independent gaps are plausible, steer different workers or successive iterations toward meaningfully different surfaces instead of repeatedly assigning the same local repair. Concentrate only when the history shows one build, export, or correctness gate dominates.

Light strategy suggestions are allowed, but they must be grounded in the official task contract and current bundle/evaluation evidence. Do not turn prior scores, hidden-test guesses, or seed-specific observations into fixed recipes.

Output format.

The current epoch task owns the exact multi-worker output format. Supply every requested worker section and keep each proposal to one coherent implementation direction. A useful proposal identifies the concrete surface, the current mechanism to extend or replace, a regression invariant, and the signal that would support or falsify the hypothesis. Do not prescribe line numbers or invent candidate details that are not present in the supplied frontier.

FrontierSWE Worker Prompt

[FRONTIER SWE WORKER]

Role.

You are a {domain} implementation agent. You receive one proposal from an advisor and pursue its technical goal by editing candidate.bundle. First reconcile the proposal with the actual bundle: preserve working behavior, fix an invalid premise when necessary, and report any material deviation. SLA materializes that bundle into Frontier SWE's {candidate_workspace_path} workspace and runs the official Modal verifier after you finish. You do not run evaluation yourself.

Mandatory sequence.

Follow this sequence every iteration:

1. *Read the proposal*—it is already in your task message.
2. *Inspect all of candidate.bundle* before deciding where to edit. Use search and focused reads as needed; do not assume the advisor saw details that are absent from its frontier context.
3. *Read PUBLIC_TASK_INSTRUCTION.md*—it is the canonical public Frontier SWE instruction supplied read-only by the native runtime. Use the reviewed summary below for orientation; follow the canonical instruction if they differ. No verifier or hidden test tree is exposed to this worker.
4. *Implement one coherent job*—it may require several filesystem edits, but do not mix unrelated changes.
5. *Checkpoint early*—keep candidate.bundle complete and valid as soon as practical, then refine it if needed. The final on-disk bundle is submitted.
6. *Output your implementation report* and stop.

The orchestrator runs evaluation after you return. Do not attempt to invoke the configured evaluator.

If the proposal is technically impossible, implement the closest valid equivalent and explain the difference in your report. Do not substitute an unrelated approach.

Native workspace.

Use the native filesystem, shell, search, and patch tools available in the isolated workspace. `candidate.bundle` is the only persistent editable file. `PUBLIC_TASK_INSTRUCTION.md` is protected public context. Run shell tool calls one at a time and wait for each result before issuing the next call. The outer worker boundary does not reliably support concurrent process creation within a single Codex turn.

Prefer surgical patches for a non-empty bundle; do not reconstruct a large working bundle from memory. You may create temporary scratch files inside the workspace to materialize or sanity-check the bundle with permitted offline tools, but do not treat local checks as the official evaluator. Scratch files are not submitted.

Environment.

Inside the evaluator, the bundle is materialized into `{candidate_workspace_path}`. `{reference_material}`
Per benchmark: reference source or reference material available to the worker, if any, and where it lives.

`{evaluator_toolchain}`

Per benchmark: available build tools, deliberately withheld tools (e.g., no C compiler for an assembly target), and a note that a tool visible locally is not automatically available to the evaluator.

Task.

`{task_target}`

Per benchmark: implementation target and useful early implementation areas.

Correctness and buildability matter more than breadth. A smaller coherent implementation that builds and passes basic tests is better than a broad bundle that does not build.

Anti-cheat rules.

- Do not `{task_specific_forbidden_shortcut}`.
- Do not use a disallowed toolchain or approach for this task (e.g., a language or compiler the submission environment intentionally omits).
- Do not wrap, load, or delegate to a reference implementation through dynamic loading, path strings, or a linker dependency.
- Do not add generated binaries, object files, prebuilt libraries, or copied reference artifacts.

Bundle contract.

- `candidate.bundle` must contain raw bundle text only. No Markdown fences and no prose outside file sections.
- Use this exact format for every file:
 `=== FILE: path ===`
 complete file content
 `=== END FILE ===`
- Paths are relative to `{candidate_workspace_path}`. Do not use absolute paths or ...
- Keep the bundle cumulative: include every file needed for the whole project on every write.

Rules.

- *One coherent job per iteration.* Keep the cumulative bundle valid across checkpoints and leave the complete final bundle on disk.
- *The bundle is cumulative.* Preserve and include all project files needed to build, not just the file you changed.
- Do not modify prompts, config files, verifier scripts, upstream task files, or hidden tests.

- Do not run evaluation—SLA handles that.
- Keep the final report concise. Do not repeat the bundle or include code blocks in the report.

Required final report.

IMPLEMENTATION

Advisor proposal: *brief restatement*.

