

Measuring Harness-Induced Belief Divergence in Multi-Step LLM Agents

Haiwen Yi*
University of Toronto
Canada

Xinyuan Song*[†]
Emory University
United States

Abstract

Software agents are becoming increasingly important in modern coding workflows, where they solve complex tasks through multi-step interaction with code repositories. A central component of these systems is the execution harness, which governs how the underlying LLM observes, acts on, and verifies its environment. We show that the harness can in turn shape the agent’s evolving beliefs about the environment, even when the task, environment, and base LLM remain fixed. To reveal this effect, we introduce a belief-rollout diagnostic that traces how an agent’s anticipated world state and future decisions evolve under alternative harnesses. We further separate immediate divergence introduced by the interface from divergence that develops over longer horizons. Across controlled coding tasks include HIBench-Code, SWE-bench Verified and Terminal-Bench, we find substantial cross-harness belief divergence that is often invisible from terminal success alone and can propagate into different downstream actions. Building on this observation, we introduce **Belief-Invariant World-Modeling (BIWM)**, which exposes evidence hidden or compressed by harness execution and aligns the resulting belief trajectories across different harnesses. Our findings reveal that harness design can systematically shape how software agents understand and act on their environments, providing practical guidance for building and evaluating more reliable coding agents.

CCS Concepts

• Computing methodologies → Intelligent agents.

Keywords

LLM agents, execution harnesses, belief divergence, agent evaluation, world modeling

ACM Reference Format:

Haiwen Yi and Xinyuan Song. 2027. Measuring Harness-Induced Belief Divergence in Multi-Step LLM Agents. In *Proc. of the 26th International Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems (AAMAS 2027)*, Hanoi, Vietnam, 3–7 May 2027, IFAAMAS, 15 pages.

*Equal contribution.

[†]Corresponding author.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution International 4.0 License.

1 Introduction

Large language model agents are becoming increasingly important in modern software-engineering workflows. For example, SWE-agent lets language models navigate repositories, inspect files, edit code, and execute commands through a dedicated agent–computer interface [47]. OpenHands similarly provides agents with an integrated environment for interacting with code, terminals, and other software-development tools [41, 42]. These systems increasingly target realistic repository-level tasks rather than isolated code generation, such as resolving GitHub issues in SWE-bench [16] and completing command-line workflows in Terminal-Bench [25]. A central component enabling these multi-step interactions is the *execution harness*: the system surrounding the underlying LLM that mediates how it observes, acts on, and verifies its environment. In SWE-agent, for instance, the agent–computer interface determines how repository states and commands are exposed to the model [47]; in OpenHands, the runtime similarly structures tool execution and the resulting observations returned to the agent [42]. More generally, a harness can determine which observations are exposed, which actions are available, how tool calls are executed, when verification occurs, and how execution feedback is transformed before it reaches the model [45].

These design choices are not behaviorally neutral. Vats and Golev show that running the same coding model under different agent scaffolds can produce substantial differences in task performance and token consumption [38]. Harness Bench further treats the execution harness as an explicit evaluation variable and documents differences across realistic agent workflows [51]. More recently, Hu et al. systematically vary components such as tool interfaces, context management, planning, and auxiliary agent mechanisms, showing that harness configuration can materially affect software-engineering agent performance [14]. Together, these findings suggest that the harness is not merely implementation infrastructure: it is an experimental variable that can change the behavior observed from an otherwise fixed model.

We argue that these outcome-level effects point to a deeper phenomenon: the harness can shape the agent’s evolving *beliefs* about its environment. A multi-step agent uses execution feedback to infer what has happened and decide what to do next [36, 50]. The harness mediates this feedback, so changing the harness can change the agent’s interpretation even when the task and base LLM remain fixed. Consider a command that fails during execution. A raw harness may expose the failure directly, whereas a risk-gated harness may prevent the command from executing and instead report that it was blocked. The agent is then given different evidence about the same intended interaction and may form a different belief about the state of the task. Because this belief informs subsequent

reasoning, the difference can propagate into later decisions. We refer to this phenomenon as *harness-induced belief divergence*.

Figure 1 illustrates the central intuition: changing the harness changes the evidence available to the agent, which can alter its belief about the task. This effect may remain hidden behind the same terminal outcome, motivating us to examine how beliefs evolve during multi-step reasoning.




Figure 1: Harness-induced belief divergence. The same task and LLM can form different beliefs when the harness changes the interaction evidence.

To measure this effect, we introduce a *belief-rollout diagnostic* that traces how an agent expects a task to evolve under a given harness. Unlike traditional world models that predict environment transitions [10, 11], we treat the agent’s inference-time world model as an evolving belief trajectory. For each harness, we begin from its visible interaction record and ask the same fixed LLM to recursively forecast K belief updates, following the broader idea of simulated planning with language models [12, 49]. Each update summarizes the model’s current interpretation of the task and its expectation of what will happen next. The predicted belief is then carried forward as context for the following step, allowing harness-induced differences to accumulate over the imagined horizon. We repeat this procedure across harnesses under controlled conditions, isolating how harness-mediated evidence shapes the resulting belief trajectories. We compare the resulting K -step belief trajectories across harnesses, where K denotes the number of recursively imagined belief updates rather than live environment interactions.

We study this phenomenon on HIBench-Code and extend the analysis to SWE-bench Verified and Terminal-Bench [25, 28]. Across these settings, alternative harnesses induce substantial belief divergence with distinct horizon-dependent patterns. This divergence also has behavioral consequences: larger belief-growth divergence is associated with greater downstream action divergence. In risk-gated settings, agents may even return to the same class of risky actions after an earlier attempt has been blocked. These results show that harness effects extend beyond terminal outcomes to the belief dynamics that guide subsequent behavior.

Building on these findings, we introduce **Belief-Invariant World-Modeling (BIWM)**, a no-training protocol for reducing dependence on a single harness view. BIWM first exposes evidence that may be hidden or compressed during execution, making harness-induced differences more observable. This step can increase measured divergence because previously missing evidence becomes explicit. BIWM then aligns beliefs across harness views to improve robustness to these differences. Thus, BIWM separates

evidence exposure from *belief alignment*, rather than treating divergence reduction as a single operation.

Our main contributions are summarized as follows:

- We identify and systematically measure *harness-induced belief divergence*, showing that different execution harnesses can induce distinct belief trajectories for the same task and base LLM.
- We introduce a *belief-rollout diagnostic* with the $D_{\text{arrival}}/D_{\text{growth}}$ decomposition to separate immediate interface effects from divergence that develops over the imagined horizon, and evaluate it across HIBench-Code, SWE-bench Verified, and Terminal-Bench.
- We introduce **Belief-Invariant World-Modeling (BIWM)**, a no-training protocol that exposes harness-mediated evidence and aligns beliefs across harness views, providing a practical approach for diagnosing and reducing harness dependence.

2 Related Work

Agent harnesses and interfaces. Agent systems intertwine model reasoning with external execution interfaces. ReAct established the now-standard thought-act-observe loop [50], while Reflexion demonstrated that interaction feedback can reshape subsequent agent behaviour [36]. In software engineering, SWE-agent elevated the agent-computer interface to a first-class design variable and showed that interface choices materially affect coding performance [47]. Complementary work has explored searching over modular agent design spaces [35], adapting runtime harness parameters [45], and building production-oriented agent platforms [41, 42]. Program-repair agents further show that automatic retries and repair feedback are central to software-agent behaviour [2]. These studies establish that the harness is consequential rather than incidental. Our focus is different: rather than optimizing a harness for task success, we hold the task and LLM fixed and measure how harness variation changes the intermediate world-model belief trajectory.

LLM world models and multi-step reasoning. Framing an LLM as an implicit world model has a growing literature. RAP connects language-model reasoning with world-model planning [12], while PlaNet and Dreamer demonstrate how learned latent world models can support long-horizon planning [10, 11]. Recent work probes whether LLMs develop stable internal state representations [37], trains multi-turn world-model reasoning [40], and studies LLM-agent planning through world-model-style simulation [4, 15]. WebDreamer [6] applies this perspective to web navigation, using LLM-simulated futures to reduce real-environment interaction. Our setting differs in that we neither train a separate parametric world model nor treat a single verifier output as a world model. Instead, we operationalize the world model through repeated inference-time belief updates whose structured intermediate states can be audited and compared across matched harnesses. This enables us to study whether changing the execution harness alone changes the resulting belief trajectory.

Agent benchmarks and evaluation. SWE-bench [16], WebArena [54], OSWorld [44], and τ -bench [48] provide widely used evaluations for coding, web navigation, desktop control, and tool-use agents. API-Bank [19], ToolLLM [31], Gorilla/APIBench [30], and the Berkeley Function Calling

Table 1: Comparison with closely related work. ✓ indicates that the work explicitly studies or provides the corresponding capability, while ✗ indicates that it does not. ACI denotes agent–computer interface. “Belief reports” refers to structured intermediate reports elicited over imagined continuations rather than only executed trajectories.

