

RESAMPLE THE ANSWER: WHERE TO SPEND TEST-TIME COMPUTE IN RECURSIVE REASONING

Maxime Illouz

Concordia University

Mila – Québec AI Institute

Montréal, Canada

maxime.illouz@mila.quebec

ABSTRACT

Recursive reasoning models such as the Tiny Recursive Model (TRM) iteratively refine two latent states: an answer state y , decoded into the output, and a reasoning state z , which is never decoded. Many of their failures have been attributed to bad basins, regions of latent space that trap the recursion on wrong answers. Recent test-time approaches perturb y , z or both to recover these failures, but the impact of this choice on performance, test-time compute efficiency and scaling properties remains unclear. Through controlled experiments on TRM, we find that a failed trajectory carries its failure in its answer state. At equal compute, in depth and in width, resampling y recovers more failures than any perturbation of z we tested, and the performance gap widens as the test-time compute budget grows. Our approach, **Gated Answer Resampling (GAR)**, pairs this resampling of the answer state with the model’s own halting head and restarts only the puzzles that the head rejects. With at most 64 restarts per puzzle and no training or hyperparameter search, GAR takes TRM from 85.9% to 99.4% on Sudoku-Extreme and from 68.8% to 85.6% on Pencil Puzzle Bench validation. On the same checkpoints, GAR also outperforms Probabilistic TRM (PTRM), which perturbs z at each step, even when PTRM uses 42 to 197 times as much compute.

1 INTRODUCTION

Recursive reasoning models such as the Hierarchical Reasoning Model (HRM; Wang et al., 2025) and the Tiny Recursive Model (TRM; Jolicoeur-Martineau, 2025) solve hard structured puzzles by refining a latent state over many iterations instead of writing out intermediate steps as tokens. TRM does so with one two-layer network of a few million parameters and two states: an *answer state* y , decoded into the output grid, and a *reasoning state* z , which is never decoded. In each latent recursion, z is recomputed six times from the input, the answer state and itself, after which y is updated once from y and z . This makes y , the state the decoder reads, the slow state and the only one the input never reaches directly. Since the recursion is deterministic, a rerun fails the same puzzles in exactly the same way. Sghaier et al. (2026) attribute many of these failures to *bad basins*, regions of latent space that decode to wrong grids and that the recursion does not escape, and Ren & Liu (2026) report a similar failure mode in HRM, spurious fixed points of its latent dynamics that correspond to wrong answers.

Recent test-time approaches make the recursion stochastic. Probabilistic TRM (PTRM) adds Gaussian noise to z before every supervision step of K independent rollouts so that they follow different trajectories and some reach a good basin (Sghaier et al., 2026). Efstathiou & Balwani (2026) perturb the initial answer as a proof of concept, and Corbett et al. (2026) run a particle filter whose proposal perturbs both states. All three rely on the model’s halting head to select or reweight trajectories. GRAM (Generative Recursive Reasoning Models; Baek et al., 2026) and Equilibrium Reasoners (EqR; Huang et al., 2026), by contrast, train new models with noise, on the slow state for GRAM and on both states for EqR. Three questions remain open. First, these approaches perturb y , z or both, but it remains unclear which state carries the failure, and what impact this choice has on performance, test-time efficiency and scaling properties. In particular, it is unknown whether test-time compute is better spent diversifying trajectories through z , as PTRM does, or resampling




Figure 1: **Gated Answer Resampling (GAR)**. The recursion runs in blocks of 16 supervision steps over a fast reasoning state z (blue) and a slow answer state y (orange). The first block is the standard pass. After each block, the grid $\hat{y}$ is committed if the halting logit $\hat{q}$, read from y , is non-negative. Otherwise a new block (a *retry*) runs, at most R times. A retry restarts from the initial states, except on the fillable cells of y , which receive fresh isotropic Gaussian vectors rescaled to the norm of y_{init} . If no grid is committed, the *fallback* returns the grid of the block with the highest $\hat{q}$.

y . Evidence from training is mixed: noise on the fast state did not help GRAM (its footnote 3), randomising either initial state alone gave TRM similar gains in EqR’s ablation (single runs), and Dillon (2026) finds that training works best with four different reasoning states per puzzle and one shared answer state. Second, it is also unclear whether extra test-time compute should continue a failed trajectory (depth) or restart it from the initial state (width). PTRM, for instance, scales depth without noise and width with noise, and its longer noisy rollouts start from the initial state rather than from a failed trajectory. Third, all five draw fresh trajectories for every puzzle, even those the model already solves, and PTRM’s headline configurations cost 400 and 300 standard passes.

We study these questions within a shared *harness*: after the standard pass, each puzzle that the halting head rejects receives up to R *retries*, extra runs of 16 supervision steps, until the head accepts a grid. Only the retry varies: it perturbs y , z or both, and it continues the failed trajectory or restarts from the initial state. Our study leads to **Gated Answer Resampling (GAR)**, a test-time compute approach whose retries restart from the initial state, with the fillable cells of y (those not fixed by the input) resampled as isotropic Gaussian vectors rescaled to the norm of the initial answer state (Figure 1 and Algorithm 1). We make three contributions.

1. **The answer state carries the failure.** After 16 retries, continuing the failed trajectory without perturbation recovers 74% of the standard-pass failures on Sudoku-Extreme and 16% on Pencil Puzzle Bench (PPBench) validation. Resampling y raises this to 89% and 34%, whereas resampling z barely helps (74% and 19%). A diagnostic suggests why, qualifying TRM’s view that z acts like a chain of thought: one step into a continued retry, resampling y has moved z further than resampling z itself, as if z were largely recomputed from the input and y . Once y is resampled, restarting from the initial state performs as well (88% and 40%), so retries can restart and run in parallel (Figure 2, Section 4).
2. **Test-time compute is better spent resampling y than perturbing z .** At the same number of retries, whether they continue (depth) or restart (width), resampling y once per retry recovers more failures than any perturbation of z we tested, even PTRM’s noise before every step, and the gap widens as the compute budget increases (Figures 2 and 4). After 64 restarts, it recovers 96% of the standard-pass failures on Sudoku-Extreme and 54% on PPBench validation, compared with 85% and 27% when z is resampled instead, and 85% and 33% with PTRM’s noise on the same checkpoints. With only 16 restarts, it already recovers 88% and 40%, more than either perturbation of z does with 64 (Table 1).
3. **The resulting approach, GAR, is tuning-free and compute-efficient.** On Sudoku-Extreme and PPBench validation, it restarts only the puzzles the halting head rejects: 99.3% and 87.5% of the failures and none of the successes, so it loses no solved puzzle (Table 3). With up to 64 restarts and no noise scale to tune, it raises TRM from 85.9% to 99.4% and from 68.8% to 85.6%, at only $2.03\times$ and $7.08\times$ the cost of a standard pass. On the

same checkpoints, it outperforms PTRM even when PTRM uses 197 and 42 times as much compute (Section 5).

2 BACKGROUND

Tiny Recursive Models. TRM (Jolicoeur-Martineau, 2025) keeps two latent states of shape $[P + L, d]$, with L grid cells preceded by a prefix of P positions ($P = 16$ in the released implementation) and hidden width $d = 512$. The answer state $\mathbf{y}$ is decoded into the grid $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ by a linear head on its cell positions, and the reasoning state $\mathbf{z}$ is never decoded. A *supervision step* applies one two-layer network f_θ in $T = 3$ latent recursions, each made of $n = 6$ updates of $\mathbf{z}$ and then one update of $\mathbf{y}$,

$$\mathbf{z} \leftarrow f_\theta(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}) \quad (n \text{ times}), \quad \mathbf{y} \leftarrow f_\theta(\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{z}), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}$ is the input embedding. Under *deep supervision*, the detached $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ initialise the next step, for at most $N_{\text{sup}} = 16$ steps, with a cross-entropy loss on the output logits at every step. A second linear head, the *halting head*, reads the first prefix position of $\mathbf{y}$ and outputs the halting logit $\hat{q}$, trained at every step by binary cross-entropy against the exact-match indicator. This simplified form of HRM’s adaptive computation time (ACT; Wang et al., 2025; Graves, 2016) halts a training sample once $\hat{q} > 0$, and is switched off at evaluation, where all N_{sup} steps run (Sghaier et al., 2026). In the released implementation, each layer of f_θ ends in an RMS normalisation without learnable gain, so every position of $\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ that f_θ outputs has norm $\sqrt{d}$. The initial states are fixed, untrained random vectors broadcast to every position, and they are not normalised. We write $\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for these vectors and for their broadcast to all $P + L$ positions, and take norms of states per position. One run of $T_{\text{blk}} = N_{\text{sup}} = 16$ steps from a given state is a *block*. The standard evaluation, which we call the *standard pass*, is one block from $(\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$, and all costs below are in blocks per puzzle.

Depth and width. Sghaier et al. (2026) distinguish two axes of test-time compute. *Depth* continues one trajectory beyond the N_{sup} steps the model was trained on, and *width* draws several trajectories per puzzle from the initial state. Depth can be scaled without perturbation. Doing so recovers most failures on Sudoku-Extreme but few on PPBench (Section 4), where PTRM also reports only a small gain. Width cannot be scaled at all without perturbation, since a deterministic model replays its trajectory bit for bit. To scale width, PTRM runs K rollouts per puzzle from $(\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$, adds $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$ to $\mathbf{z}$ before every supervision step and, after D steps, returns the grid of the rollout with the largest $\hat{q}$ (*best- $Q@K$* , *pass@ K* is the oracle), for $KD/16$ blocks per puzzle. With $D > 16$, it also scales depth. Its headline configurations on Sudoku-Extreme ($K = 100$, $D = 64$) and PPBench ($K = 100$, $D = 48$) cost 400 and 300 blocks.

3 A CONTROLLED SPACE OF RETRIES

Shared harness. Under the harness, every method runs the standard pass from $(\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$ and reads the halting logit at its last supervision step. If $\hat{q} \geq 0$, the grid is committed and nothing else runs. Otherwise, the *gate* re-opens the puzzle, and retries run one block at a time, for at most R blocks. The first retry with $\hat{q} \geq 0$ ends the search (the *stopping rule*), and its grid is committed. If none reaches $\hat{q} \geq 0$, the harness returns the grid with the highest $\hat{q}$ among the standard pass and the retries. This *fallback* keeps the standard-pass grid unless a retry is rated above it. We fixed two budgets in advance, the default $R = N_{\text{sup}} = 16$ and $R = 64$. Since the random draws of a retry do not depend on R , the first r retries of any run form a run with $R = r$, which is what *after r retries* means. A solved puzzle can be lost only if the gate re-opens it (a false positive). On Sudoku-Extreme, the gate re-opens 99.3% of the puzzles the standard pass fails and none of those it solves. On PPBench, it re-opens 87.5% of the failures and none of the successes on validation, and 93.8% and 3.0% on the golden split (Table 3).

