

WeaveGuard: Hybrid Checkpoint Verification and Lightweight Branching for Long-Horizon Software Repair

Anonymous Authors

Abstract

Long-horizon software repair agents do not fail only because they lack one more sampled patch. They also fail because localization becomes stale, edits grow beyond the evidence that justified them, public checks are over-trusted, and final failures are not traced back to the workflow decision that caused them. We introduce WeaveGuard, a test-time control layer for software repair agents. WeaveGuard combines three mechanisms: lightweight multi-strength branching, a hybrid online verifier that guards workflow checkpoints, and post-failure attribution that turns final failures into controller feedback. At runtime, repository-visible signals, patch structure, public regression summaries, route telemetry, and sanitized trajectory metadata decide whether to continue, branch to a cheap reader or critic, invoke a stronger patcher, shrink or roll back a patch, or stop and select a candidate. After a run, official aggregate labels are used only for reporting and offline attribution, never as online verifier evidence. On a local 28-task SWE-bench Pro development suite, the best public-portfolio WeaveGuard run solves 19/28 tasks under official aggregate evaluation, compared with 4/28 for a mini-swe-agent GPT-5.4 baseline on the same suite. Negative ablations show that more branch/debug compute can reduce pass rate, motivating checkpointed correction rather than unbounded multi-agent scale-out.

1 Introduction

Repository-level software repair agents must operate over long trajectories: they localize a bug, inspect source files, propose edits, run public checks, debug failures, and eventually submit a patch for official evaluation. At many points the agent is uncertain. It may have weak localization, insufficient interface evidence, a risky multi-file patch, a public regression failure, or a green public check after a large debug edit. A common response is to spend more test-time compute: launch more workers, sample more candidates, or ask a verifier to rerank completed trajectories.

That response is incomplete for long-horizon repair. First, repair workflows need *selective* extra compute: a cheap read-only branch can resolve a localization gap, while a strong patcher is only worthwhile when a checkpoint predicts that synthesis quality, not evidence, is the bottleneck. Second, verifiers need to intervene before the final answer. A verifier that only reranks completed patches cannot stop a risky plan, shrink a bloated edit, or force a public-evidence obligation before debugging compounds the error. Third, failed final patches should not be discarded as undifferentiated negative labels. A failure caused by route instability, verifier false positive, scope bloat, or missing public coverage implies different controller changes.

WeaveGuard treats software repair as a checkpointed control problem. The system runs a base repair trajectory but guards its major stages with a hybrid online verifier. The verifier combines deterministic public rules with LLM/PRM-style process judgments over public evidence. At each checkpoint it may continue, ask for lightweight branch evidence, invoke a stronger agent, shrink a patch, roll back an edit, or stop and select. The branch mechanism is multi-strength: cheap readers, public probes, scoped critics, file-owned writers, and stronger patchers are all available, but they are opened only when a predicted public condition justifies their cost and risk.

The design is constrained by a fairness boundary. Online branch and verifier decisions may use only repository-visible files, the task statement, requirements and interface text, public regression summaries, patch structure, candidate metadata, model-route telemetry, and sanitized trajectory summaries. They must not use hidden tests, hidden stack traces, raw hidden assertion diffs, hidden evaluator internals, or evaluation work directories. Official aggregate labels are used only after a run completes to report pass counts and to attribute failure modes.

Our local evidence suggests both the value and the risk of checkpointed control. On the 28-task SWE-bench Pro development suite, a fair public-portfolio run reaches 19/28 official passes, substantially above local mini-swe-agent baselines. At the same time, several plausible controller variants regress: deterministic evidence closure reaches 14/28, a route-hard predicate reaches 16/28, and a fallback-only route-hold ablation falls to 10/28. The failures are instructive: branches that create more obligations, more debug loops, or more locally plausible notes can still hurt final

repair quality. WeaveGuard therefore treats branch utility as a process signal that must be calibrated against official aggregate outcomes and cost.

We make three contributions.

- We introduce *lightweight multi-strength branching* for long-horizon repair. Public trajectory conditions decide whether to use a cheap reader, public probe, scoped critic, file-owned writer, or strong patcher, while branch-copy isolation and merge guards keep the canonical patch path controlled.
- We design a *hybrid online checkpoint verifier* for agent workflows. It combines public deterministic checks and verifier/process judgments at localization, pre-edit planning, patch scope, public regression, and candidate-selection checkpoints, then issues concrete correction actions.
- We add *post-failure attribution* after final aggregate evaluation. Sanitized trajectory evidence is used to attribute failures to workflow causes such as localization miss, verifier false positive, scope bloat, route instability, coverage gap, or debug overreach, feeding future controller calibration.

2 Problem Setting and Fairness Boundary

Each SWE-bench Pro task provides a real repository state and public task information [Deng et al., 2025]. A repair system may inspect repository files, run public or locally constructed checks, and edit source files. The final patch is evaluated by an official batch evaluator. We use official aggregate `eval_results.json` files as the source of truth for pass counts when they are present.

Allowed online evidence. WeaveGuard decisions may use the problem statement, requirements, interface text, visible repository files, candidate diffs, patch size and changed-file structure, public regression aggregates, public test names, and sanitized trajectory telemetry such as token counts, fallback counts, branch-decision records, and route summaries.

Disallowed online evidence. The controller, verifier, and workers must not inspect hidden tests, hidden test files, raw hidden stack traces, raw hidden assertion diffs, hidden-gate internals, `_output.json`, or `/work/eval`. Official aggregate labels are used only offline after the run.