Work	Harness / ACI Variation	Executed-Trace Analysis	Belief Reports	Sequential Uncertainty	Arrival / Growth	Censored Evidence	Matched Cross-Harness Contrast	Alignment / Robustness Audit
<i>Harness design and agent evaluation</i>								
SWE-agent [47]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
Life-Harness [45]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
HAL [18]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
Harness-Bench [52]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗
AgentBoard [24]	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
<i>World modeling and sequential uncertainty</i>								
WebDreamer / SiRA [4, 6]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
VAGEN [40]	✗	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗
UProp / SAUP [5, 53]	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗	✗	✗
<i>Runtime safety and verification</i>								
ToolSafe / Verifier Tax [27, 33]	✓	✓	✗	✗	✗	✓	✗	✗
This paper	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Leaderboard [29] further evaluate API selection, tool invocation, and function-call correctness, while RedCode [7] makes risky code execution an explicit evaluation dimension. These benchmarks primarily report execution-level quantities such as task success, pass rate, API-call correctness, and cost. Process-oriented evaluation provides a complementary perspective: AgentBoard [24], for example, introduces fine-grained progress measurements for multi-turn agents, while broader surveys cover evaluation across coding, tool-use, and embodied settings [20, 23]. Audits of agent-benchmark reporting further indicate that protocol and infrastructure details can remain under-specified, complicating cross-system comparisons [26]. Our evaluation complements these approaches by holding the task and model fixed, systematically varying the harness, and measuring the resulting structured belief trajectory rather than only the terminal execution outcome.

Calibration, safety, and guardrails. Uncertainty calibration in LLMs builds on classical probability calibration and language-model self-evaluation [8, 17], with more recent work studying uncertainty and its propagation in multi-step settings [5, 13, 21, 39]. In parallel, safety-oriented agent systems study when an agent should terminate [1], how to apply step-level guardrails [27], how to intercept risky tool calls [46], how to emulate risky execution in a sandbox [32], and how to evaluate prompt-injection attacks and defenses in tool-using agents [3]. Other work studies failures of safety mechanisms under long-context or agentic risk states [9, 43]. These interventions do more than constrain execution: blocking, verification, repair, and selective observation also change the evidence available to subsequent reasoning. Our analysis treats this evidence mediation as measurable rather than incidental. BIWM makes blocked-action, repair, verification, and shadow-execution evidence observable, and then separately applies cross-harness alignment to reduce dependence on any single harness view.

Comparison with prior work. Table 1 positions our work relative to prior studies of harness design, world modeling, sequential

uncertainty, and runtime safety. Unlike prior work, we jointly measure harness-conditioned belief trajectories, decompose divergence into arrival and growth components, and use BIWM to distinguish evidence exposure from cross-harness alignment.

3 Preliminaries

Harness-conditioned comparison. We study how the execution harness shapes an agent’s beliefs while holding the underlying task and model fixed. We fix the task $\mathcal{T}$, environment $\mathcal{E}$, base LLM M , belief elicitation procedure, initial interaction record, and matched random seed, and vary only the harness

$$H = (O_H, A_H, G_H, R_H, L_H), \quad (3.1)$$

where O_H , A_H , G_H , R_H , and L_H denote the observation, action, gating, repair, and logging components, respectively. Together, they determine the interaction and execution evidence exposed to the model. Appendix A.1 gives the full harness specification and canonicalization procedure.

Harness-conditioned belief rollout. Given a harness-visible interaction record, the fixed model produces structured beliefs over task state, failure mode, constraints, numeric forecasts, and the recommended next action. Starting from the same matched initial record, we recursively elicit the horizon- K belief rollout

$$B_{0:K}^H = (B_0^H, \dots, B_K^H). \quad (3.2)$$

This rollout captures the model’s anticipated belief trajectory rather than K additional live environment interactions. Harness-mediated events such as blocking, repair, and verification remain represented in the forecast context, so B_K^H is a model forecast rather than environment ground truth. Each horizon is elicited independently from the same matched initial record and seed. Appendix A.2 gives the full belief space and rollout process.

Belief divergence. For matched harnesses H_a and H_b , let $B_K^{H_a}$ and $B_K^{H_b}$ be their final-step beliefs from the rollouts in eq. (3.2). We compare them using bounded distances over categorical state, failure mode, constraint content, numeric forecasts, and recommended action, collected as

$$\mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) = (D_{\text{cat}}, D_{\text{fail}}, D_{\text{set}}, D_{\text{num}}, D_{\text{act}})^\top. \quad (3.3)$$

With a non-negative weight vector $\mathbf{w}$ satisfying $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1$, the overall belief divergence is

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K). \quad (3.4)$$

This provides an overall measure of harness-induced belief disagreement while keeping its component sources separately inspectable. Appendix A.3 gives the component definitions, normalization, and recomputation details.

Arrival and growth divergence. We separate harness-induced disagreement into *arrival* differences in constraints and recommended actions and *growth* differences in state, failure, and numeric forecasts. For the component vector $\mathbf{D}$ in Eq. (3.3) and weight vector $\mathbf{w}$ in Eq. (3.4), let $\mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}$ and $\mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}}$ select the corresponding components, and define

$$\alpha_{\text{arr}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}}, \quad \alpha_{\text{gro}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}}}. \quad (3.5)$$

The normalized readouts are

$$D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \alpha_{\text{arr}} (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K), \quad (3.6)$$

and

$$D_{\text{growth}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \alpha_{\text{gro}} (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K), \quad (3.7)$$

where $\odot$ denotes element-wise multiplication. Since $\mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}} + \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}} = \mathbf{1}$, the divergence in Eq. (3.4) decomposes exactly as

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \alpha_{\text{arr}}^{-1} D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) + \alpha_{\text{gro}}^{-1} D_{\text{growth}}(H_a, H_b; K). \quad (3.8)$$

Thus, D_{arrival} captures disagreement in constraints and recommended actions, while D_{growth} captures disagreement in belief quantities that may evolve across the forecast horizon. Appendix A.4 provides the detailed definitions of the selection vectors, normalization, decomposition, bounds, and associated theoretical properties.

Scope. The matched setup in Eq. (3.1) attributes differences between the belief rollouts in Eq. (3.2) to the harness by holding the task, environment, model, elicitation procedure, initial record, and randomness fixed. An individual harness component is isolated only when the compared harnesses differ solely in that component. The BIWM intervention in Section 4 is analyzed separately because it additionally varies instrumentation and cross-view evidence. Appendix A.5 provides the detailed matched-comparison assumptions, component-level isolation conditions, and harness-level attribution result, while Appendix A.6 formalizes censoring under harness gating and its induced belief divergence.

4 Method

Harness-specific evidence interventions. Figure 2(a) evaluates six instances of the harness in Eq. (3.1): raw reference, structured, risk-gated, repair-heavy, verification-selective, and cost-aware. They

differ through observation presentation, action gating, repair exposure, verification evidence, and cost-driven evidence removal while satisfying Assumption 2. For a component-level intervention, Definition 8 requires

$$H_a^{(j)} \neq H_b^{(j)}, \quad H_a^{(i)} = H_b^{(i)} \text{ for all } i \neq j. \quad (4.1)$$

Thus, each controlled pair changes one harness mechanism while retaining the matched rollout protocol.

Recursive belief rollout. For each task, harness and K , we apply the rollout in Definition 3 and Eq. (3.2). The next belief is conditioned on the current belief and harness-visible record as specified in Eq. (A.6); recommended actions follow Eq. (A.7). In the gated case $G_H(A_t^H) = \emptyset$, the forecast retains the blocked-action evidence according to Eq. (A.8) rather than inserting an unrealized environment outcome. Algorithm 1 implements the process shown in Fig. 2(a).

Algorithm 1 K -step harness-conditioned belief rollout

- 1: Initialise the rollout from the matched initial record.
 - 2: **for** $t = 0$ **to** $K - 1$ **do**
 - 3: Construct the harness-visible record using Eq. (3.1).
 - 4: Elicit the next belief according to Eq. (A.6).
 - 5: Read the recommended action using Eq. (A.7).
 - 6: Apply gating, repair, verification, and logging according to the active harness.
 - 7: Record visible evidence and the resulting structured belief.
 - 8: Extend the imagined record without executing a new live benchmark action.
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: **Return** the rollout in Eq. (3.2).
-

Each horizon is elicited independently from the same matched initial record and seed. Final beliefs are compared using Eq. (3.4), with the arrival and growth readouts in Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7).

BIWM evidence exposure. Figure 2(b) applies canonicalization, blocked-action logging, repair unrolling, verification annotation, and shadow execution to recover omitted or compressed evidence. These operations preserve censored branches in Eq. (A.8) and may increase the divergence in Eq. (3.4) by exposing previously hidden disagreement.

BIWM cross-harness alignment. Figure 2(c) aligns matched report views by categorical voting and numeric averaging while retaining disagreement as uncertainty. Alignment may reduce view dependence, whereas evidence exposure may increase measured divergence; thus, BIWM is not a uniform divergence-reduction operator. Details are provided in Appendix B.

5 Experiments

5.1 Metrics

Following prior work that evaluates multi-step agents beyond terminal success through process-level measurements [5, 24, 26], we measure harness-conditioned belief differences using the five components in Eq. (3.3). D_{cat} measures disagreement in task progress,




Figure 2: Harness-to-belief instrumentation pipeline. (a) A fixed task, LLM, schema, decoding procedure, and seed isolate harness-induced arrival and growth divergence through recursive belief forecasts. **(b)** BIWM evidence preparation exposes blocked, repaired, verified, and shadow evidence, which may increase measured divergence. **(c)** BIWM alignment reconciles cross-harness report views and may reduce view dependence.

risk state, and recoverability as defined in Eq. (A.10); D_{fail} measures failure-mode disagreement using Eq. (A.11); D_{set} compares known, satisfied, and violated constraints using Eq. (A.14); D_{num} measures disagreement in numeric forecasts using Eq. (A.15); and D_{act} measures disagreement in the recommended next action using Eq. (A.16).

The overall divergence D_{belief} is computed by Eq. (3.4). We additionally report the arrival and growth readouts in Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7): $D_{arrival}$ summarizes constraint and action disagreement, while D_{growth} summarizes categorical-state, failure-mode, and numeric-forecast disagreement. Reporting the component distances together with these aggregate readouts allows changes in D_{belief} to be traced to specific parts of the belief state rather than interpreted as a single undifferentiated score.