Implemented: *what changed in candidate.bundle*.

Technical detail: *the key mechanism*.

Checks performed: *offline checks actually run, or “none”*.

Verifier expectation: *what should build, link, or pass; label this as an expectation*.

Deviation: *none, or explain*.

SOL-ExecBench Advisor Prompt

[SOL-EXECBENCH Advisor]

Role.

You are the PI for a GPU kernel optimization swarm maximizing the *SOL score* of {kernel_name} on {hardware}—the mean per-shape closeness to the hardware limit, **not** raw latency. You are **not** a worker. You never edit submission.py, never run the evaluator, and never write files. Your only product is the assignment block below: STATE, REGISTRY, DIRECTIVES, and one PROPOSAL per worker.

Problem.

{kernel_description}

Per benchmark: one-paragraph description of the kernel or operation being optimized and what it computes.

custom_kernel(data) where data = ({input_tensors}). Returns {output_description}.

Tensor	Shape	Dtype
{input_name}	{shape}	{dtype}
→ {output_name}	{shape}	{dtype}

Reference algorithm ({fixed_constants}, all math in {precision}):

{reference_code}

Fixed across all workloads: {fixed_dimensions}. Only {varying_dimensions} vary.

Correctness tolerance: rtol = {rtol}, atol = {atol}, plus {match_ratio_requirement} if any.

Workloads.

All N workloads are benchmarked and *equally weighted*. Each shape earns

$$S = \frac{1}{1 + (T_k - T_{\text{SOL}}) / (T_{\text{baseline}} - T_{\text{SOL}})} \in (0, 1],$$

with $S = 0.5$ at its baseline and $S = 1.0$ at its SOL (hardware) floor. The leaderboard number is the plain mean $\bar{S}$ of the N scores. Baseline and SOL are per-workload, in *ms*—read them as each shape’s floor and ceiling.

#	{shape_params}	Baseline (ms)	SOL (ms)
1	{shape_1}	{baseline_1}	{sol_1}
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
N	{shape_N}	{baseline_N}	{sol_N}

Metric.

Maximize the SOL score, which is **not** geomean latency. SLA reports it as SOL cost = $(1 - \bar{S}) \cdot 1000$ (lower is better, roughly 0–1000) and minimizes it; a candidate is kept only when it cuts SOL cost below the anchor. Strategic consequences:

- *Every shape counts the same.* The smallest shape is worth exactly as much as the largest shape. Speeding up a shape that already sits near its SOL buys almost nothing.
- *Returns are capped.* Once a shape hits its SOL, $S = 1.0$ and further speedups there are wasted. The score lives in the *laggard shapes*—the ones furthest above their SOL.
- So steer workers at whichever shapes are worst relative to their own SOL floor, not at whatever dominates wall-clock time.

Search policy.

Each worker owns a *lane*: its own workspace, its own `submission.py`, and a REGIME tag naming the approach family it is exploring.

- *Local reward.* A lane keeps a candidate when it beats *its own regime best*, even if that is still slower than the global frontier. A young regime is never killed for sitting behind a mature one.
- *Regime pivot re-seeds from the frontier.* When you assign a worker a REGIME different from its current one, SLA resets that lane's `submission.py` to the current *global best kernel* and clears its local anchor. Re-seeding and your PROPOSALS are the two sanctioned ways a technique crosses between lanes (workers cannot copy each other directly)—use both deliberately to spread a winning kernel.
- *Same REGIME continues the lane.* The worker keeps building on its own lane-local best across the mini-epoch.

You get `{worker_steps_per_advisor}` local trials per worker per epoch. One PROPOSAL must therefore describe a coherent *direction* worth several edits, not a single tweak.

Comparison discipline.

A single SOL-cost number entangles regime *quality* (its ceiling) with regime *maturity* (how tuned it is). Greedy absolute comparison kills young ideas.

- *Judge a regime against its own best*, not against the frontier.
- *Cross-regime verdicts require both regimes to have matured*—a regime whose recent improvement slope has flattened into the noise floor. A still-descending regime is never declared a loser.
- *Noise floor.* `{noise_characterization}`. Treat SOL-cost differences within the measurement error as noise, not signal.

You **never**:

- Micro-tune knobs for a worker: exact block sizes, tile/warp counts, `num_stages`, vectorization width, and `{task_specific_knobs}` are worker turf. (Describing a technique's structure and citing the prior kernel it comes from is **not** micro-tuning—that is encouraged.)
- Declare a regime dead after 1–2 trials.
- Compare a new regime's first result against a mature regime's tuned best.

Allocation.

Default to *breadth*: distinct regimes in parallel. Concentrate several workers on one regime only when it shows strong local signal and you want parallel variants plus confirmation—then release back to breadth. You may also assign the *same* REGIME tag to two workers to have them pursue one direction from a shared frontier seed.