Retries. A retry either *continues* the failed trajectory from where the previous block left it, which scales depth, or *restarts* from $(\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$, which scales width. It either applies no perturbation, *resamples* one state or, as in PTRM, adds noise to $\mathbf{z}$ before every supervision step. We also run retries that perturb both states, but only when continuing (Section 4.3). To resample a state, we replace the vector of each of its fillable cells, once at the block boundary, with a fresh direction, drawn from an isotropic Gaussian and rescaled to the norm of that state’s initial value, $\|\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}\|$ or

Algorithm 1 Gated Answer Resampling (GAR). BLOCK runs T_{blk} supervision steps and returns the new state, the grid and the last halting logit, without reading any label.

Require: puzzle $\mathbf{x}$, a trained TRM, $T_{\text{blk}} = N_{\text{sup}} = 16$, budget $R (= N_{\text{sup}} \text{ by default})$, halting threshold 0

```

1:  $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{q}) \leftarrow \text{BLOCK}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$   $\triangleright$  the standard 16-step pass
2:  $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^*, \hat{q}^*) \leftarrow (\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{q})$   $\triangleright$  fallback on the halting logit
3: for  $r = 1$  to  $R$  do
4:   if  $\hat{q} \geq 0$  then return  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^*$   $\triangleright$  the gate at  $r = 1$ , then the stopping rule
5:    $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) \leftarrow (\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$   $\triangleright$  restart: nothing crosses the boundary
6:    $\mathbf{y}_i \leftarrow \|\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}\| \varepsilon_i / \|\varepsilon_i\|$ ,  $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_d)$ , for every cell  $i \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$   $\triangleright$  prefix and given cells untouched
7:    $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{q}) \leftarrow \text{BLOCK}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z})$ 
8:   if  $\hat{q} > \hat{q}^*$  then  $(\hat{\mathbf{y}}^*, \hat{q}^*) \leftarrow (\hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{q})$ 
9: end for
10: return  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}^*$ 

```

$\|\mathbf{z}_{\text{init}}\|$. On Sudoku-Extreme, the fillable cells, $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$, are the blank cells. PPBench has no blank token, so Appendix A defines its fillable cells. The other cells, fixed by the input, are the given cells. Positions a retry does not resample are kept if it continues and set back to $(\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}, \mathbf{z}_{\text{init}})$ if it restarts. Restarts are thus independent draws, so they can also run in parallel. Keeping the first accepted grid in the order of the draws, or the fallback’s grid if none is accepted, then gives the same grids as the sequential run. Running them one at a time only lets the stopping rule save compute (Appendix C). GAR restarts and resamples $\mathbf{y}$, and the two central comparisons each change one thing in it: they resample $\mathbf{z}$ instead of $\mathbf{y}$, or continue instead of restarting (the *continuation variant* of GAR). In Algorithm 1, skipping line 5 gives the continuation variant, and skipping lines 5 and 6 gives the continuation without perturbation, which is the depth baseline. Skipping line 6 alone gives a restart without perturbation, which replays the standard pass bit for bit (a control). Resampling $\mathbf{z}$ instead of $\mathbf{y}$ in line 6 gives the restart that resamples $\mathbf{z}$. Skipping line 6 and adding noise to $\mathbf{z}$ before every step of the BLOCK in line 7 gives PTRM under the harness. To compare methods at matched numbers of retries, we run it with one rollout of $D = 16$ steps per retry. The restart that resamples $\mathbf{z}$ then lets us split the gap between GAR and PTRM, puzzle by puzzle, into two paired differences: which state is resampled, and whether $\mathbf{z}$ is resampled once or receives noise before every step (Section 4.2).

Setup. We train one checkpoint per benchmark (Appendix B): TRM-MLP, the attention-free variant of TRM (Jolicoeur-Martineau, 2025), on *Sudoku-Extreme* (Wang et al., 2025), and TRM-Att, the self-attention variant, on six puzzle types of *PPBench* (Waugh, 2026). On *Sudoku-Extreme*, we evaluate on 1,000 random test puzzles and the standard pass solves 85.90% (141 failures, 140 re-opened). On *PPBench*, following PTRM, we report five of the six types (sudoku, lightup, nurikabe, heyawake and tapa) and the standard pass solves 68.83% of our 308 validation puzzles of these five types (96 failures, 84 re-opened). Unless a split is named, *PPBench* results in Sections 4 and 5 are on validation, and results on the golden split (the same 49 puzzles as in PTRM) are in Appendix G.

Baseline. Since PTRM’s checkpoints were not publicly available, all methods, PTRM included, run on our checkpoints. These differ from PTRM’s in standard-pass accuracy, slightly on *Sudoku-Extreme* and by several points on *PPBench* (Appendix C), so comparisons across papers are only indicative. We therefore rerun PTRM’s protocol, best- $Q@K$ over rollouts drawn for every puzzle. We draw $K = 100$ rollouts per puzzle and use the first $K' \leq K$. We call this rerun *PTRM with its own protocol*. On *Sudoku-Extreme*, we keep PTRM’s $\sigma = 0.3$. On *PPBench*, we use $\sigma^* = 1.5$, inside the plateau of best- $Q@25$ in a sweep of σ on our validation split, where PTRM’s value, 0.2, scores 2.70 points lower (Table 6). The scale σ^* is thus selected on the labels of the split we report.

Statistical protocol. Stochastic methods run with three sampling seeds on a fixed checkpoint, and $\pm$ is the standard deviation over seeds. Differences between methods are paired by instance and averaged over seeds, with 95% bootstrap intervals over instances ($B = 10,000$). GAR also draws the same random directions as its continuation variant and the restart that resamples $\mathbf{z}$ (Appendix A). We call a difference significant when its 95% interval excludes zero, without correction for multiplicity.




Figure 2: **Resampling y recovers the most failures, whether retries continue or restart.** Fraction of the standard-pass failures that end up correct after 16 retries, out of 141 on Sudoku-Extreme and 96 on PPBench validation. In each panel, retries continue the failed trajectory on the left (depth) and restart from the initial state on the right (width). Each side has four bars, one per kind of retry: no perturbation, PTRM’s noise on z , resampling z , and resampling y , which on the right is GAR. A restart without perturbation replays the standard pass and recovers nothing. Bars show the mean over three seeds $\pm$ one standard deviation (values in Table 9).

4 WHERE TO EXPLORE AT TEST TIME

Depth alone as a baseline. Under the harness, after 16 retries, continuing the recursion beyond the training horizon without perturbation already recovers 73.8% of the standard-pass failures on Sudoku-Extreme, but only 15.6% on PPBench validation (Figure 2). On Sudoku-Extreme, most failures thus come from trajectories that the horizon cuts short. Trajectories that remain trapped in a spurious attractor (Efsthathiou & Balwani, 2026) or cannot escape a bad basin (Sghaier et al., 2026) can only be among the failures that depth alone leaves, so they account for at most 26.2% of the failures on Sudoku-Extreme and 84.4% on PPBench. We next ask what keeps the remaining failures in place.

4.1 WHICH STATE TO PERTURB WHEN CONTINUING




Figure 3: **When continuing a failed trajectory, resampling y lets it escape, but resampling z does not.** The states y and z of one sudoku from the PPBench validation split after each supervision step, coloured by block. Each state is projected onto two principal axes common to the three runs. With depth alone, y stays near the region visited by the standard pass. Resampled at each block boundary, y returns there until block 14, where it escapes, z follows, and the block ends on the correct grid. Resampled instead, z is back near its region one step later, and y stays near its own, as with depth alone.

A continued retry starts from both states of the failed trajectory, so perturbing one of them tests which state carries the failure. Resampling y removes $56.8 \pm 7.2\%$ of the failures that depth alone leaves on Sudoku-Extreme and $22.2 \pm 3.3\%$ on PPBench (left side of each panel of Figure 2),




Figure 4: **Resampling y scales better with retries than perturbing z , at a lower cost.** For each benchmark, the figure shows the accuracy after r retries and the fraction of re-opened puzzles still active (no grid accepted) before the r -th retry, against r on a logarithmic scale (Table 11 gives accuracies and costs at seven of the ten plotted values of r). Whether z is resampled once (“ z instead of y ”) or perturbed before every step (PTRM), GAR’s lead grows with r , and its searches end sooner. On PPBench, each doubling of r adds about two points to GAR, versus about one when z is perturbed. On Sudoku-Extreme, “continue instead of restart” almost coincides with GAR. Curves show the mean over three seeds $\pm$ one standard deviation. TRM continues without perturbation under the harness (depth alone). PTRM scales width: each retry is one rollout of $D = 16$ steps.

whereas the same resampling of z removes $1.8 \pm 5.6\%$ and $4.1 \pm 1.4\%$. Figure 3 follows one failure that depth alone leaves and that resampling y recovers, but resampling z does not. The gain from resampling y is positive for every seed on both benchmarks, and it comes at a lower cost, since re-opened puzzles stop sooner (Appendix D). No intervention that we ran on z alone removes more than 1.8% of the failures that depth alone leaves on Sudoku-Extreme or 5.8% on PPBench, be it PTRM’s noise in continued retries (at five scales on PPBench), a reset to z_{init} or a resampling of every grid cell (Appendix D). The asymmetry grows with retries. After one retry, resampling z , resampling y and depth alone have solved 48.0, 49.7 and 38 of the 140 re-opened Sudoku-Extreme puzzles and after 16 retries, the counts are 104.7, 125.0 and 104 (Appendix F). Roughly half of the gain from resampling y comes from erasing the carried answer. A deterministic reset of y to y_{init} on the fillable cells removes 27.0% and 9.9% of these failures, and the fresh directions account for the rest.

4.2 WHICH STATE TO PERTURB WHEN RESTARTING

A restart discards both states of the failed trajectory, so it tests the choice of state when no failure is carried over. Resampling the answer state still leads (Figures 2 and 4): after 64 retries, GAR recovers 96% of the standard-pass failures on Sudoku-Extreme and 54% on PPBench, versus 85% and 27% for the same restart with z resampled instead of y (Table 1). The gap is significant at 16 and 64 retries on both benchmarks (Table 12), and it widens as the budget increases. Resampling z also costs more (Table 1) and leaves more re-opened puzzles still active before the 64th retry: 13.1% vs. 2.9% for GAR on Sudoku-Extreme, and 61.9% vs. 20.6% on PPBench (Figure 4). At 64 retries, GAR solves nearly every puzzle that this restart solves: summed over the three seeds, it solves 49 of the 52 puzzles that only one of the two solves on Sudoku-Extreme, and 84 of 90 on PPBench (Appendix E).

Resampling once or adding noise at every step. When a restart perturbs z , resampling it once and adding PTRM’s noise before every step both recover 85% of the Sudoku-Extreme failures after 64 retries. On PPBench, with a noise scale selected on the labels of the split we report, PTRM recovers 33% vs. 27% for a single resampling, a significant difference, but only about a fifth of the gap between resampling y and resampling z (Tables 1 and 12). Which state is perturbed thus matters far more than how z is perturbed. The two perturbations of z also differ in size and extent: the resampling rotates the fillable cells by 90° , whereas the noise deflects every position, prefix included, by 16.7° on Sudoku-Extreme and 56.3° on PPBench before each step (Appendices A and C). Their comparison therefore does not isolate how often z is perturbed.