5.2 Harness Mechanism Study

We evaluate HIBENCH-CODE-v0, a controlled coding benchmark with eight tasks spanning off-by-one errors, missing null checks, import cycles, and destructive-action traps, complementing outcome-oriented benchmarks such as SWE-bench [16], AgentBench [22], and AgentBoard [24]. The evaluation crosses six harnesses, four rollout horizons, and three random seeds while holding the matched quantities in Assumption 2 fixed.

The raw reference exposes unfiltered observations and executed actions, following fully visible execution used in coding-agent evaluation [16, 47]. Structured adds parsed tracebacks, targeted verification summaries, and explicit intermediate state. Risk-gated intercepts high-risk actions before execution and records policy-violation metadata [7, 27, 46]. Repair-heavy records failure–repair–recovery transitions [2]. Verification-selective records whether verification is applied at each state, while cost-aware reduces expensive verification and long-running checks under budget constraints [33].

BIWM is protocol instrumentation rather than a separate harness: it augments these views with canonicalization, blocked-action logging, repair-unrolled traces, verification masks, shadow execution, and cross-harness alignment.

Each mediated harness is compared with the raw reference using Eq. (3.4), with arrival and growth reported by Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7). Table 2 reports final-step divergence averaged over task–seed pairs.

Table 2: Controlled harness mechanism study. Final-step divergence relative to the raw reference harness across rollout horizons. Gray cells mark the largest D_{belief} or D_{growth} at each horizon.

Comparison	Metric	$K = 1$	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 8$
Raw–structured	D_{belief}	0.409	0.437	0.479	0.478
	$D_{arrival}$	0.999	0.990	0.998	1.000
	D_{growth}	0.156	0.200	0.257	0.254
Raw–risk-gated	D_{belief}	0.398	0.422	0.408	0.411
	$D_{arrival}$	0.995	0.990	0.999	1.000
	D_{growth}	0.142	0.179	0.154	0.158
Raw–repair-heavy	D_{belief}	0.436	0.425	0.402	0.387
	$D_{arrival}$	0.997	1.000	0.997	0.975
	D_{growth}	0.195	0.178	0.147	0.134
Raw–verification-selective	D_{belief}	0.431	0.444	0.404	0.462
	$D_{arrival}$	0.994	0.995	0.996	1.000
	D_{growth}	0.190	0.208	0.151	0.231
Raw–cost-aware	D_{belief}	0.421	0.405	0.414	0.398
	$D_{arrival}$	0.997	0.998	0.997	0.999
	D_{growth}	0.174	0.152	0.164	0.140

Table 2 shows why the decomposition in Eq. (3.8) is necessary. $D_{arrival}$ is already near its upper bound at $K = 1$, producing a large

arrival floor in D_{belief} , whereas D_{growth} separates the subsequent belief dynamics: structured execution increases from 0.156 to 0.257 by $K = 5$, verification-selective execution reaches 0.231 at $K = 8$, and repair-heavy execution decreases from 0.195 to 0.134. Thus, harness effects are not merely immediate differences in constraints or recommended actions; the growth component in Eq. (3.7) reveals distinct horizon-dependent belief trajectories that are partially obscured by the overall divergence.

5.3 Generalization Across Public Benchmarks

We test whether the harness effects in Section 5.2 persist on SWE-bench Verified [16, 28] and Terminal-Bench [25]. Tasks are grouped by execution regime, and all six harnesses are evaluated at $K \in \{3, 5\}$ under Assumption 2. Table 3 reports mean divergence using Eq. (3.4).

Table 3: Harness-induced belief divergence across public benchmarks. Mean D_{belief} by task group. Gray cells mark the largest divergence within each group.

Benchmark	Group	Structured	Risk-gated	Repair-heavy	Verify-selective	Cost-aware
SWE-bench Verified	A_bug	0.613	0.640	0.669	0.656	0.655
	B_feature	0.613	0.641	0.646	0.645	0.656
	C_refactor	0.617	0.616	0.662	0.671	0.648
Terminal-Bench	X_risky	0.557	0.591	0.640	0.587	0.601
	Y_timeout	0.514	0.514	0.578	0.564	0.594
	Z_verif	0.516	0.495	0.559	0.531	0.532

Table 3 shows that harness-induced divergence persists on both public benchmarks, while the largest effect varies across task regimes. We next examine whether this transfer is also visible in individual belief components.

Table 4: Horizon-dependent divergence on SWE-bench Verified. Gray cells highlight the largest failure-mode divergence.

Comparison	K	D_{belief}	D_{cat}	D_{fail}	D_{set}	D_{num}
Raw-structured	3	0.325	0.150	0.300	0.797	0.041
Raw-structured	5	0.373	0.150	0.600	0.943	0.051
Raw-risk-gated	3	0.330	0.125	0.400	0.844	0.050
Raw-risk-gated	5	0.383	0.092	0.800	0.927	0.049

On SWE-bench Verified [16, 28], D_{fail} increases from 0.300 to 0.600 for structured execution and from 0.400 to 0.800 for risk gating as K increases from 3 to 5, showing that additional rollout steps can amplify failure-attribution differences even when changes in Eq. (3.4) are smaller.

Table 5 further shows that the composition of Eq. (3.4) is benchmark-dependent: HIBENCH-CODE produces the largest D_{set} , whereas SWE-bench Verified [16, 28] produces the largest risk-gated D_{fail} at 0.800. Together, Tables 3–5 support a mechanism-specific generalization claim: harness-induced belief divergence persists across public benchmarks, but its dominant harness and belief component depend on the execution regime.

5.4 BIWM Effects

We evaluate BIWM using the growth readout in Eq. (3.7). Table 6 separates evidence exposure in Fig. 2(b) from cross-harness alignment in Fig. 2(c) at $K = 5$.

Table 5: Cross-benchmark divergence at $K = 5$. Overall, failure-mode, and constraint-set divergence for two harness interventions. Gray cells mark the largest component differences.

Pair	Metric	HIBENCH-CODE	Terminal-Bench	SWE-bench Verified
Raw-structured	D_{belief}	0.479	0.381	0.373
	D_{fail}	0.708	0.500	0.600
	D_{set}	0.998	0.676	0.943
Raw-risk-gated	D_{belief}	0.408	0.363	0.383
	D_{fail}	0.458	0.500	0.800
	D_{set}	0.999	0.676	0.927

Table 6: BIWM exposure and alignment effects at $K = 5$. Positive Δ_{exp} exposes hidden divergence; negative Δ_{rob} indicates reduced harness dependence.

Harness	Baseline D_{growth}	Exposure D_{growth}	Δ_{exp}	Aligned D_{growth}	Δ_{rob}
Structured	0.312	0.318	+0.006	0.298	−0.014
Risk-gated	0.487	0.492	+0.005	0.451	−0.036
Repair-heavy	0.147	0.373	+0.226	0.112	−0.035
Verify-selective	0.151	0.367	+0.216	0.134	−0.017
Cost-aware	0.103	0.251	+0.148	0.089	−0.014

Evidence exposure is largest for repair-heavy (+0.226) and verification-selective (+0.216), whereas alignment yields the largest reduction for risk-gated execution (−0.036). Thus, BIWM exposes hidden disagreement before reducing harness-specific dependence.

Component ablation. Table 7 localizes the exposure effect to individual instrumentation components and the full components 1–5 stack.

Table 7: BIWM component ablation at $K = 5$. Gray cells mark the largest D_{growth} within each harness block.

Base view	Instrumentation	D_{belief}	D_{arrival}	D_{growth}
Structured	None	0.479	0.998	0.257
Structured	Canonicalisation	0.490	0.994	0.274
Structured	BIWM-full	0.536	0.983	0.344
Risk-gated	None	0.408	0.999	0.154
Risk-gated	Blocked-action log	0.427	0.999	0.182
Risk-gated	BIWM-full	0.537	0.988	0.344
Repair-heavy	None	0.402	0.997	0.147
Repair-heavy	Repair-unrolled log	0.533	0.978	0.342
Repair-heavy	BIWM-full	0.553	0.974	0.373
Verification-selective	None	0.404	0.996	0.151
Verification-selective	Verification mask	0.434	0.986	0.198
Verification-selective	BIWM-full	0.553	0.986	0.367
Cost-aware	None	0.414	0.997	0.164
Cost-aware	Shadow execution	0.433	0.999	0.191
Cost-aware	BIWM-full	0.539	0.987	0.347

All mechanism-specific interventions increase D_{growth} with comparatively small changes in D_{arrival} ; repair-unrolled logging produces the largest single-component effect.

Transfer across benchmarks. We next test whether the exposure effects transfer from HIBENCH-CODE to Terminal-Bench [25]. Table 8 compares each uninstrumented harness with its BIWM-full counterpart at $K = 5$.

Table 8: BIWM-full effects across benchmarks at $K = 5$. Positive ΔD_{belief} denotes additional divergence exposed by instrumentation relative to the corresponding uninstrumented view.

Base view	HIBENCH-CODE ($n = 21$ paired)			Terminal-Bench ($n = 10$)		
	Base	BIWM-full	ΔD_{belief}	Base	BIWM-full	ΔD_{belief}
Structured	0.479	0.525	+0.046	0.381	0.447	+0.066
Risk-gated	0.408	0.536	+0.128	0.363	0.430	+0.067
Repair-heavy	0.402	0.537	+0.135	0.421	0.450	+0.029
Verify-selective	0.404	0.551	+0.147	0.393	0.439	+0.046
Cost-aware	0.414	0.527	+0.112	0.360	0.463	+0.103

The full stack increases D_{belief} for every harness on both benchmarks, but the effect does not transfer uniformly across mechanisms. Repair-heavy shows the strongest attenuation, from +0.135 on HIBENCH-CODE to +0.029 on Terminal-Bench, suggesting that the additional repair evidence exposed by BIWM is more task-dependent. In contrast, cost-aware remains nearly unchanged (+0.112 versus +0.103), indicating that evidence suppressed by cost-aware execution persists across both task families. Thus, the cross-benchmark result supports transfer of the overall exposure effect, but not of its mechanism-specific magnitude.