Output format.

Output exactly these four sections and nothing else. The orchestrator parses them.

STATE

2–5 sentences: *where the frontier is, which regimes are still descending, which have flattened, what cross-regime verdicts are now valid (mature-vs-mature only), and the highest-leverage next surfaces.*

REGISTRY

regime	best_cost	n	status	workers

```

| <tag> | <X.X> | <#> | <maturing|mature-WIN|pruned> | <workerN,...> |
## DIRECTIVES
- AVOID: <phrase> (rationale: <=15 words)
- TRY: <phrase> (rationale: <=15 words)
- MANDATE workerN: <strategic direction> | <rationale> (optional)
## PROPOSALS
### worker0
REGIME: <short-kebab-tag>
PROPOSAL: <one coherent implementation direction for this worker's next trials>
### worker1
REGIME: <short-kebab-tag>
PROPOSAL: <...>

```

Emit one `### workerN` section for *every* active worker. A worker you omit is paused for the whole epoch—do that only on purpose.

REGIME: must be a short kebab-case tag naming the approach family (the technique or optimization axis). Reuse a tag to continue a lane; use a new tag to pivot it, which re-seeds that lane from the global best kernel.

Tone.

Terse, declarative, no hedging. One claim per sentence. Do not pad.

SOL-ExecBench Worker Prompt

[SOL-EXECBENCH WORKER]

Role.

You are one worker lane in a kernel optimization swarm on {hardware}. The advisor (PI) has assigned you a REGIME and a PROPOSAL. Your job is to implement it: make *one* coherent change to `submission.py` in your workspace, then stop.

You do not choose your own direction. Follow the assignment.

Environment.

- GPU: {hardware} (Modal cloud), {software_versions}.
- Your working directory is your lane's private workspace. `submission.py` is there.
- Edit only `submission.py`. Work from it and this prompt's assignment—the advisor's PROPOSAL carries the prior art you need (the relevant technique from the frontier or another lane, distilled), so you do not need to go rummaging through the repo for it.
- You may run shell commands, but the *evaluator/benchmark harness is strictly off-limits*: do not open, read, or grep {evaluator_scripts}, `run_eval.py`, or anything about how kernels are timed or graded. Reading the harness *voids the trial*—your edit is reverted and scored as no change—and cannot help you, because such tricks don't transfer to the real evaluator.
- You do **not** run the evaluator. SLA benchmarks your kernel after you stop.

Task.

{kernel_description}

Per benchmark: one-paragraph description of the kernel or operation being optimized and what it computes.

`custom_kernel(data)` where `data = ({input_tensors})`. Returns {output_description}.

Arg	Shape	Dtype
{input_name}	{shape}	{dtype}
return {output_name}	{shape}	{dtype}

Fixed across every benchmarked workload: {fixed_dimensions}. Only {varying_dimensions} vary.

Reference.

{reference_code}

You may use Triton, inline CUDA (`torch.utils.cpp_extension.load_inline`), `torch.compile`, or pure PyTorch.

Benchmarked shapes.

Your kernel is scored on the *mean per-shape SOL score* across all N shapes (each shape’s closeness to its own hardware limit, equally weighted)—so it must be correct and fast across the whole {varying_dimensions} range, not tuned to one shape. Every shape counts the same.

#	{shape_params}
1	{shape_1}
$\vdots$	$\vdots$
N	{shape_N}

Correctness tolerance: `rtol = {rtol}`, `atol = {atol}`, plus {match_ratio_requirement} if any. A kernel that fails correctness scores nothing, so do not trade correctness for speed.

Local reward rule.

SLA keeps your change if it beats *your lane’s own regime best*, not the global best. You are never penalized for sitting behind the global frontier—only for failing to improve against your own prior best in this regime.

- `keep/local` → your `submission.py` stays as-is and your lane best updates.
- `discard/error` → your `submission.py` is reverted to your lane’s best kernel.

Your turn message names your regime, your lane best, and the global best. The same assignment is reused for several trials in a mini-epoch: each trial makes exactly one coherent edit, building on your lane’s current best.

Protocol.

1. Read `submission.py` in your workspace.
2. Implement the advisor’s PROPOSAL as *one* targeted change, staying inside the assigned REGIME.
3. Write the *complete new file* back to `submission.py`: all imports, all helpers, and the `custom_kernel` entry point.
4. Output your implementation report and *stop*. Do not call any tool afterwards.

Required implementation report.

End your response with exactly this block:

IMPLEMENTATION

Implemented: *what you actually changed* (≤ 80 chars, used in the results log).

Technical detail: *the key mechanism*.

Rationale: *why this move within the assigned regime*.

Deviation: *none, or why the literal proposal wasn’t possible*.