Table 1: **With 16 retries, GAR already outperforms TRM and both perturbations of z at 64 retries.** Accuracies (% , $\pm$ standard deviation) and costs in blocks per puzzle (in parentheses) are means over three seeds. All methods, PTRM included, share our checkpoints, instances and harness, which begins with the standard pass of TRM, given in the header. Under the harness, TRM continues without perturbation (depth alone). Each indented row changes one thing in GAR. PTRM runs one rollout of $D = 16$ steps per retry and differs from “ z instead of y ” only in how z is perturbed.

	<i>Sudoku-Extreme</i>				<i>PPBench validation</i>			
	TRM, standard pass: 85.90				TRM, standard pass: 68.83			
	16 retries		64 retries		16 retries		64 retries	
TRM, under the harness	96.30	(1.97)	97.40	(3.33)	73.70	(4.79)	75.00	(15.20)
PTRM	96.93 $\pm$ 0.15	(1.82)	97.87 $\pm$ 0.06	(2.90)	76.52 $\pm$ 0.68	(4.25)	79.00 $\pm$ 0.19	(11.86)
GAR	98.27 $\pm$ 0.21	(1.68)	99.43 $\pm$ 0.15	(2.03)	81.28 $\pm$ 0.68	(3.48)	85.61 $\pm$ 0.37	(7.08)
z instead of y	96.97 $\pm$ 0.35	(1.80)	97.90 $\pm$ 0.00	(2.84)	75.43 $\pm$ 0.50	(4.42)	77.16 $\pm$ 0.19	(12.92)
continue instead of restart	98.40 $\pm$ 0.26	(1.69)	99.73 $\pm$ 0.06	(1.98)	79.55 $\pm$ 0.86	(3.73)	83.01 $\pm$ 0.50	(9.06)

4.3 CONTINUING OR RESTARTING

With y resampled, continuing differs from restarting only in what it carries over from the failed block: all of z , and the prefix and given cells of y . Table 10 cross-tabulates what a continued retry does to z and to y , and suggests how little z carries across a block boundary. Once y is resampled, also perturbing z (by a resampling, a reset to z_{init} or PTRM’s noise) recovers 87% to 90% of the standard-pass failures on Sudoku-Extreme after 16 retries and 31% to 33% on PPBench, compared with 89% and 34% for resampling y alone. On PPBench, even returning z to z_{init} on every position (32%) stays below GAR (40%), which also resets the prefix and given cells of y . With the same random directions, however, continuing instead of restarting makes no significant difference at 16 retries on either benchmark (Table 12). At 64 retries, continuing takes recovery from 96% to 98% on Sudoku-Extreme, a barely significant gain, and from 54% to 45% on PPBench, a significant loss, nearly all on its sudoku type (Appendix G). Retries can thus restart and, being independent, run in parallel. Run one at a time, restarts are also cheaper on PPBench (Table 1).

4.4 WHY THE ANSWER STATE?

In the recursion, z is the fast state and y the slow one. Within one supervision step, z is updated eighteen times, and each of these updates reads x and y . The answer state is updated only three times (Equation 1). A resampled y is therefore read by all seven updates of the next latent recursion, while a resampled z is read once and then recomputed through the map $z \mapsto f_{\theta}(x + y + z)$. Corbett et al. (2026, Proposition 5.1) assume that this map contracts locally around the deterministic path, and on both of their models, at moderate noise, the deviations they measure stay within the bound this assumption implies. We hypothesise the same contraction on our checkpoints. Perturbing z does not change the map, so z can return towards the unperturbed path. Perturbing y changes the map itself, and moves z away from that path. On Sudoku-Extreme, we compare each perturbed continuation with an unperturbed copy run in lockstep. One supervision step after all grid cells of z are resampled, z is already back to a cosine of 0.829 with that copy. At that point, resampling the fillable cells of y moves z further than resampling the same cells of z itself (0.565 vs. 0.837, Appendix F). The diagnostic thus suggests that, to a first approximation, whatever z carries across a block boundary at inference is recomputed from x and y . This would qualify the view that z records how the model reached its answer (Jolicoeur-Martineau, 2025). Inside a failed trajectory, the carried y would then impose the failure on z again at every update. From the initial state, where y_{init} carries no answer, a resampled z can still redirect the trajectory even though it is read only once. It recovers fewer failures than a resampled y (Figure 2), which is read seven times. In the diagnostic, z is not recomputed exactly. Once z is resampled, its cosine settles near 0.74, and by the end of the block the grid has changed about as much as when y is resampled.

5 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

Design and tuning. GAR (Algorithm 1) runs the harness with retries that restart and resample y , as Section 4 suggests. It reads no label at inference, and we tune none of its hyperparameters: the block length and the default R come from the training horizon, the threshold from the halting rule, the norm from y_{init} , and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ from the input tokens. The only free parameter is the retry budget R , which trades compute for accuracy, monotonically on average (Figure 4). Labels of the reported splits did, however, inform two design decisions: the choice of retry, made on Sudoku-Extreme and PPBench validation, and, on PPBench, the given cells of each puzzle type, which we specified by hand and checked against the labels of its validation and golden splits (Appendix A).

Table 2: **With $R = 64$, GAR outperforms every PTRM configuration we ran and loses no solved puzzle.** We rerun PTRM on our checkpoints, with $\sigma = 0.3$ on Sudoku-Extreme and $\sigma^* = 1.5$ on PPBench. The first column gives the perturbed state, and *rejected* means the puzzles the halting head rejects. Cost is in blocks per puzzle. *Lost* counts the puzzles that the standard pass solves and a method fails, out of 859 and 212. Stochastic rows are averaged over three seeds, and the standard deviation of their accuracy is at most 0.46 points on Sudoku-Extreme and 0.75 on PPBench. The uniform unroll runs the recursion for D steps on every puzzle. The dagger marks PTRM’s headline budget of 100 rollouts of 64 and 48 steps. It costs 197 and 42 times as much as GAR at $R = 64$, and 4.3 and 6.0 times as much under the harness. Tables 7 and 8 list ten configurations per benchmark.

state	method	runs on	Sudoku-Extreme			PPBench validation		
			cost	accuracy	lost	cost	accuracy	lost
<i>Deterministic TRM</i>								
—	TRM, standard pass	all	1	85.90	—	1	68.83	—
—	TRM, uniform unroll ($D=64/48$)	all	4	92.80	0.0	3	68.18	10.0
<i>PTRM with its own protocol: K' rollouts (width) of D steps (depth)</i>								
z	PTRM ($K'=1, D=16$)	all	1	87.70	29.0	1	68.29	12.0
z	PTRM ($K'=1, D=64/48$)	all	4	93.60	5.0	3	68.72	15.7
z	PTRM ($K'=25, D=16$)	all	25	97.40	1.0	25	77.81	1.0
z	PTRM ($K'=100, D=16$)	all	100	98.07	0.3	100	80.63	1.3
z	PTRM ($K'=100, D=64/48$) [†]	all	400	98.57	0.0	300	79.98	10.3
<i>PTRM under the harness: at most K' retries of D steps</i>								
z	PTRM ($K'=100, D=64/48$) [†]	rejected	8.65	98.47	0.0	42.25	82.14	0.0
<i>GAR (ours): at most R retries of 16 steps</i>								
y	GAR ($R=16$)	rejected	1.68	98.27	0.0	3.48	81.28	0.0
y	GAR ($R=64$)	rejected	2.03	99.43	0.0	7.08	85.61	0.0

With PTRM’s own protocol. Averaged over three seeds, GAR with $R = 16$ is above every PTRM configuration costing up to 100 blocks on Sudoku-Extreme, and every configuration on PPBench. With $R = 64$, it even exceeds the $\text{pass}@K'$ oracle of every configuration on both benchmarks (Tables 7 and 8). This protocol can also lose solved puzzles. For every puzzle, including those the standard pass solves, it returns the grid of the noisy rollout with the largest $\hat{q}$ ($\text{best-}Q@K'$). With a single noisy rollout of 16 steps, it loses 3.4% of the solved Sudoku-Extreme puzzles, but with 100 rollouts almost none. On PPBench, its 300-block configuration still loses 4.9% of the solved puzzles, about as many as the uniform unroll of 48 steps (Table 2). On Sudoku-Extreme, where the head ranks rollouts almost perfectly, such losses come from the protocol rather than from the head (Appendix C). GAR loses no solved puzzle on Sudoku-Extreme or PPBench validation, and one on the golden split, re-opened by the gate’s only false positive (Tables 3 and 15).

Under the harness. The harness applies to PTRM as well, with its K' rollouts run one at a time, each as one retry of D steps. For PTRM’s headline budgets, it divides the cost by 46 and 7.1, loses no solved puzzle and changes accuracy by -0.10 and $+2.16$ points (Table 2). Of the configurations we ran, only these two exceed GAR at $R = 16$, at 5.1 and 12 times its cost, and none reaches GAR at $R = 64$ (Appendix C). At matched numbers of 16-step retries, PTRM stays below GAR on average at every budget and is never cheaper (Figure 4, Table 11).

6 RELATED WORK

Recursive computation and halting. Iterating a weight-tied module to trade compute for accuracy appears in Universal Transformers (Dehghani et al., 2019), deep-thinking networks (Schwarzschild et al., 2021; Bansal et al., 2022; Bear et al., 2024) and recurrent-depth language models (Geiping et al., 2025). HRM and TRM add deep supervision and a head that halts over supervision steps, a segment-level form of ACT (Graves, 2016). At inference, HRM raises its segment budget. GRAM (Baek et al., 2026, Appendix A.1) and Huang et al. (2026, Section 6.3) can keep the head on to stop each trajectory early, and Dillon (2026) returns the answer of the first ensemble member to halt. Our harness uses the head differently, to decide which puzzles are re-opened, since its logit stays negative on most failures (Sghaier et al., 2026, Section 3.2; Dillon, 2026, Section 5.10).

Bad basins in recursive reasoners. Failure modes of iterated updates predate recursive reasoners: convergence to initialisation-dependent attractors (Anil et al., 2022) and degradation beyond the trained number of iterations (Bansal et al., 2022), which Viakhirev et al. (2026) tie to the dynamical regime of the trained operator. For HRM, Ren & Liu (2026) identify spurious fixed points and scale the model’s guesses with data augmentation, input perturbations at inference and model bootstrapping. For TRM, Sghaier et al. (2026) call the phenomenon *bad basins*, and Efstathiou & Balwani (2026) read the recursion as a search over an attractor landscape and attribute failures to the answer initialisation rather than to insufficient depth. Perturbing both latent states, Corbett et al. (2026) recover failures with a particle filter and Huang et al. (2026) with random restarts after noisy training. Zhao & Tang (2026) select among these restarts with energies built from the task rules. On our checkpoints, depth alone recovers most Sudoku-Extreme failures (Section 4), as Krishna et al. (2026) find on two released checkpoints, and the initial answer is the stronger lever, not the only one (Section 4.2).