Single-component transfer. Table 9 tests whether the individual instrumentation effects in Table 7 persist across benchmarks.

Table 9: Single-component BIWM transfer. ΔD_{belief} is the mean change from the uninstrumented view; positive/total counts cases with $\Delta D_{\text{belief}} > 0$.

Component	HIBENCH-CODE		Terminal-Bench	
	ΔD_{belief}	Positive/total	ΔD_{belief}	Positive/total
Canonicalisation	+0.011	15/24	+0.005	4/10
Blocked-action log	+0.019	13/24	+0.034	6/10
Repair-unrolled log	+0.131	22/24	+0.007	5/10
Verification mask	+0.030	18/24	+0.025	8/10
Shadow execution	+0.019	10/24	-0.002	4/10

Component effects transfer unevenly across task families. Repair-unrolled logging is strongest on HIBENCH-CODE (+0.131) but falls to +0.007 on Terminal-Bench, whereas verification masks remain positive on both benchmarks and affect 18/24 and 8/10 cases, respectively.

Alignment across horizons. Figure 3 extends the $K = 5$ alignment result in Table 6 across rollout depths.

Behavioral consequences. We test whether larger growth divergence in Eq. (3.7) is associated with greater disagreement in the recommended next action. Recommendations are mapped to six coarse action categories using the same classifier across harnesses.




Figure 3: Cross-harness alignment reduces growth divergence across horizons. The reduction increases from 0.012 at $K = 1$ to 0.037 at $K = 8$.

Table 10 compares matched pairs in the lowest and highest D_{growth} quartiles.

Table 10: Growth divergence is associated with action disagreement. Matched pairs with larger D_{growth} exhibit substantially higher action divergence.

D_{growth} group	Pairs	Action divergence	Change
Lowest quartile	211	0.280	–
Highest quartile	210	0.595	+0.315

Across 840 matched step-level pairs, action divergence increases from 0.280 to 0.595 between the lowest and highest D_{growth} quartiles. Across harnesses, the rate ranges from 0.321 for repair-heavy to 0.601 for structured execution. On risk-gated Terminal-Bench [25], $42/60 = 0.700$ blocked high-risk steps are followed by a same-class risky proposal within three steps, showing that blocking execution does not necessarily eliminate the corresponding action tendency.

Temporal self-consistency. Finally, we test whether BIWM changes the consistency between an early world-model forecast and the same model’s later imagined belief state. For failure prediction, we compare the step-0 failure-attractor probability with whether the final belief at $K = 5$ assigns a non-null failure mode, using AUROC. This measures within-rollout consistency rather than calibration against environment outcomes [8, 17].

Table 11: Temporal self-consistency at $K = 5$. AUROC compares the initial failure-attractor forecast with the final imagined failure state; it does not measure environment-grounded accuracy.

Harness	Base	BIWM-full	Δ
Structured	0.519	0.591	+0.073
Verify-selective	0.450	0.556	+0.106
Cost-aware	0.174	0.428	+0.254

BIWM-full increases temporal agreement for all three non-degenerate harnesses, with the largest change under

cost-aware execution. However, the cost-aware AUROC remains below 0.5, and the final belief is itself model-generated rather than environment ground truth. The result therefore provides evidence of changed internal consistency, not improved predictive accuracy or calibration.

5.5 Long-Horizon Diagnostics

We extend the controlled HIBENCH-CODE study to $K \in \{1, 3, 5, 8, 12, 16, 20\}$ using the same task and harness families, base LLM, elicitation template, decoding procedure, and logging protocol. The overlapping horizons provide a separate replication of the short-horizon pattern in Table 2.

Table 12: Long-horizon belief divergence relative to the raw harness. D_{belief} does not grow monotonically with rollout horizon.

Comparison	$K = 1$	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 8$	$K = 12$	$K = 16$	$K = 20$
Raw-structured	0.404	0.445	0.457	0.494	0.482	0.485	0.479
Raw-risk-gated	0.368	0.453	0.365	0.454	0.430	0.430	0.484
Raw-repair-heavy	0.436	0.445	0.379	0.394	0.387	0.400	0.413
Raw-verification-selective	0.420	0.474	0.413	0.474	0.409	0.427	0.426
Raw-cost-aware	0.425	0.397	0.381	0.430	0.388	0.422	0.431

Table 12 shows no systematic long-horizon growth in Eq. (3.4): each harness exhibits local increases and decreases rather than monotone accumulation. We therefore inspect the component distances from Eq. (3.3).

Table 13: Component-level long-horizon diagnostics. Action and constraint distances remain near saturation, while categorical, failure-mode, and numeric distances continue to vary.

Component	$K = 1$	$K = 3$	$K = 5$	$K = 8$	$K = 12$	$K = 16$	$K = 20$
D_{belief}	0.410	0.443	0.399	0.449	0.419	0.433	0.447
D_{cat}	0.087	0.135	0.087	0.131	0.079	0.079	0.110
D_{fail}	0.500	0.575	0.325	0.575	0.475	0.500	0.575
D_{set}	0.993	0.983	0.996	0.995	0.998	1.000	0.983
D_{num}	0.044	0.081	0.099	0.100	0.099	0.136	0.126
D_{act}	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 13 shows that scalar stability does not imply component convergence. D_{act} remains saturated and D_{set} remains near one, while D_{num} increases from 0.044 at $K = 1$ to 0.136 at $K = 16$ and remains 0.126 at $K = 20$. Meanwhile, D_{fail} transiently falls to 0.325 at $K = 5$ before returning to 0.575 at $K = 8$ and $K = 20$. Thus, Eq. (3.4) can appear stable even when individual belief components remain horizon-sensitive.

5.6 Metric Sensitivity Analysis

We test whether the main D_{belief} pattern depends on the component weights in Definition 5. Setting A uses the implemented weight vector $\mathbf{w}_A = (0.30, 0.15, 0.25, 0.25, 0.05)^\top$. Setting B downweights the arrival-heavy set component and reallocates weight toward categorical and numeric divergence, while setting C uses uniform weights $\mathbf{w}_C = (0.20, 0.20, 0.20, 0.20, 0.20)^\top$.

Table 14: Metric-weight sensitivity at $K = 5$. Changing component weights alters the scale and middle ordering of D_{belief} , while structured remains the largest-divergence harness.

Harness	A (implemented)	B (arrival-down)	C (uniform)
Structured	0.479	0.492	0.597
Risk-gated	0.408	0.404	0.523
Repair-heavy	0.402	0.426	0.540
Verify-selective	0.404	0.440	0.549
Cost-aware	0.414	0.396	0.514

Structured remains the largest-divergence harness under all three settings, while the middle ordering changes with $\mathbf{w}$. Thus, the absolute scale and fine-grained ranking of D_{belief} are weight-sensitive, motivating the accompanying D_{arrival} , D_{growth} , and component-level analyses.

5.7 Cross-Harness Agreement Structure

The preceding experiments compare each mediated harness with the raw reference. We complement this analysis by measuring agreement between all harness-conditioned beliefs. For each harness pair, we average categorical agreement over task progress, risk state, and recoverability.

Table 15: Pairwise categorical agreement across harnesses. Entries report mean agreement over task progress, risk state, and recoverability at $K = 1$ and $K = 8$.

$K = 1$	Raw	Struct.	Risk	Repair	Verify	Cost
Raw	1.000	0.694	0.694	0.514	0.500	0.542
Struct.	0.694	1.000	0.736	0.639	0.639	0.694
Risk	0.694	0.736	1.000	0.597	0.639	0.667
Repair	0.514	0.639	0.597	1.000	0.653	0.681
Verify	0.500	0.639	0.639	0.653	1.000	0.736
Cost	0.542	0.694	0.667	0.681	0.736	1.000
$K = 8$	Raw	Struct.	Risk	Repair	Verify	Cost
Raw	1.000	0.500	0.639	0.778	0.528	0.736
Struct.	0.500	1.000	0.556	0.514	0.403	0.569
Risk	0.639	0.556	1.000	0.639	0.542	0.750
Repair	0.778	0.514	0.639	1.000	0.653	0.736
Verify	0.528	0.403	0.542	0.653	1.000	0.528
Cost	0.736	0.569	0.750	0.736	0.528	1.000

The pairwise structure changes with rollout depth. At $K = 1$, structured and risk-gated agree at 0.736, while verification-selective and cost-aware also agree at 0.736. By $K = 8$, structured becomes more distinct, reaching only 0.403 agreement with verification-selective, whereas risk-gated and cost-aware retain 0.750 agreement and repair-heavy and cost-aware retain 0.736.

These results show that harness-conditioned beliefs are neither identical nor independent. Their structured agreement and disagreement provide complementary views for the cross-harness alignment evaluated in Fig. 3.

6 Conclusion

Execution harnesses are a measurable source of belief divergence in multi-step LLM agents, even when the task and model are fixed. Our arrival–growth decomposition reveals differences obscured by terminal outcomes, and larger growth divergence is associated with greater downstream action disagreement. BIWM further separates evidence exposure from cross-harness alignment, showing that instrumentation can first reveal hidden divergence and then reduce harness-specific dependence. These results motivate evaluating agents through both outcomes and harness-conditioned belief trajectories.