Where noise is injected. GRAM learns its stochasticity on the slow state, the counterpart of TRM’s y , so its training-time design and our test-time interventions on a model trained without noise pick the same state. Drozdova et al. (2026) train a denoiser whose inference re-noises non-clue variables at every step. Huang et al. (2026, Appendix A.3) vary which initial state is randomised in training (single runs: 84.06% with a fixed initialisation, 86.29% and 86.25% with only the answer or only the reasoning state randomised, respectively, and at best 87.30% with both, the reasoning state at a larger scale). Dillon (2026, Section 5.4) trains TRMs whose parallel states compete through a winner-take-all loss, and reports higher accuracy with parallel reasoning states than with parallel answer states (97.7% vs. at most 95.9%). Both results are about training, and neither says which state a test-time retry should perturb in a model trained with fixed initial states. PTRM contrasts its noise at every step with the single perturbation by Efstathiou & Balwani (2026). Since the first acts on z and the second on the initial answer, that contrast varies the state and the form of the perturbation together. The restart that resamples z isolates the state (Section 4.2).

7 CONCLUSION

Our evidence suggests that, in a failed trajectory, it is the slow, decoded answer state that carries the failure. Resampling it removes some of the failures that depth alone leaves, while resampling the reasoning state instead adds almost nothing. On our TRM checkpoints, test-time compute is best spent on the answer state, increasingly so as the budget grows, and only where the model’s own halting head rejects its answer. At matched retries, resampling the answer state beats PTRM’s noise on the reasoning state, at a lower cost. Since restarting does about as well as continuing, width can be scaled with independent retries. GAR applies these findings without training or hyperparameter search. It can lose a solved puzzle only if the gate re-opens it, and with $R = 64$ it outperforms every PTRM configuration we ran, at 2.03 and 7.08 standard passes, versus up to 400 and 300 for PTRM.

Limitations. PTRM’s PPBench checkpoint was not public when we ran our experiments, and its paper gives neither the tokenisation nor the number of epochs, so ours is trained on a reconstruction of its data pipeline (Appendix B.2). GAR inherits the halting head, which misses 12.5% of the PPBench validation failures and can end the search on a wrong grid. We have not tested GAR on Maze-Hard, where the head is poorly aligned (Sghaier et al., 2026; Corbett et al., 2026), on ARC-

AGI (Chollet, 2019), or beyond TRM. On PPBench, $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ relies on a hand-written per-type table (Appendix A), and the gains are smaller on nurikabe and heyawake (Appendix G).

REPRODUCIBILITY STATEMENT

Section 3 specifies the protocol, and Appendix A lists the checks recorded in every run: bit-identical standard passes across paired runs and a self-test of the restart. Appendix C explains how we rerun PTRM on our checkpoints, including how its noise scale is chosen. The Sudoku-Extreme checkpoint is trained with the released recipe of Jolicoeur-Martineau (2025), with AdamW in place of its AdamATan2 optimiser, and our PPBench build is a reconstruction from Appendix A.3 of Sghaier et al. (2026). Appendix B gives the data and the training configuration of both checkpoints. We will release the code and these checkpoints.

AI USE STATEMENT

We used generative AI tools as coding assistants for some of our experiments and to edit parts of the paper for readability. We have reviewed all AI-assisted work, and the code runs the checks listed in Appendix A. We take full responsibility for the final content of this work.

REFERENCES

- Cem Anil, Ashwini Pople, Kaiqu Liang, Johannes Treutlein, Yuhuai Wu, Shaojie Bai, J. Zico Kolter, and Roger B. Grosse. Path independent equilibrium models can better exploit test-time computation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 7796–7809, 2022.
- Junyeob Baek, Mingyu Jo, Minsu Kim, Mengye Ren, Yoshua Bengio, and Sungjin Ahn. Generative recursive reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.19376v2*, 2026.
- Arpit Bansal, Avi Schwarzschild, Eitan Borgnia, Zeyad Emam, Furong Huang, Micah Goldblum, and Tom Goldstein. End-to-end algorithm synthesis with recurrent networks: Extrapolation without overthinking. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 20232–20242, 2022.
- Jay Bear, Adam Prügel-Bennett, and Jonathon Hare. Rethinking deep thinking: Stable learning of algorithms using Lipschitz constraints. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 37, pp. 97027–97052, 2024.
- François Chollet. On the measure of intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.01547*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.01547>.
- Andrew Corbett, Archit Sood, Anna Tzatzopoulou, Sai-Aakash Ramesh, and Tim Dodwell. Boosting inference with guided reasoning: Stochastic exploration for recursive models. In *ICML 2026 Workshop on Structured Probabilistic Inference & Generative Modeling (SPIGM)*, 2026. arXiv:2605.25230.
- Mostafa Dehghani, Stephan Gouws, Oriol Vinyals, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Łukasz Kaiser. Universal Transformers. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019.
- Joshua V. Dillon. Speed is confidence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.19085*, 2026.
- Mariia Drozdova, Aidan Sirbu, Pietro Miotti, Robert Obryk, Mayalen Etcheverry, Eyvind Niklasson, and Blake Richards. Diffusion as a training curriculum for timestep-free iterative reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.01449*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.01449>.
- Andreas Efstathiou and Aishwarya Balwani. Recursive reasoning as attractor landscape search: Mechanistic dynamics of the Tiny Recursive Model. In *ICLR 2026 Workshop on Latent & Implicit Thinking – Going Beyond CoT Reasoning*, 2026. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=kKps9WlK7n>.

- Katie E. Everett, Lechao Xiao, Mitchell Wortsman, Alexander A. Alemi, Roman Novak, Peter J. Liu, Izzeddin Gur, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Jaehoon Lee, and Jeffrey Pennington. Scaling exponents across parameterizations and optimizers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 12666–12700, 2024. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v235/everett24a.html>.
- Jonas Geiping, Sean McLeish, Neel Jain, John Kirchenbauer, Siddharth Singh, Brian R. Bartoldson, Bhavya Kailkhura, Abhinav Bhatele, and Tom Goldstein. Scaling up test-time compute with latent reasoning: A recurrent depth approach. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 38, pp. 41340–41391, 2025.
- Alex Graves. Adaptive computation time for recurrent neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.08983*, 2016.
- Benhao Huang, Zhengyang Geng, and J. Zico Kolter. Equilibrium Reasoners: Learning attractors enables scalable reasoning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 306 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 46586–46616, 2026. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v306/huang26l.html>.
- Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau. Less is more: Recursive reasoning with tiny networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.04871*, 2025.
- Hare Krishna, Shubham Singh, Stephen Ebert, and Hao-Yu Sun. When recursive models finish computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2609.26487*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.26487>.
- Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2019. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bkg6RiCqY7>.
- Lucas Prieto, Melih Barsbey, Pedro A. M. Mediano, and Tolga Birdal. Grokking at the edge of numerical stability. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=TvfkSyHZRA>.
- Zirui Ren and Ziming Liu. Are your reasoning models reasoning or guessing? A mechanistic analysis of Hierarchical Reasoning Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.10679*, 2026.
- Avi Schwarzschild, Eitan Borgnia, Arjun Gupta, Furong Huang, Uzi Vishkin, Micah Goldblum, and Tom Goldstein. Can you learn an algorithm? Generalizing from easy to hard problems with recurrent networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pp. 6695–6706, 2021.
- Amin Sghaier, Ali Parviz, and Alexia Jolicoeur-Martineau. Probabilistic Tiny Recursive Model. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2026. arXiv:2605.19943v1.
- Ivan Viakhirev, Kirill Borodin, Amirah Almutairi, Serguei Barannikov, Maxim Abramov, and Grach Mkrtchian. Think shallow, solve deep: Controlling recurrent dynamics for reliable test-time depth. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.18222*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2608.18222>.
- Guan Wang, Jin Li, Yuhao Sun, Xing Chen, Changling Liu, Yue Wu, Meng Lu, Sen Song, and Yasin Abbasi Yadkori. Hierarchical Reasoning Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.21734*, 2025.
- Justin Waugh. Pencil Puzzle Bench: A benchmark for multi-step verifiable reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2603.02119*, 2026.
- Yifei Zhao and Ying Tang. Energy-guided Recursive Model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2607.10128*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.10128>.

OVERVIEW OF THE APPENDICES

Appendix A specifies the protocol and the checks recorded in every run, and Appendix B describes the data and training of the two checkpoints. In Appendix C, we rerun PTRM on these checkpoints, both with PTRM’s own protocol and under the harness. Appendices D to F contain the detailed results behind Section 4, namely every perturbation we ran, matched retries at seven budgets, and the lockstep diagnostic. Appendix G breaks the PPBench results down by type and reports the golden split.

A PROTOCOL AND CHECKS

Evaluation path. Every method follows the evaluation path of the training code, with batches of 768, exactly $T_{\text{blk}} = 16$ steps per block, and correctness counted by the evaluator of that code. All methods in a run use the same batches, standard pass and gate. Our implementation advances the whole batch and discards the outputs of committed rows. Rows do not interact, so up to floating-point rounding this is equivalent to advancing only the rows not yet committed, and cost is charged for those rows only.

Details of the retries. At each retry, GAR returns every position of $\mathbf{y}$ and $\mathbf{z}$ to $\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}$ and $\mathbf{z}_{\text{init}}$, prefix included, just as the model’s own reset does at a cold start, and then resamples the fillable cells of $\mathbf{y}$. No retry resamples the prefix of $\mathbf{y}$, whose first position is the only one the halting head reads. Continued retries leave the prefix and the given cells of $\mathbf{y}$ untouched, and the continuation variant does not touch any position of $\mathbf{z}$. GAR, its continuation variant and the restart that resamples $\mathbf{z}$ use *common random numbers*: their directions depend only on the sampling seed and the batch, so a puzzle receives the same directions at a given retry in all three (the third applies them to $\mathbf{z}$). The continuation that resamples $\mathbf{z}$ draws its directions from the same distribution, but independently of the other methods.

The mask on PPBench. Sudoku-Extreme has a blank token, but PPBench has no single token that marks a fillable cell, since each token encodes the whole visible state of a cell. We therefore declare, once per puzzle type, the *static* clue families, whose answer is fixed by the input. These are the given digits on sudoku, the walls on lightup and shakashaka, the numbered cells on nurikabe (which stay white) and the clue cells on tapa (which are never shaded). Heyawake has none, because its numbers belong to rooms and a cell that shows one can be shaded. The mask $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{x})$ is the set of cells whose token is neither the pad token nor in a static family, and at inference it reads only the input tokens.

Checks. The standard passes of paired runs match bit for bit, on grids and logits alike (for the PTRM rollouts on Sudoku-Extreme, checked on the first batch of 768 puzzles). Positions output by f_θ have norm $\sqrt{d} = 22.627$, and resampled directions are rescaled to $\|\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}\| = 21.244$ in $\mathbf{y}$ and $\|\mathbf{z}_{\text{init}}\| = 22.689$ in $\mathbf{z}$. Without perturbation, the restart leaves accuracy unchanged on every split, and continued blocks reproduce a single unrolled recursion on grids and logits (on Sudoku-Extreme, a $D = 64$ unroll is identical to four continued blocks of 16). A self-test on a real batch of each benchmark checks that, when nothing is resampled, the restart replays the standard pass bit for bit. Geometrically, PTRM’s noise at $\sigma = 0.2, 0.3$ and 1.5 deflects a position of norm $\sqrt{d}$ by 11.3° , 16.7° and 56.3° and scales its norm by $1.02, 1.04$ and 1.80 , whereas a resampling at matched norm rotates it by 90° .

The gate builds on an observation by Sghaier et al. (2026, Section 3.2), who find on PPBench that at convergence the halting logit is near $+6$ on correct trajectories and near -6 on incorrect ones.

Table 3: **The halting head at the last step of the standard pass, against ground truth.** Recall is the fraction of the standard-pass failures that the gate re-opens (140 of 141, 84 of 96 and 15 of 16), and the false-positive rate is the fraction of the standard-pass successes that it re-opens (0 of 859, 0 of 212 and 1 of 33).

benchmark	split	n	standard pass (%)	recall (%)	false-positive rate (%)
Sudoku-Extreme	1,000 test puzzles	1,000	85.90	99.3	0.0
PPBench (5 types)	validation	308	68.83	87.5	0.0
PPBench (5 types)	golden	49	67.35	93.8	3.0

B DATA AND CHECKPOINTS

Both checkpoints use the model, loss, data loader and training loop from the released code of Jolicoeur-Martineau (2025). We leave this code as it is, except for the reporting of the PPBench evaluation (Appendix B.2) and the optimiser of the network weights, where we use AdamW (Loshchilov & Hutter, 2019), as named in the TRM paper, instead of the AdamATan2 optimiser (Everett et al., 2024) of the released code. Table 5 gives the training configuration of the two checkpoints. As in the released loader, an epoch visits every training puzzle once, through one of its examples. Each checkpoint is trained on a single NVIDIA A100 80GB GPU.

B.1 SUDOKU-EXTREME

We build the data with the released script and command, from the Hugging Face dataset `sapientinc/sudoku-extreme`, which is the Sudoku-Extreme release of Wang et al. (2025). The training split holds 1,000 puzzles, drawn without a fixed seed, each expanded into 1,001 examples (the puzzle itself and 1,000 copies transformed by rule-preserving symmetries). The test split consists of the 422,786 puzzles of the test file, without augmentation, and the 1,000 puzzles of Section 3 are drawn from it uniformly without replacement, with seed 0. We run the released TRM-MLP command (Table 5), which trains for 50,000 epochs whereas the TRM paper reports 60,000, and keep the last checkpoint. It reaches 85.90% on our 1,000 puzzles and 86.50% on the full test split, compared with the 87.4% reported by Jolicoeur-Martineau (2025).

B.2 PPBENCH

Sghaier et al. (2026) describe their PPBench build in prose (their Appendix A.3) and through per-type counts (their Table 4), with a unified 294-token vocabulary over 100 positions (sudoku being padded to 10×10). They give neither the tokenisation nor the number of epochs. Our build is therefore a reconstruction, which may be one reason why our checkpoint differs from theirs. Table 4 compares our splits with theirs.

Source and splits. Our corpus is the full PPBench dataset (Waugh, 2026), 62,231 puzzles released as the Hugging Face dataset `bluecoconut/pencil-puzzle-bench`. We first remove the 90 golden puzzles of the six types (15 per type), matched to their corpus records. As in PTRM, 100 puzzles per type (50 for tapa) are then drawn for validation before any size filter, here with seed 0, and the rest are kept for training. All three splits then keep only 9×9 sudoku and 10×10 grids of the other types (Table 4).

Tokenisation. Each cell is a single token encoding its full visible state, namely the puzzle type, the clue (a given digit, a wall with or without a number, a nurikabe or heyawake number, a tapa clue, or none) and the answer mark (a digit, a shaded cell or a bulb, a shakashaka triangle and its orientation, or none). Inputs keep the annotation dots of the replayed moves while labels drop them, so a label is the solved board. A heyawake cell also carries two wall bits for the room borders. Sudoku is padded with a pad token, and the 19 padded label positions are ignored by the loss and by every metric. The vocabulary, read off the data, has 439 ids (438 cell states plus the pad token).

Augmentation. According to PTRM’s text, each training puzzle is expanded into 10 examples, the unaugmented pair and 9 sampled ones. Yet every per-type training count in its Table 4 is a multiple

of 11 (and four of the six are not multiples of 10). We therefore use 11 examples per training puzzle, the unaugmented pair and 10 sampled ones. With this factor, our training and validation puzzles add up exactly to PTRM’s for sudoku, lightup, shakashaka and tapa, while nurikabe and heyawake keep 70 and 257 more puzzles than PTRM’s counts imply. A sampled example takes as input the board after the first k moves of the solution (k uniform on $\{0, \dots, m - 1\}$ for m moves), and one of the 8 dihedral transforms, drawn uniformly, is applied to both input and label. Validation and golden puzzles are not augmented.

Training and checkpoint. PTRM does not say which of TRM’s per-benchmark settings it uses on PPBench. We train TRM-Att with the Sudoku-Extreme settings and a puzzle embedding indexed by puzzle type, for 21,000 epochs (Table 5). A puzzle counts as solved when every supervised cell is predicted exactly, and the aggregates weight each of the five reported types by its number of puzzles. As in PTRM, shakashaka is used in training but left out of the aggregates and our checkpoint solves 64 of its 66 validation puzzles and all 12 golden ones. We evaluate the model every 1,000 epochs on the twelve evaluation sets (six types, validation and golden) and keep the last checkpoint, which is also the best of the 21 evaluations on the validation aggregate.

Table 4: **Our PPBench splits against those of Sghaier et al. (2026).** Entries count puzzles per type after the size filter. PTRM’s Table 4 counts training examples, which we divide by 11. Each build draws its own validation set before the size filter, hence the different validation counts. The asterisk marks shakashaka, which is used in training but left out of the aggregates.

type	training		validation		golden
	ours	PTRM	ours	PTRM	both
sudoku	708	710	99	97	15
lightup	874	864	55	65	8
nurikabe	1,446	1,380	59	55	9
heyawake	4,086	3,828	69	70	7
tapa	333	333	26	26	10
shakashaka*	1,878	1,882	66	62	12
total	9,325	8,997	374	375	61
five reported types			308	313	49
training examples ($\times 11$)	102,575	98,967			

Table 5: **Training configuration of the two checkpoints.** Centred entries apply to both. The loss uses the stablemax of Prieto et al. (2025). The 97 positions of TRM-MLP are the $P = 16$ prefix positions and the 81 cells. Each checkpoint is the last of its training run.

	Sudoku-Extreme	PPBench
<i>model</i>		
variant	TRM-MLP (MLP across the 97 positions)	TRM-Att (self-attention, 8 heads)
positional encoding	none	RoPE
layers, width	2, 512; channel SwiGLU width 1,536	
T, n, N_{sup}	3, 6, 16	
prefix P	16	
puzzle identifiers	1 (shared)	7 (6 types, blank)
vocabulary, cells	11, 81	439, 100
network parameters	5.03M	7.27M
precision	bfloat16 forward	
<i>training</i>		
loss	stablemax cross-entropy + $0.5 \times$ halting BCE	
halting exploration	0.1	
optimiser, network	AdamW, $\beta = (0.9, 0.95)$, decay 1.0	
optimiser, puzzle embeddings	sign-SGD, decay 1.0	
learning rates	10^{-4} , 2,000 warm-up steps, then constant	
batch	768	
training set	1,000 puzzles $\times$ 1,001 examples	9,325 puzzles $\times$ 11 examples
epochs	50,000	21,000
EMA	0.999 on the network weights (evaluation and checkpoint)	

C PTRM ON OUR CHECKPOINTS

Implementation. Each rollout starts from the model’s own initial states, so that with $\sigma = 0$ and $D = 16$ it reproduces the standard pass bit for bit, on grids and on logits. Noise of scale σ is added to $\mathbf{z}$ before every supervision step, on all positions including the prefix, which is how we read Sghaier et al. (2026).

The noise scale. We choose the PPBench scale on the validation split alone, using best- $Q@25$ at the settings of PTRM’s noise ablation (its Appendix B, which does not cover PPBench, our Table 6). From $\sigma = 1.25$ upwards, the five scales span 1.84 points, or about six instances out of 308. The chosen $\sigma^* = 1.5$ trails the maximum of the grid, reached at its edge ($\sigma = 2.5$), by 0.65 points. This is less than the 0.76 points separating two independent draws of the same configuration (the sweep, and the first 25 of the 100 rollouts of the main rerun), so at this resolution $\sigma^* = 1.5$ cannot be told apart from the best scale of the grid. The scale is chosen at $K = 25$, whereas the matched-retry comparison spans $K' = 1$ to $K' = 64$, where a smaller scale might serve PTRM better: at σ^* , a single rollout is below the standard pass on average (Table 8). On the golden split, PTRM is run only at the frozen scale, and this split never enters the choice of σ .

Fidelity of the rerun. On Sudoku-Extreme, our standard pass differs slightly from PTRM’s (86.50% vs. 87.28% on the full test split), and at PTRM’s headline configuration the rerun gains 12.67 points over our standard pass on our 1,000 puzzles, compared with 11.47 computed from PTRM’s Table 3. On PPBench, our standard pass, which adds no noise, already differs from PTRM’s in accuracy (68.83% vs. 76.4% on validation, where each paper draws its own split, and 67.35% vs. 62.6% on golden), and PTRM gains less on our checkpoint than in its paper: at its headline budget, it gains 11.15 points over our standard pass on validation and 10.20 on golden (49 puzzles), versus 14.0 and 28.6 computed from PTRM’s Tables 5 and 1. Both gaps may come from the tokenisation (our vocabulary has 439 tokens vs. PTRM’s 294), from the length of training, or from other differences in data or training (Appendix B). The best noise scales on our PPBench checkpoint (Table 6) are also several times the 0.2 that PTRM uses there. The same implementation of the noise reproduces PTRM’s headline gain on Sudoku-Extreme at PTRM’s own scale, and PTRM’s selected scales themselves range from 0.2 to 1.0 across its four benchmarks, so this difference, too, more likely reflects the checkpoint than the implementation. Within PTRM’s window, the scale matters

Table 6: **The noise scale of PTRM on our PPBench checkpoint.** Pass@25 and best- $Q@25$ (%) on the 308 validation puzzles, with $K = 25$ rollouts of $D = 16$ steps, averaged over three seeds. The grid extends PTRM’s window $[0, 1]$, beyond which this checkpoint still improves. Bold entries mark the plateau of best- $Q@25$ inside which we fix $\sigma^* = 1.5$.

σ	pass@25	best- $Q@25$
0.0 (<i>deterministic</i>)	68.83	68.83
0.1	76.19	76.19
0.2 (<i>PTRM’s value</i>)	75.97	75.87
0.3	76.19	76.08
0.5	76.30	76.19
0.8	77.16	76.84
1.0	77.16	76.62
1.25	78.25	77.92
1.5 (<i>used throughout</i>)	79.00	78.57
1.75	78.25	77.38
2.0	79.87	79.11
2.5	79.98	79.22

little on this checkpoint: best- $Q@25$ varies by less than one point between $\sigma = 0.1$ and $\sigma = 1.0$. Our comparison does not depend on the accuracies PTRM reports, since GAR and our rerun use the same checkpoints, instances and evaluation path.