References

- [1] Vamshi Krishna Bonagiri, Ponnurangam Kumaragurum, Khanh Nguyen, and Benjamin Plaut. 2025. Check Yourself Before You Wreck Yourself: Selectively Quitting Improves LLM Agent Safety.
- [2] Islem Bouzenia, Premkumar Devanbu, and Michael Pradel. 2025. RepairAgent: An Autonomous, LLM-Based Agent for Program Repair. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.17134>
- [3] Edoardo Debenedetti, Jie Zhang, Mislav Balunovic, Luca Beurer-Kellner, Marc Fischer, and Florian Tramèr. 2024. AgentDojo: A Dynamic Environment to Evaluate Prompt Injection Attacks and Defenses for LLM Agents.
- [4] Mingkai Deng, Jinyu Hou, Zhiting Hu, and Eric P. Xing. 2025. General Agentic Planning Through Simulative Reasoning with World Models.
- [5] Jinhao Duan, James Diffenderfer, Sandeep Madireddy, Tianlong Chen, Bhavya Kaikhura, and Kaidi Xu. 2025. UProp: Investigating the Uncertainty Propagation of LLMs in Multi-Step Agentic Decision-Making.
- [6] Yu Gu, Boyuan Zheng, Boyu Gou, Kai Zhang, Cheng Chang, Sanjari Srivastava, Yanan Xie, Peng Qi, Huan Sun, and Yu Su. 2024. Is Your LLM Secretly a World Model of the Internet? Model-Based Planning for Web Agents.
- [7] Chengquan Guo, Xun Liu, Chulin Xie, Andy Zhou, Yi Zeng, Zinan Lin, Dawn Song, and Bo Li. 2024. RedCode: Risky Code Execution and Generation Benchmark for Code Agents. [arXiv:2411.07781 \[cs.SE\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07781) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.07781>
- [8] Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. 2017. On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks. 1321–1330 pages.
- [9] Tsimur Hadeliya, Mohammad Ali Jauhar, Nidhi Sakpal, and Diogo Cruz. 2025. When Refusals Fail: Unstable Safety Mechanisms in Long-Context LLM Agents.
- [10] Danijar Hafner, Timothy Lillicrap, Ian Fischer, Ruben Villegas, David Ha, Honglak Lee, and James Davidson. 2019. Learning Latent Dynamics for Planning from Pixels.
- [11] Danijar Hafner, Jurgis Pašukonis, Jimmy Ba, and Timothy Lillicrap. 2023. Mastering Diverse Domains through World Models.
- [12] Shibo Hao, Yi Gu, Haodi Ma, Joshua Hong, Zhen Wang, Daisy Zhe Wang, and Zhiting Hu. 2023. Reasoning with Language Model is Planning with World Model.
- [13] Prakul Sunil Hiremath and Harshit R. Hiremath. 2026. Calibration Drift Under Reasoning: How Chain-of-Thought Budgets Induce Overconfidence in Large Language Models.
- [14] Haichuan Hu, Quanjun Zhang, Shengcheng Yu, Zhifei Chen, Tianyu Luo, Chunrong Fang, Zhenyu Chen, and Liang Xiao. 2026. Beyond the Model: Demystifying Harness Effects in Software Engineering Agents. [arXiv:2609.32459 \[cs.SE\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.32459) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2609.32459>
- [15] Xu Huang, Weiwen Liu, Xiaolong Chen, Xingmei Wang, Hao Wang, Defu Lian, Yasheng Wang, Ruiming Tang, and Enhong Chen. 2024. Understanding the planning of LLM agents: A survey.
- [16] Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2024. SWE-bench: Can Language Models Resolve Real-World GitHub Issues?
- [17] Saurav Kadavath, Tom Conerly, Amanda Askell, Tom Henighan, Dawn Drain, Ethan Perez, Nicholas Schiefer, Zac Hatfield-Dodds, Nova DasSarma, Eli Tran-Johnson, et al. 2022. Language Models (Mostly) Know What They Know.
- [18] Sayash Kapoor, Benedikt Strobl, Peter Kirgis, Nitya Nadgir, Zachary S. Siegel, Boyi Wei, Tianci Xue, Ziru Chen, Felix Chen, Saiteja Utpala, Franck Ndzomga, Dheeraj Oruganty, Sophie Luskin, Kangheng Liu, Botao Yu, Amit Arora, Dongyoon Hahm, Harsh Trivedi, Huan Sun, Juyong Lee, Tengjun Jin, Yifan Mai, Yifei Zhou, Yuxuan Zhu, Rishi Bommasani, Daniel Kang, Dawn Song, Peter Henderson, Yu Su, Percy Liang, and Arvind Narayanan. 2025. Holistic Agent Leaderboard: The Missing Infrastructure for AI Agent Evaluation. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2510.11977
- [19] Minghao Li, Yingxiu Zhao, Bowen Yu, Feifan Song, Hangyu Li, Haiyang Yu, Zhoujun Li, Fei Huang, and Yongbin Li. 2023. API-Bank: A Comprehensive Benchmark for Tool-Augmented LLMs. 3102–3116 pages. doi:10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.187
- [20] Xinyi Li, Sai Wang, Siqi Zeng, Yu Wu, and Yi Yang. 2024. A survey on LLM-based multi-agent systems: workflow, infrastructure, and challenges. 9 pages.
- [21] Xiaou Liu, Tiejun Chen, Longchao Da, Chacha Chen, Zhen Lin, and Hua Wei. 2025. Uncertainty Quantification and Confidence Calibration in Large Language Models: A Survey. doi:10.1145/3711896.3736569
- [22] Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, Yu Gu, Hangliang Ding, Kaiwen Men, Kejuan Yang, Shudan Zhang, Xiang Deng, Aohan Zeng, Zhengxiao Du, Chenhui Zhang, Sheng Shen, Tianjun Zhang, Yu Su, Huan Sun, Minlie Huang, Yuxiao Dong, and Jie Tang. 2023. AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as Agents.
- [23] Junyu Luo, Weizhi Zhang, Ye Yuan, Yusheng Zhao, et al. 2025. Large Language Model Agent: A Survey on Methodology, Applications and Challenges.
- [24] Chang Ma, Junlei Zhang, Zhihao Zhu, Cheng Yang, Yujia Yang, Yaohui Jin, Zhenzhong Lan, Lingpeng Kong, and Junxian He. 2024. AgentBoard: An Analytical Evaluation Board of Multi-turn LLM Agents.
- [25] Mike A. Merrill, Alexander G. Shaw, Nicholas Carlini, Boxuan Li, Harsh Raj, Ivan Bercovich, Lin Shi, Jeong Yeon Shin, Thomas Walshe, E. Kelly Buchanan, et al. 2026. Terminal-Bench: Benchmarking Agents on Hard, Realistic Tasks in Command Line Interfaces.
- [26] Mahdi Naser Moghadasi and Faezeh Ghaderi. 2026. What Twelve LLM Agent Benchmark Papers Disclose About Themselves: A Pilot Audit and an Open Scoring Schema.
- [27] Yutao Mou, Zhangchi Xue, Lijun Li, Peiyang Liu, Shikun Zhang, Wei Ye, and Jing Shao. 2026. ToolSafe: Enhancing Tool Invocation Safety of LLM-based agents via Proactive Step-level Guardrail and Feedback.
- [28] OpenAI. 2024. Introducing SWE-bench Verified. OpenAI Research. Human-validated subset of SWE-bench. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-swe-bench-verified/>
- [29] Shishir G. Patil, Huanzhi Mao, Fanja Yan, Charlie Cheng-Jie Ji, Vishnu Suresh, Ion Stoica, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2025. The Berkeley Function Calling Leaderboard (BFCL): From Tool Use to Agentic Evaluation of Large Language Models.
- [30] Shishir G. Patil, Tianjun Zhang, Xin Wang, and Joseph E. Gonzalez. 2024. Gorilla: Large Language Model Connected with Massive APIs.
- [31] Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Lauren Hong, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. ToolLLM: Facilitating Large Language Models to Master 16000+ Real-world APIs.
- [32] Yangjun Ruan, Honghua Dong, Andrew Wang, Silviu Pitit, Yongchao Zhou, Jimmy Ba, Yann Dubois, Chris J. Maddison, and Tatsunori Hashimoto. 2023. Identifying the Risks of LM Agents with an LM-Emulated Sandbox.
- [33] Tanmay Sah, Vishal Srivastava, Dolly Sah, and Kayden Jordan. 2026. The Verifier Tax: Horizon Dependent Safety Success Tradeoffs in Tool Using LLM Agents.
- [34] Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessi, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. Toolformer: Language Models Can Teach Themselves to Use Tools.
- [35] Yu Shang, Yu Li, Keyu Zhao, Likai Ma, Jiahe Liu, Fengli Xu, and Yong Li. 2025. AgentSquare: Automatic LLM Agent Search in Modular Design Space.
- [36] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Edward Berman, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. 2023. Reflexion: Language Agents with Verbal Reinforcement Learning. [arXiv:2303.11366 \[cs.AI\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11366) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11366>
- [37] Keyon Vafa, Justin Y. Chen, Ashesh Rambachan, Jon Kleinberg, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2024. Evaluating the World Model Implicit in a Generative Model. [arXiv:2406.03689 \[cs.CL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03689) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.03689>
- [38] Naman Vats and Oleg Golev. 2026. The Scaffold Effect in Coding Agents: Harness Choice as a Hidden Variable in Coding-Agent Evaluation. [arXiv:2607.22585 \[cs.AI\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.22585) <https://arxiv.org/abs/2607.22585>
- [39] Hanlin Wang, Jian Wang, Chak Tou Leong, and Wenjie Li. 2025. STeCa: Step-level Trajectory Calibration for LLM Agent Learning.
- [40] Kangrui Wang, Pingyue Zhang, Zihan Wang, Yaning Gao, Linjie Li, Qineng Wang, Hanyang Chen, Chi Wan, Yiping Lu, Zhengyuan Yang, Lijuan Wang, Ranjay Krishna, Jiajun Wu, Li Fei-Fei, Yejin Choi, and Manling Li. 2025. VAGEN: Reinforcing World Model Reasoning for Multi-Turn VLM Agents.
- [41] Xingyao Wang, Boxuan Li, Yufan Song, Frank F. Xu, et al. 2025. OpenHands: An Open Platform for AI Software Developers as Generalist Agents. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.16741>
- [42] Xingyao Wang, Simon Rosenberg, Juan Michelini, Calvin Smith, et al. 2025. The OpenHands Software Agent SDK: A Composable and Extensible Foundation for Production Agents.
- [43] Patrick Wilhelm and Odej Kao. 2026. From Reward-Hack Activations to Agentic Risk States: Context-Calibrated Mechanistic Monitoring in LLM Agents.
- [44] Tianbao Xie, Danyang Zhang, Jixuan Chen, Xiaochuan Li, Siheng Zhao, Ruisheng Cao, Toh Jing Hua, Zhoujun Cheng, Dongchan Shin, Fangyu Lei, et al. 2024. OSWorld: Benchmarking Multimodal Agents for Open-Ended Tasks in Real Computer Environments.
- [45] Tianshi Xu, Huifeng Wen, and Meng Li. 2026. Adapting the Interface, Not the Model: Runtime Harness Adaptation for Deterministic LLM Agents.