The harness applied to PTRM. Nothing in the gate, the fallback or the stopping rule is specific to GAR, and withholding them from PTRM would compare systems rather than mechanisms. Tables 7 and 8 therefore evaluate ten PTRM configurations under each rule, on the same rollouts. For PTRM, the fallback adds the standard-pass grid to the candidates and breaks ties in its favour, and the stopping rule goes through the rollouts of a re-opened puzzle in the order they were drawn, stopping at the first one with $\hat{q} \geq 0$. PTRM’s own protocol (best- $Q@K'$) costs $K'D/16$ blocks per puzzle, and $1 + K'D/16$ with the fallback, which also runs the standard pass. Under the gate, the K' rollouts of a re-opened puzzle run in parallel, for $1 + gK'D/16$ blocks, with g the fraction of puzzles the gate re-opens (0.140 on Sudoku-Extreme and 0.273 on PPBench validation). With the stopping rule, they run one at a time, and we measure the sequential cost puzzle by puzzle. On Sudoku-Extreme, the parallel and the sequential variants give the same answers, and on PPBench validation they differ by at most one instance.

Sudoku-Extreme. The fallback removes all 29 losses of $K' = 1$, $D = 16$, and with it at most 0.3 losses remain in any configuration of Table 7. The head is thus a near-perfect ranker here, and the 29 losses come from the protocol, which reconsiders a puzzle whose answer was already right. Under the gate and the stopping rule, every configuration stays within 0.10 points of its value with the fallback. The stopping rule does make PTRM’s rollouts sequential. But without it, with the K' rollouts run in parallel on the re-opened puzzles only, the configuration $K' = 10$, $D = 16$ costs more than GAR at $R = 16$ and is less accurate (Tables 2 and 7). The retries of GAR are independent draws and can run in parallel as well: keeping the first accepted retry (or the fallback’s grid if none is) returns the grids of the sequential run, at $1 + gR$ blocks. At $R = 10$, GAR then costs the same 2.40 blocks as that configuration and reaches 97.33%, versus 96.37% (Table 11). The comparison thus does not rest on making PTRM’s rollouts sequential.

PPBench. At $R = 16$, GAR exceeds the pass@ K' oracle of every configuration costing up to 75 blocks. Here too, the fallback removes most losses. The gate and the stopping rule keep every configuration within three instances of its value with the fallback, and they save most of the compute of the large ones. Without the stopping rule, the configuration $K' = 10$, $D = 16$ is again both costlier and less accurate than GAR at $R = 16$. Run in parallel, at the same 3.73 blocks, GAR with $R = 10$ reaches 79.76% (Table 11), compared with 76.08%.

Table 7: **PTRM on Sudoku-Extreme, with its own protocol and under the harness.** Each configuration uses the first K' of 100 rollouts of D steps at $\sigma = 0.3$, with three seeds, on our 1,000 test puzzles. Costs are in blocks per puzzle. Pass@ K' counts a puzzle as solved when any of its K' rollouts is correct. Lost counts the standard-pass successes a configuration loses, out of 859, and is zero on every row of the bottom part, under the gate. The last columns are PTRM under the harness.

configuration	own protocol				+ fallback	
	cost	accuracy (%)	pass@ K'	lost	accuracy (%)	lost
TRM, standard pass	1	85.90	—	—	—	—
TRM, uniform unroll ($D=64$)	4	92.80	—	0.0	—	—
$K'=1, D=16$	1	87.70 ± 0.44	87.70 ± 0.44	29.0	90.57 ± 0.25	0.0
$K'=5, D=16$	5	94.70 ± 0.26	94.70 ± 0.26	3.7	95.03 ± 0.15	0.0
$K'=10, D=16$	10	96.30 ± 0.10	96.33 ± 0.15	1.3	96.40 ± 0.10	0.0
$K'=25, D=16$	25	97.40 ± 0.17	97.43 ± 0.21	1.0	97.43 ± 0.21	0.3
$K'=100, D=16$	100	98.07 ± 0.21	98.10 ± 0.20	0.3	98.07 ± 0.21	0.3
$K'=1, D=64$	4	93.60 ± 0.46	93.60 ± 0.46	5.0	94.00 ± 0.36	0.0
$K'=5, D=64$	20	96.90 ± 0.10	96.90 ± 0.10	0.3	96.87 ± 0.15	0.0
$K'=10, D=64$	40	97.70 ± 0.20	97.70 ± 0.20	0.3	97.67 ± 0.12	0.0
$K'=25, D=64$	100	98.07 ± 0.12	98.07 ± 0.12	0.0	98.03 ± 0.15	0.0
$K'=100, D=64$	400	98.57 ± 0.06	98.57 ± 0.06	0.0	98.53 ± 0.06	0.0

configuration	+ gate + fallback		+ stopping rule	
	cost	accuracy (%)	cost	accuracy (%)
$K'=1, D=16$	1.14	90.57 ± 0.25	1.14	90.57 ± 0.25
$K'=5, D=16$	1.70	95.00 ± 0.20	1.42	95.00 ± 0.20
$K'=10, D=16$	2.40	96.37 ± 0.15	1.63	96.37 ± 0.15
$K'=25, D=16$	4.50	97.40 ± 0.17	2.06	97.40 ± 0.17
$K'=100, D=16$	15.00	98.00 ± 0.20	3.58	98.00 ± 0.20
$K'=1, D=64$	1.56	94.00 ± 0.36	1.56	94.00 ± 0.36
$K'=5, D=64$	3.80	96.83 ± 0.12	2.27	96.83 ± 0.12
$K'=10, D=64$	6.60	97.63 ± 0.15	2.79	97.63 ± 0.15
$K'=25, D=64$	15.00	97.97 ± 0.12	4.02	97.97 ± 0.12
$K'=100, D=64$	57.00	98.47 ± 0.06	8.65	98.47 ± 0.06

Table 8: **The same configurations on PPBench validation.** The table follows the conventions of Table 7 on the 308 validation puzzles, with $\sigma^* = 1.5$, and omits the standard deviation where the three seeds agree. *Lost* counts the losses among the 212 standard-pass successes and is zero on every row of the bottom part.

configuration	own protocol				+ fallback	
	cost	accuracy (%)	pass@ K'	lost	accuracy (%)	lost
TRM, standard pass	1	68.83	—	—	—	—
TRM, uniform unroll ($D=48$)	3	68.18	—	10.0	—	—
$K'=1, D=16$	1	68.29 ± 0.75	68.29 ± 0.75	12.0	72.19 ± 0.75	0.0
$K'=5, D=16$	5	74.13 ± 0.82	74.35 ± 0.86	3.0	75.00 ± 0.32	0.3
$K'=10, D=16$	10	76.19 ± 0.75	76.62 ± 0.56	1.3	76.41 ± 0.37	0.7
$K'=25, D=16$	25	77.81 ± 0.19	78.57 ± 0.32	1.0	77.92 ± 0.32	0.7
$K'=100, D=16$	100	80.63 ± 0.50	81.71 ± 0.37	1.3	80.63 ± 0.50	1.3
$K'=1, D=48$	3	68.72 ± 0.75	68.72 ± 0.75	15.7	73.70 ± 0.86	0.3
$K'=5, D=48$	15	73.92 ± 0.37	74.57 ± 0.37	11.3	77.06 ± 0.37	1.3
$K'=10, D=48$	30	75.87 ± 0.50	76.73 ± 0.68	10.3	78.79 ± 0.50	1.3
$K'=25, D=48$	75	76.84 ± 0.50	78.25 ± 0.32	10.3	79.65 ± 0.37	1.7
$K'=100, D=48$	300	79.98 ± 0.50	82.03 ± 0.37	10.3	82.47 ± 0.86	2.7

configuration	+ gate + fallback		+ stopping rule	
	cost	accuracy (%)	cost	accuracy (%)
$K'=1, D=16$	1.27	72.08 ± 0.56	1.27	72.08 ± 0.56
$K'=5, D=16$	2.36	74.57 ± 0.50	2.15	74.57 ± 0.50
$K'=10, D=16$	3.73	76.08 ± 0.37	3.14	75.87 ± 0.50
$K'=25, D=16$	7.82	77.27 ± 0.32	5.79	77.27 ± 0.32
$K'=100, D=16$	28.27	79.98 ± 0.50	16.82	79.98 ± 0.50
$K'=1, D=48$	1.82	73.48 ± 1.04	1.82	73.48 ± 1.04
$K'=5, D=48$	5.09	76.95	4.26	76.95
$K'=10, D=48$	9.18	78.14 ± 0.82	6.88	77.92 ± 0.65
$K'=25, D=48$	21.45	79.22 ± 0.32	13.94	79.11 ± 0.19
$K'=100, D=48$	82.82	82.36 ± 0.37	42.25	82.14 ± 0.32

D WHICH STATE TO PERTURB: FULL RESULTS

Table 9 lists the values of Figure 2 with their seed standard deviations. Its continuation row is detailed in Table 10, and its restart row gives the restarts that perturb one state. With $\mathbf{y}$ kept, the costs we recorded for the retries of Table 10 span 1.90 to 1.97 blocks per puzzle on Sudoku-Extreme and 4.53 to 4.79 on PPBench, and with $\mathbf{y}$ resampled, 1.65 to 1.69 and 3.70 to 3.81. The deterministic reset of Section 4.1, which returns $\mathbf{y}$ to $\mathbf{y}_{\text{init}}$ on the fillable cells and keeps $\mathbf{z}$, recovers 114.0 failures on Sudoku-Extreme and 23.0 on PPBench validation after 16 continued retries.

Table 9: **The values of Figure 2.** In each entry, the first percentage is for Sudoku-Extreme and the second for PPBench validation. The shaded entry is GAR, and the restart entry with PTRM’s noise is PTRM itself, with $K' = 16$ rollouts of $D = 16$ steps under the harness.

	the retry			
	no perturbation	adds PTRM’s noise to $\mathbf{z}$	resamples $\mathbf{z}$	resamples $\mathbf{y}$
continues (depth)	73.8 / 15.6	70.7 ± 2.7 / 17.7 ± 1.0	74.2 ± 1.5 / 19.1 ± 1.2	88.7 ± 1.9 / 34.4 ± 2.8
restarts (width)	0.0 / 0.0	78.3 ± 1.1 / 24.7 ± 2.2	78.5 ± 2.5 / 21.2 ± 1.6	87.7 ± 1.5 / 39.9 ± 2.2

Seed by seed. On Sudoku-Extreme, continuing without perturbation recovers 104 failures. With $\mathbf{y}$ carried, the three perturbations of $\mathbf{z}$ (resampling the fillable cells, resampling every grid cell, and

Table 10: **Perturbations of $\mathbf{z}$ crossed with the resampling of $\mathbf{y}$, when continuing.** Entries count the failures recovered after 16 continued retries, by what each retry does to $\mathbf{z}$ (rows) and, at the block boundary, to the fillable cells of $\mathbf{y}$ (columns). A reset returns $\mathbf{z}$ to $\mathbf{z}_{\text{init}}$. *All cells* means every grid cell, without the P prefix positions, and *all positions* includes the prefix. The noise is PTRM’s, at the scales of Table 2. Bold marks the retry that resamples $\mathbf{y}$ alone, and a dash a retry we did not run.