- [46] Chenglin Yang. 2026. AgentTrust: Runtime Safety Evaluation and Interception for AI Agent Tool Use.
- [47] John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. 2024. SWE-agent: Agent-Computer Interfaces Enable Automated Software Engineering.
- [48] Shunyu Yao, Noah Shinn, Pedram Razavi, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2024. τ -bench: A Benchmark for Tool-Agent-User Interaction in Real-World Domains. arXiv:2406.12045 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.12045>
- [49] Shunyu Yao, Dian Yu, Jeffrey Zhao, Izhak Shafran, Thomas L. Griffiths, Yuan Cao, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Tree of Thoughts: Deliberate Problem Solving with Large Language Models.
- [50] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. ReAct: Synergizing Reasoning and Acting in Language Models.
- [51] Yilun Yao, Xinyu Tan, Chao-Hsuan Liu, Yaoming Li, Zhengyang Wang, Wenhan Yu, Zhewen Tan, Yuxuan Tian, Guangxiang Zhao, Lin Sun, Xiangzheng Zhang, and Tong Yang. 2026. Harness-Bench: Measuring Harness Effects across Models in Realistic Agent Workflows. arXiv:2605.27922 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2605.27922>
- [52] Yilun Yao, Xinyu Tan, Chao-Hsuan Liu, Yaoming Li, Zhengyang Wang, Wenhan Yu, Zhewen Tan, Yuxuan Tian, Guangxiang Zhao, Lin Sun, Xiangzheng Zhang, and Tong Yang. 2026. Harness-Bench: Measuring Harness Effects across Models in Realistic Agent Workflows. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2605.27922
- [53] Qiwei Zhao, Dong Li, Yanchi Liu, Wei Cheng, Yiyao Sun, Mika Oishi, Takao Osaki, Katsushi Matsuda, Huaxiu Yao, Chen Zhao, Haifeng Chen, and Xujiang Zhao. 2025. Uncertainty Propagation on LLM Agent. 6064–6073 pages. doi:10.18653/v1/2025.acl-long.302
- [54] Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Tianyue Ou, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Uri Alon, and Graham Neubig. 2024. WebArena: A Realistic Web Environment for Building Autonomous Agents. arXiv:2307.13854 [cs.AI] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13854>

A Full Formalization

A.1 Harness Specification

Let H be the set of finite histories of observation–action–outcome triples, and let A and O denote the full action and observation spaces of the environment.

Definition 1 (Harness). The harness in Eq. (3.1) is

$$H = (O_H, A_H, G_H, R_H, L_H), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where:

- $O_H : H \rightarrow O_H$ is the observation map, where $O_H \subseteq O$;
- $A_H \subseteq A$ is the action component;
- $G_H : A \rightarrow A \cup \{\emptyset\}$ is the gating component, where $G_H(a) = \emptyset$ indicates that action a is blocked before execution;
- $R_H : H \rightarrow H$ is the repair component, which rewrites the history presented to the model after failure or correction;
- $L_H : H \rightarrow L$ is the logging component, which projects the interaction history onto the auditable record space L .

The raw reference harness H_{raw} sets

$$O_{H_{\text{raw}}} = \text{id}, \quad A_{H_{\text{raw}}} = A, \quad G_{H_{\text{raw}}} = \text{id}, \quad R_{H_{\text{raw}}} = \text{id}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and $L_{H_{\text{raw}}}$ records the full history verbatim.

Assumption 1 (Canonical Embedding). There exist canonical schema spaces O^* and A^* and deterministic maps

$$\iota_O : \bigcup_H O_H \rightarrow O^*, \quad \iota_A : \bigcup_H A_H \rightarrow A^*, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

such that semantically equivalent observation and action representations are mapped to the same canonical representation.

The maps ι_O and ι_A remove only schema- and syntax-level variation. Differences introduced by observation filtering, action availability, gating, repair, or logging remain unchanged. In particular, if $G_H(a) = \emptyset$, canonicalization preserves the blocked-action event rather than replacing it with an unrealized environment outcome.

A.2 K -Step Harness-Conditioned Belief Rollout

We formalize the belief rollout in Eq. (3.2) using the five belief components introduced in Eq. (3.3).

Definition 2 (Belief Space). A belief state is

$$B_t^H = (B_{t,\text{cat}}^H, B_{t,\text{fail}}^H, B_{t,\text{set}}^H, B_{t,\text{num}}^H, B_{t,\text{act}}^H) \in B, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the five components represent categorical task state, failure mode, constraint content, numeric forecasts, and the recommended next action, respectively. These are exactly the components compared by $\mathbf{D}$ in Eq. (3.3); their field-level definitions and ranges are given in Appendix 5.1.

Definition 3 (K -Step Harness-Conditioned Belief Rollout). Fix the matched task T , base LLM M , initial record h_0 , random seed, and elicitation procedure, and vary only the harness H in Eq. (3.1). The rollout $B_{0:K}^H$ in Eq. (3.2) is defined recursively by the conditional distributions

$$P(B_0^H \mid T, M, h_0, H), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

and

$$P(B_{t+1}^H \mid B_t^H, h_t, T, M, H), \quad t = 0, \dots, K-1, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where h_t is the harness-visible forecast record at step t . The recommended action is the action component of the current belief,

$$A_t^H = B_{t,\text{act}}^H. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The next forecast record is conditioned on the harness components in Eq. (3.1): O_H determines the visible observation, A_H the available actions, G_H whether the recommended action is admitted or blocked, R_H the repaired record, and L_H the retained execution evidence.

The rollout represents a belief forecast rather than K additional live environment interactions. When an action is blocked, the subsequent belief is conditioned on the blocked-action evidence rather than an unrealized environment outcome:

$$P(B_{t+1}^H \mid B_t^H, h_t, G_H(A_t^H) = \emptyset, T, M, H). \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Each horizon K is elicited independently from the same matched initial record and seed.

Conditioned on the current belief and harness-visible record, the rollout satisfies

$$P(B_{t+1}^H \mid B_{0:t}^H, h_{0:t}, T, M, H) = P(B_{t+1}^H \mid B_t^H, h_t, T, M, H). \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Thus, the augmented process (B_t^H, h_t) is first-order, while the belief sequence alone need not be Markov because B_t^H need not contain the complete record h_t . For matched harnesses H_a and H_b , the final beliefs $B_K^{H_a}$ and $B_K^{H_b}$ are compared by Eq. (3.4).

A.3 Belief Divergence

We now instantiate the five component distances collected in $\mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K)$ in Eq. (3.3). The comparison is between the final beliefs $B_K^{H_a}$ and $B_K^{H_b}$ produced by the matched K -step rollouts in Definition 3. Their categorical, failure, set-valued, numeric, and action components are those defined in Definition 2.

Definition 4 (Component Distances). Let $B_K^{H_a}$ and $B_K^{H_b}$ be the matched final beliefs from Definition 3.

For their categorical components $B_{K,\text{cat}}^{H_a}$ and $B_{K,\text{cat}}^{H_b}$, let (p_a, r_a, c_a) and (p_b, r_b, c_b) denote the corresponding progress, risk, and recoverability fields. Their normalized distance is

$$D_{\text{cat}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{|p_a - p_b|}{4} + \frac{|r_a - r_b|}{2} + \frac{|c_a - c_b|}{2} \right). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

For the failure-mode components $B_{K,\text{fail}}^{H_a} = f_a$ and $B_{K,\text{fail}}^{H_b} = f_b$, define

$$D_{\text{fail}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \mathbf{1}\{f_a \neq f_b\}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

For the set-valued components $B_{K,\text{set}}^{H_a} = (\mathcal{K}_a, \mathcal{S}_a, \mathcal{V}_a)$ and $B_{K,\text{set}}^{H_b} = (\mathcal{K}_b, \mathcal{S}_b, \mathcal{V}_b)$, define

$$I_{ab} = |\mathcal{K}_a \cap \mathcal{K}_b| + |\mathcal{S}_a \cap \mathcal{S}_b| + |\mathcal{V}_a \cap \mathcal{V}_b|. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$U_{ab} = |\mathcal{K}_a \cup \mathcal{K}_b| + |\mathcal{S}_a \cup \mathcal{S}_b| + |\mathcal{V}_a \cup \mathcal{V}_b|. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Their constraint-set distance is

$$D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1 - \frac{I_{ab}}{U_{ab}}, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

with $D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 0$ when $U_{ab} = 0$.