$\mathbf{z}$	Sudoku-Extreme (141 failures)		PPBench validation (96 failures)	
	$\mathbf{y}$ kept	$\mathbf{y}$ resampled	$\mathbf{y}$ kept	$\mathbf{y}$ resampled
kept	104.0	125.0 ± 2.6	15.0	33.0 ± 2.6
resampled, fillable cells	104.7 ± 2.1	123.3 ± 2.5	18.3 ± 1.2	29.7 ± 2.9
resampled, all cells	102.0 ± 3.0	—	17.3 ± 0.6	—
reset, fillable cells	103.0	126.3 ± 2.1	15.0	31.7 ± 1.5
reset, all cells	101.0	126.7 ± 1.5	17.0	29.3 ± 2.1
reset, all positions	103.0	125.3 ± 2.9	19.0	30.7 ± 1.5
noise before every step	99.7 ± 3.8	124.3 ± 3.2	17.0 ± 1.0	31.7 ± 3.2

the noise) change this count by at most 7 for any seed, whereas resampling the fillable cells of $\mathbf{y}$ with $\mathbf{z}$ kept adds between 18 and 23 for every seed.

D.1 NOISE ON THE REASONING STATE IN CONTINUED RETRIES

On Sudoku-Extreme, adding PTRM’s noise to $\mathbf{z}$ before every step of a continued retry is inert or slightly harmful, whether $\mathbf{y}$ is carried or resampled. Paired by seed, it recovers 4.3 ± 3.8 and 0.7 ± 2.1 fewer failures, which is of the order of the seed-to-seed spread (Table 10). In a separate run, we add noise to $\mathbf{z}$ at $\sigma \in \{0.2, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0\}$ in the retry that carries $\mathbf{y}$, on PPBench validation with three seeds each. This recovers 13.0 ± 2.0 , 14.3 ± 1.2 , 19.7 ± 1.2 , 17.3 ± 1.5 and 18.0 ± 2.6 of the 96 failures, compared with 15.0 without perturbation and 33.0 ± 2.6 with $\mathbf{y}$ resampled (this run draws its own noise, hence 17.3 at $\sigma = 1.5$ instead of 17.0 ± 1.0 in Table 10). At its best scale, $\sigma = 1.0$, it recovers 26% of the gain that resampling the answer state produces, and the number of failures recovered by a single resampling of $\mathbf{z}$ at the block boundary falls within the range of this grid. The noise and the resampling also differ in magnitude (Appendix A), but the resampling of $\mathbf{z}$ on the fillable cells has the same extent and angle as the resampling of $\mathbf{y}$, which removes that confound. On PPBench, perturbing the reasoning state therefore saturates well below resampling the answer state, and the contrast of Section 4.1 is not an artefact of the noise scale. In the setting the noise was designed for, namely fresh rollouts from the initial state, its effect is measured by the restart row of Table 9 and by the comparison with a single resampling of $\mathbf{z}$ (Section 4.2).

E MATCHED RETRIES ACROSS BUDGETS

Table 11 extends Table 1 to seven budgets, and to the golden split at 16 and 64 retries, and Table 12 reports the paired differences at the same budgets. We test these differences at $r = 16$ and $r = 64$, the two budgets fixed in advance (Section 3), and their values at the other budgets are descriptive. The 95% interval of GAR minus PTRM lies above zero at every budget except $r = 2$ on Sudoku-Extreme and $r = 1$ on PPBench validation. At 64 retries, the disagreements between GAR and the restart that resamples $\mathbf{z}$ (the puzzles that only one of the two solves) favour GAR for every seed, on Sudoku-Extreme, PPBench validation and the golden split alike (49 of 52 and 84 of 90 on the first two, summed over seeds). Compared in the same way, the continuation variant is ahead of GAR for every seed on Sudoku-Extreme, and GAR is ahead for every seed on PPBench validation.

Table 11: **Accuracy and cost at seven retry budgets.** The table extends Table 1 and adds the golden split at 16 and 64 retries. Accuracies (%) are means over three seeds, with the standard deviation shown where the seeds disagree, and costs are in blocks per puzzle. The standard pass scores 85.90%, 68.83% and 67.35% on the three splits.

<i>r</i>	TRM, under the harness		PTRM		GAR		z instead of y		continue instead of restart	
	accuracy (%)	cost	accuracy (%)	cost	accuracy (%)	cost	accuracy (%)	cost	accuracy (%)	cost
<i>Sudoku-Extreme</i> (1,000 puzzles, 141 failures)										
1	89.70	1.14	90.57 ± 0.25	1.14	91.43 ± 0.32	1.14	91.23 ± 0.47	1.14	90.87 ± 0.15	1.14
2	91.80	1.24	92.63 ± 0.49	1.23	93.27 ± 0.74	1.22	93.10 ± 0.56	1.23	92.67 ± 0.21	1.23
5	93.70	1.46	95.00 ± 0.20	1.42	95.87 ± 0.31	1.39	95.30 ± 0.46	1.40	95.83 ± 0.12	1.41
10	95.50	1.73	96.37 ± 0.15	1.63	97.33 ± 0.25	1.55	96.47 ± 0.42	1.61	97.53 ± 0.06	1.57
16	96.30	1.97	96.93 ± 0.15	1.82	98.27 ± 0.21	1.68	96.97 ± 0.35	1.80	98.40 ± 0.26	1.69
32	97.10	2.50	97.60	2.24	99.07 ± 0.06	1.85	97.57 ± 0.15	2.20	99.17 ± 0.21	1.86
64	97.40	3.33	97.87 ± 0.06	2.90	99.43 ± 0.15	2.03	97.90	2.84	99.73 ± 0.06	1.98
<i>PPBench validation</i> (308 puzzles, 96 failures)										
1	70.78	1.27	72.08 ± 0.56	1.27	73.05 ± 0.32	1.27	70.78 ± 0.97	1.27	72.73	1.27
2	71.43	1.53	73.05 ± 0.86	1.51	75.11 ± 0.50	1.49	72.19 ± 0.50	1.52	74.46 ± 0.37	1.49
5	72.08	2.26	74.57 ± 0.50	2.15	77.81 ± 0.75	2.04	73.70 ± 0.32	2.19	76.19 ± 0.82	2.05
10	73.38	3.44	75.87 ± 0.50	3.14	79.76 ± 0.99	2.76	74.46 ± 0.50	3.23	78.03 ± 0.37	2.87
16	73.70	4.79	76.52 ± 0.68	4.25	81.28 ± 0.68	3.48	75.43 ± 0.50	4.42	79.55 ± 0.86	3.73
32	74.35	8.32	77.71 ± 0.19	6.95	83.77	4.98	76.19 ± 0.19	7.36	81.17 ± 0.65	5.73
64	75.00	15.20	79.00 ± 0.19	11.86	85.61 ± 0.37	7.08	77.16 ± 0.19	12.92	83.01 ± 0.50	9.06
<i>PPBench golden</i> (49 puzzles, 16 failures)										
16	75.51	5.16	72.11 ± 1.18	4.95	80.27 ± 1.18	3.51	74.83 ± 1.18	5.24	78.23 ± 2.36	4.14
64	77.55	15.82	74.83 ± 1.18	14.60	81.63	8.07	75.51 ± 2.04	16.45	82.31 ± 1.18	9.78

Table 12: **Paired differences at the budgets of Table 11.** Each column gives the difference in accuracy points between two methods, with a 95% bootstrap interval over instances. *y minus z* is GAR minus the same restart with *z* resampled instead of *y*, and *once minus noise* is that restart minus PTRM, so that their sum gives GAR minus PTRM up to rounding. *Continue minus restart* is GAR’s continuation variant minus GAR. Differences are computed before rounding.

<i>r</i>	y minus z	once minus noise	GAR minus PTRM	continue minus restart
<i>Sudoku-Extreme</i> (1,000 puzzles, 141 failures)				
1	+0.20 [−0.60, +1.03]	+0.67 [−0.03, +1.37]	+0.87 [+0.07, +1.67]	−0.57 [−1.23, +0.10]
2	+0.17 [−0.60, +0.97]	+0.47 [−0.20, +1.13]	+0.63 [−0.10, +1.37]	−0.60 [−1.27, +0.07]
5	+0.57 [−0.23, +1.37]	+0.30 [−0.20, +0.80]	+0.87 [+0.10, +1.67]	−0.03 [−0.70, +0.63]
10	+0.87 [+0.13, +1.63]	+0.10 [−0.33, +0.53]	+0.97 [+0.30, +1.70]	+0.20 [−0.30, +0.70]
16	+1.30 [+0.60, +2.07]	+0.03 [−0.40, +0.47]	+1.33 [+0.67, +2.10]	+0.13 [−0.30, +0.57]
32	+1.50 [+0.80, +2.30]	−0.03 [−0.33, +0.27]	+1.47 [+0.77, +2.27]	+0.10 [−0.30, +0.50]
64	+1.53 [+0.87, +2.27]	+0.03 [−0.23, +0.30]	+1.57 [+0.87, +2.37]	+0.30 [+0.03, +0.60]
<i>PPBench validation</i> (308 puzzles, 96 failures)				
1	+2.27 [+0.76, +3.90]	−1.30 [−2.60, −0.11]	+0.97 [−0.11, +2.06]	−0.32 [−1.52, +0.87]
2	+2.92 [+1.19, +4.76]	−0.87 [−2.06, +0.22]	+2.06 [+0.43, +3.68]	−0.65 [−2.06, +0.76]
5	+4.11 [+2.27, +6.06]	−0.87 [−2.27, +0.43]	+3.25 [+1.41, +5.30]	−1.62 [−3.35, +0.11]
10	+5.30 [+3.14, +7.58]	−1.41 [−3.03, 0.00]	+3.90 [+1.73, +6.17]	−1.73 [−3.68, +0.22]
16	+5.84 [+3.57, +8.33]	−1.08 [−2.27, −0.11]	+4.76 [+2.49, +7.25]	−1.73 [−3.79, +0.32]
32	+7.58 [+4.98, +10.39]	−1.52 [−2.92, −0.32]	+6.06 [+3.35, +8.87]	−2.60 [−4.87, −0.43]
64	+8.44 [+5.52, +11.47]	−1.84 [−3.46, −0.43]	+6.60 [+3.90, +9.52]	−2.60 [−4.76, −0.54]
<i>PPBench golden</i> (49 puzzles, 16 failures)				
16	+5.44 [−2.72, +14.29]	+2.72 [−0.68, +8.16]	+8.16 [+2.04, +15.65]	−2.04 [−8.84, +4.08]
64	+6.12 [−1.36, +14.29]	+0.68 [−3.40, +6.12]	+6.80 [+0.68, +14.29]	+0.68 [−4.08, +6.12]

F PERSISTENCE OF A BOUNDARY PERTURBATION, BY STATE

The lockstep diagnostic of Table 13 asks whether interventions on $\mathbf{z}$ are erased before they can act. It yields four observations. First, resampling erases the cells it touches. In $d = 512$ dimensions, a fresh isotropic direction has expected cosine 0 with the vector it replaces, so, right after resampling, the mean cosine should equal the fraction of cells left alone, which is what we find (step 0 of Table 13). Second, a perturbation of $\mathbf{z}$ is not too weak to act. At the end of the block, the three perturbed copies are at about the same distance from the unperturbed copy in both states, change a similar fraction of cells, and have each solved more re-opened puzzles than that copy, which has solved 38. Over 16 retries, however, they recover 125.0, 104.7 and 102.0 failures, versus 104.0 without perturbation (Table 10). The difference between resampling $\mathbf{y}$ and the two resamplings of $\mathbf{z}$ lies in what the later retries add. Third, the reasoning state largely erases its own perturbation within a single step, as one would expect if the recursion re-derives $\mathbf{z}$ from $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$, both of which are intact: one step after all its grid cells are resampled, $\cos \mathbf{z}$ is back to 0.829. Fourth, one step after the boundary, resampling $\mathbf{y}$ moves $\mathbf{z}$ further than resampling $\mathbf{z}$ itself does. Across seeds, the standard deviation of the entries of Table 13 is at most 0.026 for the cosines, 0.025 for the cells and 4.0 for the counts of solved puzzles.

Table 13: **How long a boundary perturbation survives, by state.** For each perturbation, two copies of the continuation are run in lockstep from one standard pass on the 1,000 Sudoku-Extreme test puzzles, one perturbed at the block boundary and the other not. The step column counts supervision steps since the boundary, so step 16 ends the first retry. The cosines compare the two copies cell by cell and are averaged over grid cells and re-opened puzzles, and then over seeds. *Cells* gives the fraction of the fillable cells that the two copies decode differently, and *solved* counts the re-opened puzzles whose decoded grid is correct at that step, out of 140.

step	resampling $\mathbf{y}$				resampling $\mathbf{z}$, fillable cells				resampling $\mathbf{z}$, all cells			
	$\cos \mathbf{y}$	$\cos \mathbf{z}$	cells	solved	$\cos \mathbf{y}$	$\cos \mathbf{z}$	cells	solved	$\cos \mathbf{y}$	$\cos \mathbf{z}$	cells	solved
0	0.300	1.000	—	0.0	1.000	0.300	—	0.0	1.000	0.000	—	0.0
1	0.768	0.565	0.462	1.7	0.957	0.837	0.161	4.7	0.952	0.829	0.169	5.0
2	0.892	0.723	0.321	5.7	0.929	0.790	0.186	11.0	0.934	0.796	0.179	11.7
4	0.876	0.718	0.269	18.7	0.901	0.756	0.209	20.0	0.907	0.762	0.210	18.0
8	0.856	0.707	0.257	31.7	0.891	0.754	0.219	31.7	0.881	0.739	0.228	27.0
16	0.857	0.720	0.236	49.7	0.876	0.747	0.214	48.0	0.873	0.736	0.217	43.3

Interpretation. One step after the boundary, $\cos \mathbf{z}$ is back to about 0.83 when $\mathbf{z}$ is resampled, and down to 0.565 when $\mathbf{y}$ is resampled instead (the third and fourth observations), which suggests that, to a first approximation, the fast state relaxes within a step towards a function of the input and the slow state. This is reminiscent of HRM’s fast module, which, according to its authors, converges within each cycle to a local equilibrium that depends on the state of the slow module (Wang et al., 2025). If $\mathbf{z}$ were exactly such a function, the dynamics of a continued trajectory across steps would reduce, for a given puzzle, to that of the answer state alone, and the regions that hold a failed trajectory would be regions of answer-state space. The approximation is rough, however: by the end of the block, a resampled $\mathbf{z}$ has changed the grid about as much as a resampled $\mathbf{y}$ (the second observation). We offer this as an interpretation, subject to the limits given in Section 4.4.

The same diagnostic on PPBench. On the 308 validation puzzles, the first, third and fourth observations still hold. One step after the boundary, $\cos \mathbf{z}$ is 0.96 when $\mathbf{z}$ is resampled, compared with 0.73 when $\mathbf{y}$ is resampled. The second observation is weaker here. At the end of the block, the copy with $\mathbf{y}$ resampled is further from the unperturbed copy than the two copies with $\mathbf{z}$ resampled, in both states. It changes about 1.7 times as many cells as they do, and has solved twice as many re-opened puzzles as the unperturbed copy (12.0 vs. 6.0, and 7.3 and 6.7 for the two resamplings of $\mathbf{z}$). On this benchmark, the diagnostic therefore does not say whether a perturbation of $\mathbf{z}$ is too weak to act. But the resampling of $\mathbf{z}$ on the fillable cells, which has the same extent and angle as the resampling of $\mathbf{y}$, and PTRM’s noise up to $\sigma = 2.0$ both recover far fewer failures than resampling $\mathbf{y}$ (Appendix D.1).

G PPBENCH PER TYPE AND THE GOLDEN SPLIT

Table 14: **PPBench per type, on the validation split.** Accuracy (%) after 16 and 64 retries, averaged over three seeds. Methods are named and run as in Table 1. Shakashaka is used in training but left out of the aggregate, as in Sghaier et al. (2026). These results are descriptive, and we run no test per type.

type	n	failures	standard pass (%)	16 retries				64 retries			
				GAR	z instead of y	continue instead of restart	PTRM	GAR	z instead of y	continue instead of restart	PTRM
sudoku	99	56	43.43	74.07	59.93	69.36	60.94	85.86	64.98	78.11	67.00
lightup	55	4	92.73	96.97	94.55	96.36	96.36	97.58	94.55	97.58	96.36
nurikabe	59	12	79.66	81.36	81.36	82.49	82.49	81.36	81.36	82.49	83.05
heyawake	69	11	84.06	85.99	84.06	84.54	85.02	85.99	84.06	84.54	86.47
tapa	26	13	50.00	62.82	57.69	62.82	57.69	67.95	58.97	67.95	58.97
aggregate	308	96	68.83	81.28	75.43	79.55	76.52	85.61	77.16	83.01	79.00

Table 15: **The main operating points on the PPBench golden split.** The split has 49 puzzles, and the standard pass solves 33 of them (67.35%), leaving 16 failures. The table follows the conventions of Table 2, and *recovered* counts the failures that end up correct. The depth row with **y** resampled is the continuation variant of GAR, and the width row with **z** resampled is “z instead of y”.

state	method	runs on	cost	accuracy (%)	recovered	lost
—	TRM, standard pass	all	1	67.35	—	—
<i>Depth: one trajectory, continued</i>						
—	TRM, uniform unroll ($D=48$)	all	3	71.43	3.0	1.0
—	no perturbation ($R=16$)	rejected	5.16	75.51	4.0	0.0
y	resampling ($R=16$)	rejected	4.14	78.23 ± 2.36	6.3	1.0
<i>Width: trajectories drawn from the initial state</i>						
—	no perturbation (control, $R=1$)	rejected	1.33	67.35	0.0	0.0
z	resampling ($R=16$)	rejected	5.24	74.83 ± 1.18	3.7	0.0
y	GAR ($R=16$)	rejected	3.51	80.27 ± 1.18	7.3	1.0
y	GAR ($R=64$)	rejected	8.07	81.63	8.0	1.0
<i>PTRM with its own protocol: K' rollouts (width) of D steps (depth)</i>						
z	PTRM ($K'=1$, $D=16$)	all	1	63.95 ± 1.18	1.3	3.0
z	PTRM ($K'=25$, $D=16$)	all	25	73.47 ± 2.04	4.0	1.0
z	PTRM ($K'=100$, $D=16$)	all	100	76.19 ± 1.18	5.3	1.0
z	PTRM ($K'=100$, $D=48$)	all	300	77.55	7.0	2.0

Table 16: **PPBench per type, on the golden split.** Accuracy (%), averaged over three seeds, with PTRM run as in Table 1. Lightup and nurikabe have no standard-pass failures, and both methods lose the nurikabe puzzle re-opened by the gate’s only false positive. These results are descriptive.

retries	method	sudoku	lightup	nurikabe	heyawake	tapa	aggregate
16	GAR	71.11	100.00	88.89	80.95	70.00	80.27
	PTRM	55.56	100.00	88.89	71.43	60.00	72.11
64	GAR	75.56	100.00	88.89	80.95	70.00	81.63
	PTRM	64.44	100.00	88.89	71.43	60.00	74.83

What limits recovery on PPBench. The gains are concentrated where the standard pass has the most headroom, on sudoku and tapa, and are smallest on nurikabe and heyawake, where GAR recovers 1 of 12 and 1.3 of 11 failures at both budgets (Table 14). None of the methods of Table 14 loses a solved puzzle, so, for a type with n puzzles, the number of failures a method recovers is

$n/100$ times its gain in accuracy over the standard pass. The lower recovery on PPBench comes with four measured differences from Sudoku-Extreme. Depth alone does much less (Figure 2). The budget becomes limiting, as the fraction of re-opened puzzles still active falls far more slowly (Figure 4). Recall is lower (Table 3) and, on validation, uneven across types: 100% on lightup, 98.2% on sudoku, 72.7% on heyawake, 69.2% on tapa and 66.7% on nurikabe, with no false positive on any type. Finally, the head accepts wrong grids on retries. At $R = 64$, at least 15 of the 84 re-opened validation puzzles stop on a wrong grid, since 51.7 of them end up correct and 17.3 are still active before the last retry (Table 11, Section 4.2). On Sudoku-Extreme, fewer than 5 of the 140 do, since 135.3 of them end up correct. Most of the gap between resampling y and resampling z comes from the sudoku type, where the restart that resamples z stays 20.9 points below GAR at 64 retries (20.7 of the 26.0 puzzles that separate them), and from tapa. The restart that resamples z is not ahead of GAR on any type, at either budget. The lead of GAR over PTRM is concentrated in the same way: at 64 retries, the sudoku type accounts for 18.7 of the 20.3 puzzles that separate them, and PTRM is ahead only on nurikabe and heyawake, by one puzzle and by a third of one. Even so, resampling the answer state more than doubles what continuing without perturbation recovers at 16 retries, a larger relative gain than on Sudoku-Extreme (Table 10).

The golden split. Table 15 gives the main operating points on the golden split, and Tables 11 and 12 the matched retries. Continuing with z resampled is not reported on this split. GAR outperforms PTRM at 16 and 64 retries, with intervals that exclude zero, though at 64 retries the lower bound is a third of a puzzle (Table 12). Per type (Table 16), GAR is at least as accurate as PTRM at both budgets and ahead on the three types that have failures. With only $n = 49$ puzzles, however, neither the comparison of y with z nor that of continuing with restarting is conclusive, although the point estimates of the first comparison favour resampling y at both budgets. This split played no part in the choice of retry (Section 5).