For the numeric components $B_{K,\text{num}}^{H_a} = \mathbf{z}_a$ and $B_{K,\text{num}}^{H_b} = \mathbf{z}_b$, let d_{num} denote the number of numeric fields and let $\kappa_i > 0$ denote the normalization range of field i . Define

$$D_{\text{num}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \frac{1}{d_{\text{num}}} \sum_{i=1}^{d_{\text{num}}} \frac{|z_{a,i} - z_{b,i}|}{\kappa_i}. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Finally, for the recommended-action components $B_{K,\text{act}}^{H_a} = a_a$ and $B_{K,\text{act}}^{H_b} = a_b$, define

$$D_{\text{act}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1\{\eta_8(a_a) \neq \eta_8(a_b)\}, \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where η_8 applies the shared action normalization and returns the first eight tokens of the normalized action representation.

Equations (A.10)–(A.16) instantiate, in order, the five entries of the component vector in Eq. (3.3). Each component is bounded in $[0, 1]$, symmetric in H_a and H_b , and equal to zero when the corresponding components of $B_K^{H_a}$ and $B_K^{H_b}$ agree.

Definition 5 (Belief Divergence). Using the component vector in Eq. (3.3) and the non-negative weight vector $\mathbf{w}$ specified in Eq. (3.4), the final-step belief divergence is exactly

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K), \quad \mathbf{w} \succeq \mathbf{0}, \quad \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

The same $\mathbf{w}$ is fixed across tasks, horizons, and matched harness comparisons.

PROPOSITION 1 (BASIC PROPERTIES OF D_{belief}). *For the matched rollouts of Definition 3 and the component distances in Definition 4,*

$$0 \leq D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) \leq 1. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Moreover,

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H, H; K) = 0, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

and

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) = D_{\text{belief}}(H_b, H_a; K). \quad (\text{A.20})$$

The proposition follows from the boundedness and symmetry of the five component distances together with the non-negative normalized weighting in Eq. (A.17). Distinct harnesses may nevertheless induce identical final beliefs and therefore have zero divergence, so D_{belief} is used as a bounded symmetric divergence rather than a metric on the harness space. The proof is given in Appendix C.1.

A.4 Arrival and Growth Divergence

We now expand the arrival and growth readouts introduced in Eqs. (3.6) and (3.7). The construction uses the final beliefs from Definition 3, the five component distances in Definition 4, and the component vector and weight vector in Eqs. (3.3) and (3.4).

Definition 6 (Arrival and Growth Selection). Under the component ordering in Eq. (3.3), define the selection vectors

$$\mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 1)^\top, \quad \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}} = (1, 1, 0, 1, 0)^\top. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Thus, $\mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}$ selects the constraint and action components, while $\mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}}$ selects the categorical, failure, and numeric components. The selectors satisfy

$$\mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}} + \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}} = \mathbf{1}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

For the weight vector $\mathbf{w}$ in Eq. (3.4), define the normalization coefficients as in Eq. (3.5),

$$\alpha_{\text{arr}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}}, \quad \alpha_{\text{gro}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}}}, \quad (\text{A.23})$$

assuming $\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}} > 0$ and $\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}} > 0$.

Definition 7 (Arrival and Growth Readouts). For matched harnesses H_a, H_b and horizon K , the normalized arrival divergence is

$$D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \alpha_{\text{arr}} (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K), \quad (\text{A.24})$$

and the normalized growth divergence is

$$D_{\text{growth}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \alpha_{\text{gro}} (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

Here, $\odot$ denotes element-wise multiplication. By Definition 4, D_{arrival} depends only on D_{set} and D_{act} , whereas D_{growth} depends only on D_{cat} , D_{fail} , and D_{num} .

Because the selectors partition the five components as in Eq. (A.22),

$$\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}) + (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}}). \quad (\text{A.26})$$

Combining Eq. (A.26) with the belief divergence in Eq. (3.4) gives

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) = \alpha_{\text{arr}}^{-1} D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) + \alpha_{\text{gro}}^{-1} D_{\text{growth}}(H_a, H_b; K), \quad (\text{A.27})$$

which is the decomposition stated in Eq. (3.8). Since the component distances in Definition 4 lie in $[0, 1]$ and each readout renormalizes the selected weights to sum to one,

$$0 \leq D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) \leq 1, \quad 0 \leq D_{\text{growth}}(H_a, H_b; K) \leq 1. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

LEMMA 1 (CONSTRAINT-SET FLOOR). *Suppose the constraint components of the final beliefs $B_K^{H_a}$ and $B_K^{H_b}$ from Definition 3 satisfy $I_{ab} = 0$ and $U_{ab} > 0$, where I_{ab} and U_{ab} are defined in Eqs. (A.12) and (A.13). Then*

$$D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

Consequently,

$$D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) \geq \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}, \quad (\text{A.30})$$

where $\mathbf{e}_{\text{set}} = (0, 0, 1, 0, 0)^\top$ selects the constraint-set component under the ordering in Eq. (3.3). The condition $I_{ab} = 0$ and $U_{ab} > 0$ means that the matched final beliefs contain nonempty but disjoint constraint content. By Eq. (A.14), this alone makes the constraint-set distance maximal, independently of the remaining four belief components.

COROLLARY 1 (ARRIVAL FLOOR). *Under the conditions of Lemma 1,*

$$D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) \geq \alpha_{\text{arr}} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

If, in addition, $D_{\text{act}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1$, then

$$D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Lemma 1 and Corollary 1 show that disjoint constraint content creates a nonzero floor in both the overall and arrival divergences, while simultaneous maximal constraint and action disagreement makes the normalized arrival divergence maximal. Their proofs are given in Appendices C.2 and C.3, respectively.

A.5 Matched Comparison and Identification

Assumption 2 (Matched Harness Comparison). For matched harnesses H_a and H_b , we hold fixed the task $\mathcal{T}$, environment $\mathcal{E}$, base LLM M , initial record h_0 , belief elicitation procedure, decoding procedure, belief schema, and random seed. Thus, the two rollouts differ only through the harness in Eq. (3.1):

$$B_{0:K}^{H_a} \sim P(\cdot \mid \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}, M, h_0, H_a), \quad B_{0:K}^{H_b} \sim P(\cdot \mid \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{E}, M, h_0, H_b). \quad (\text{A.33})$$

Definition 8 (Component-Level Isolation). Let $H_a = (H_a^{(1)}, \dots, H_a^{(5)})$ and $H_b = (H_b^{(1)}, \dots, H_b^{(5)})$ follow the component ordering in Eq. (3.1). Harness component j is isolated if

$$H_a^{(j)} \neq H_b^{(j)}, \quad H_a^{(i)} = H_b^{(i)} \text{ for all } i \neq j. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

PROPOSITION 2 (HARNESS-LEVEL ATTRIBUTION). Under Assumption 2, if the matched final beliefs satisfy

$$B_K^{H_a} = B_K^{H_b}, \quad (\text{A.35})$$

then

$$\mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{A.36})$$

If Eq. (A.34) additionally holds for component j , the matched contrast isolates the effect of component j . The BIWM intervention in Section 4 is excluded from this attribution because it additionally changes instrumentation and cross-view evidence. The proof is given in Appendix C.5.

A.6 Censoring and Failure-Mode Divergence

Definition 9 (Censoring Event). For H_{raw} and a compared harness H , censoring at step t is defined by

$$G_{H_{\text{raw}}}(A_t^{H_{\text{raw}}}) \neq \emptyset, \quad G_H(A_t^H) = \emptyset. \quad (\text{A.37})$$

Equation (A.37) identifies the step at which the two harnesses expose different execution evidence: the raw harness admits its recommended action, while the compared harness blocks its recommendation.

Assumption 3 (Failure-Mode Censoring Sensitivity). For any censoring event satisfying Eq. (A.37),

$$\begin{aligned} P(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \in \cdot \mid B_t^{H_{\text{raw}}}, h_t, \mathcal{T}, M, H_{\text{raw}}) \\ \neq P(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H \in \cdot \mid B_t^H, h_t, \mathcal{T}, M, H). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.38})$$

Assumption 3 requires censoring to affect the conditional distribution of the next failure-mode belief; it does not require the realized failure labels to differ on every rollout.

LEMMA 2 (CENSORING-INDUCED FAILURE-MODE DIVERGENCE). Under Assumption 3,

$$\Pr(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H) > 0, \quad (\text{A.39})$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{fail}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; t+1)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[1 \left\{ B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H \right\}\right] \\ &= \Pr(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H) \\ &> 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.40})$$

Lemma 2 converts distributional sensitivity into measurable belief divergence: censoring induces a strictly positive expected failure-mode distance at the following step. The proof is given in Appendix C.4.

A.7 Growth under Censoring

Assumption 4 (Non-Negative Growth Increment). For every $t \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; t+1) - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; t)] \geq 0. \quad (\text{A.41})$$

THEOREM 1 (CENSORING-INDUCED GROWTH MONOTONICITY). Under Assumptions 2, 3, and 4, if Eq. (A.37) holds for at least one step, then

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1)] \geq \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)], \quad K \geq 1. \quad (\text{A.42})$$

The result follows from the normalized growth definition in Eq. (3.7). The proof is given in Appendix C.6.

B BIWM Implementation Details

This appendix expands the implementation of the three stages in Fig. 2. The harness, belief rollout, and divergence quantities are those defined in Eq. (3.1), Definition 3, and Eqs. (3.3)–(3.8); Algorithm 1 gives the recursive forecasting procedure.

B.1 Harness-Specific Record Transformations

The six harnesses in Fig. 2(a) differ in how they transform the interaction record before each belief update. For a history h , we write the harness-visible record compactly as

$$h^H = (O_H(h), A_H, G_H, R_H(h), L_H(h)). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

The raw harness preserves the original record. The structured harness replaces raw outputs with parsed tracebacks and explicit intermediate states; the risk-gated harness records blocked actions without unrealized outcomes; the repair-heavy harness exposes repaired transitions while compressing preceding failures; the verification-selective harness retains verification evidence only for selected states; and the cost-aware harness omits evidence whose acquisition exceeds the remaining budget.

For component-level contrasts, the active harness pair satisfies Definition 8, while all non-harness quantities remain fixed by Assumption 2. Thus, Eq. (B.1) changes only through the intended harness mechanism.

B.2 Step-Level Forecast Records

Algorithm 1 produces one record per forecast step. The stored record contains

$$r_t^H = (h_t^H, A_t^H, g_t^H, r_t^H, v_t^H, s_t^H, B_t^H), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where the entries denote the harness-visible record, recommended action, gating metadata, repair metadata, verification evidence, shadow evidence, and structured belief, respectively.

The belief itself follows Definition 3; Eq. (A.6) governs the recursive update and Eq. (A.7) supplies the recommendation. When a branch is censored, the step record retains the blocked event according to Eq. (A.8). Each horizon is generated independently from the same matched initial record and seed.

B.3 BIWM Evidence Preparation

Figure 2(b) applies five evidence-preparation operations to the step record in Eq. (B.2). We write their composition as

$$r_{t,\text{prep}}^H = S \circ V \circ R \circ G \circ C(r_t^H), \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where C canonicalizes representation, G exposes blocked branches, R unrolls repair trajectories, V annotates verification status, and S attaches shadow evidence when available.

Canonicalization follows Assumption 1. Blocked-action logging preserves the censoring semantics in Eq. (A.8); repair unrolling restores failure–repair–recovery sequences; verification annotation distinguishes checked from unchecked states; and shadow execution records sandboxed counterfactual outcomes without replacing the live record. These operations expose evidence that may be absent or compressed in the original harness record, so they may increase the disagreement measured by Eq. (3.4).

B.4 BIWM Cross-View Alignment

Figure 2(c) aligns the prepared report views associated with the same task, seed, horizon, and forecast step. For categorical fields,

$$B_{t,\text{cat}}^{\text{align}} = \text{mode}_H B_{t,\text{cat}}^H, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

while numeric fields are aligned by

$$B_{t,\text{num}}^{\text{align}} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{H}_{\text{match}}|} \sum_{H \in \mathcal{H}_{\text{match}}} B_{t,\text{num}}^H. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Cross-view disagreement is retained as uncertainty rather than discarded. Alignment therefore operates on the same belief components used in Eq. (3.3) without redefining D_{belief} , D_{arrival} , or D_{growth} .

B.5 Evaluation Role and Reproducibility

The study evaluates harness-conditioned belief variation rather than policy leaderboard performance. ReAct [50], Reflexion [36], Toolformer [34], SWE-agent [47], OpenHands [41], API-Bank [19], ToolLLM [31], Gorilla/APIBench [30], and BFCL [29] provide relevant reasoning, tool-use, software-engineering, and function-calling references. Public benchmarks are used as stress tests for the measurement protocol.

All metrics are recomputed from the stored step records in Eq. (B.2) using Definition 4 and Eqs. (3.4)–(3.8). This keeps the implementation traceable from harness-visible evidence to the reported arrival, growth, and overall divergence.

C Proofs

C.1 Proof of Proposition 1

PROOF. By Definition 4, each entry of the component vector in Eq. (3.3) satisfies

$$0 \leq D_i(H_a, H_b; K) \leq 1, \quad i \in \{\text{cat}, \text{fail}, \text{set}, \text{num}, \text{act}\}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Using $\mathbf{w} \succeq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1$ from Eq. (3.4),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &= D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &\leq \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{1} \\ &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.2})$$

which proves Eq. (A.18).

For identical harness arguments, Definition 4 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}(H, H; K) &= \mathbf{0}, \\ D_{\text{belief}}(H, H; K) &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H, H; K) \\ &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{0} \\ &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

which proves Eq. (A.19).

Each component distance in Definition 4 is symmetric, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \mathbf{D}(H_b, H_a; K), \\ D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H_b, H_a; K) \\ &= D_{\text{belief}}(H_b, H_a; K), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

which proves Eq. (A.20).

Finally, for distinct harnesses $H_a \neq H_b$ satisfying $B_K^{H_a} = B_K^{H_b}$,

$$\begin{aligned} B_K^{H_a} &= B_K^{H_b} \quad \text{and} \quad H_a \neq H_b, \\ \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \mathbf{0}, \\ D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{0} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

Thus, distinct harnesses can have zero belief divergence, so identity of indiscernibles does not hold on the harness space. $\square$

C.2 Proof of Lemma 1

PROOF. By the assumptions $I_{ab} = 0$ and $U_{ab} > 0$, together with Eq. (A.14),

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) &= 1 - \frac{I_{ab}}{U_{ab}} \\ &= 1 - \frac{0}{U_{ab}} \\ &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

which proves Eq. (A.29).

Using Eq. (3.4), the non-negativity of every entry of $\mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K)$, and the selector $\mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}$ from Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{belief}}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &\geq (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &= (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}) D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &= \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

which proves Eq. (A.30). $\square$

C.3 Proof of Corollary 1

PROOF. By Lemma 1,

$$D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Using Eq. (A.24),

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \alpha_{\text{arr}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &\geq \alpha_{\text{arr}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &= \alpha_{\text{arr}}(\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}) D_{\text{set}}(H_a, H_b; K) \\ &= \alpha_{\text{arr}} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{e}_{\text{set}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

which proves Eq. (A.31).

If, in addition, $D_{\text{act}}(H_a, H_b; K) = 1$, then the two components selected by $\mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}$ both equal one, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{arrival}}(H_a, H_b; K) &= \alpha_{\text{arr}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}})^\top \mathbf{1} \\ &= \alpha_{\text{arr}} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}} \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}}{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{arr}}} \\ &= 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

which proves Eq. (A.32). $\square$

C.4 Proof of Lemma 2

PROOF. Suppose that a coupling of the two conditional distributions in Eq. (A.38) satisfies

$$\Pr(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H) = 0. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} = B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H) &= 1, \\ P(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \in \cdot \mid B_t^{H_{\text{raw}}}, h_t, \mathcal{T}, M, H_{\text{raw}}) &= P(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H \in \cdot \mid B_t^H, h_t, \mathcal{T}, M, H), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.12})$$

which contradicts Eq. (A.38). Hence

$$\Pr(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H) > 0. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

By Eq. (A.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{fail}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; t+1)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1} \left\{B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H\right\}\right] \\ &= \Pr(B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^{H_{\text{raw}}} \neq B_{t+1, \text{fail}}^H) \\ &> 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.14})$$

which proves Eqs. (A.39) and (A.40). $\square$

C.5 Proof of Proposition 2

PROOF. By Eq. (A.35),

$$B_K^{H_a} = B_K^{H_b}. \quad (\text{C.15})$$

Since the belief representation in Definition 2 is componentwise, for every $c \in \{\text{cat}, \text{fail}, \text{set}, \text{num}, \text{act}\}$,

$$B_{K,c}^{H_a} = B_{K,c}^{H_b}. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Therefore, by Definition 4,

$$D_c(H_a, H_b; K) = 0, \quad c \in \{\text{cat}, \text{fail}, \text{set}, \text{num}, \text{act}\},$$

$$\mathbf{D}(H_a, H_b; K) = \begin{pmatrix} D_{\text{cat}} \\ D_{\text{fail}} \\ D_{\text{set}} \\ D_{\text{num}} \\ D_{\text{act}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

For component-level isolation, Eq. (A.34) gives

$$\begin{aligned} H_a^{(j)} &\neq H_b^{(j)}, \\ H_a^{(i)} &= H_b^{(i)}, \quad i \neq j. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.18})$$

Assumption 2 additionally fixes all non-harness quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_a &= \mathcal{T}_b, & \mathcal{E}_a &= \mathcal{E}_b, \\ M_a &= M_b, & h_{0,a} &= h_{0,b}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Thus, the two matched comparisons differ only in harness component $H^{(j)}$, which establishes component-level isolation. $\square$

C.6 Proof of Theorem 1

PROOF. By Eq. (3.7), the growth divergences at horizons $K+1$ and K satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) &= \alpha_{\text{gro}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1), \\ D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K) &= \alpha_{\text{gro}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

Their difference is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K) &= \alpha_{\text{gro}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - \alpha_{\text{gro}}(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K) \\ &= \alpha_{\text{gro}}[(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

Taking expectations and using linearity gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)] &= \mathbb{E}[\alpha_{\text{gro}}((\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K))] \\ &= \alpha_{\text{gro}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - (\mathbf{w} \odot \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}})^\top \mathbf{D}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)] \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 4 and

$$\alpha_{\text{gro}} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{s}_{\text{gro}}} > 0. \quad (\text{C.23})$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1) - D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1)] - \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.24})$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K+1)] \geq \mathbb{E}[D_{\text{growth}}(H_{\text{raw}}, H; K)], \quad K \geq 1. \quad (\text{C.25})$$

This proves Eq. (A.42). $\square$