3 Method

3.1 Overview

WeaveGuard is a control layer around a software repair trajectory rather than a replacement for the underlying patch generator. Figure 1 shows the full workflow. The base trajectory moves through localization, planning, patching, public regression, and candidate selection. At each stage, a hybrid online verifier builds a public risk snapshot and chooses a correction action. Branching is one possible action, but not the default: the controller may also continue, shrink scope, roll back a debugger delta, suppress optional late compute, or stop and select a candidate. After final aggregate evaluation, post-failure attribution maps failed tasks back to the likely workflow decision that should be calibrated.

3.2 Controller Algorithm

Table 1 gives the controller in executable form. The key choice is that a branch is not opened merely because an extra worker is available. It is opened only when the predicted condition identifies a specific public uncertainty and maps it to a bounded intervention budget.




Figure 1: **WeaveGuard overview.** GPT2Img-generated system figure in the style of recent software-agent papers. The method has three parts: lightweight multi-strength branches opened on demand, hybrid verifier checkpoints that issue correction actions, and offline failure attribution after final aggregate evaluation. Exact result values are reported in tables rather than inside generated figures.

3.3 Lightweight Multi-Strength Branching

Figure 2 shows the branching mechanism. The controller treats subagents as variable-strength interventions. A cheap reader or public probe is appropriate when the uncertainty is evidence or coverage; a scoped critic is appropriate when a patch passes public checks but appears large, under-justified, or outside the allowlist; a file-owned writer is used when independent ownership is predicted; a strong patcher is reserved for states where the verifier predicts that synthesis quality is the bottleneck. All branch copies are isolated. Read-only branches return evidence, while writer branches return diffs that are merged only through the conductor.

3.4 Hybrid Online Checkpoint Verifier

The predictor emits a structured branch-decision record:

(phase, condition, uncertainty, utility prior, risk flags, decision, budget).

Examples include:

- **Weak localization:** the explorer returns too few key files or many unrelated candidate files.
- **Risky pre-edit:** entropy is high when available, or public substitutes such as repeated reads and allowlist misses indicate low confidence.
- **Public-pass risk:** public regression is green after debug, but the patch is large, multi-file, outside allowlist, or lacks public coverage.
- **Route instability:** rate-limit buckets, disabled non-protected models, protected-route preservation, or timeout-heavy fallback metadata indicate infrastructure uncertainty.

Step	Controller action
1	Explore visible repository files and public task text under a fixed budget.
2	Build a public risk snapshot: localization strength, changed files, patch size, public regression state, route/fallback state, score gap, and sanitized trajectory telemetry.
3	Predict a public condition such as weak localization, risky pre-edit, public-pass risk, public regression failure, route instability, bloat risk, or clean stop.
4	If the condition predicts useful bounded intervention, log the <code>predicted_public_condition_to_bounded_lightweight_inte</code> contract and spawn a lightweight read-only reader, scoped critic, public probe, or file-owned writer.
5	Merge accepted branch evidence into the canonical repair state; merge writer diffs only through the conductor after file ownership checks.
6	Run public regression and public verifier scoring; downrank candidates with unresolved public obligations or unsafe scope growth.
7	Submit final patches to official aggregate evaluation only after the run; never use hidden artifacts during online control.

Table 1: **WeaveGuard checkpoint controller**. The method is the public checkpoint-to-correction decision, not generic worker fan-out.

- **Clean stop**: the patch is small, in-scope, public regression is green, route is stable, and score gap is large enough that extra verifier compute is unlikely to change the decision.

The checkpoint verifier is hybrid because neither deterministic rules nor an LLM judge is sufficient alone. Rule-based public checks are precise for changed-file count, patch size, public regression state, route instability, and known scope obligations. Process/verifier judgments are useful for softer questions: whether localization is under-supported, whether a companion file is missing, whether a test probe covers the behavior, or whether a patch looks semantically grounded. The verifier is online only over public evidence. Its output must be a concrete action: continue, request evidence, spawn a bounded branch, shrink, roll back, repair, stop, or select.

3.5 Bounded Interventions and Branch Accounting

The intervention type is deliberately small. Read-only branches map public interfaces and invariants without mutating the patch workspace. Critic branches inspect patch scope, hallucinated APIs, missing compatibility checks, and smaller public repairs. Writer branches are file-owned: they receive disjoint ownership when the planner predicts independent subtasks, while dependent companion clusters remain in one writer. Branch-copy diffs are merged into a canonical patch workspace only after the conductor incorporates read-only evidence and resolves ownership conflicts.

3.6 Method-Counted Branch Contract

Always-on parallel workers are not counted as the paper method. A branch is method-counted only if the trajectory records all four fields:

1. a predicted public condition,
2. the contract `predicted_public_condition_to_bounded_lightweight_intervention`,
3. the intervention unit `lightweight_subagent`, and
4. a concrete `uncertainty_intervention`.

Observed utility is logged after completion: whether the branch added a new suspect file, invariant, public check, accepted patch hunk, rollback decision, scope-reduction plan, or selected candidate. This audit boundary is important: the negative evidence-closure run produced many plausible branch-evidence items, but official performance fell, showing that local utility alone is not a final outcome metric.




Figure 2: **Lightweight multi-strength branching.** Branch workers differ in cost, mutation rights, and expected utility. The branch-copy rule keeps workers isolated, and merge guards admit only public evidence or approved file-owned diffs into the canonical patch buffer.

3.7 Post-Failure Attribution

Final failures are used to improve the controller only after a run completes. WeaveGuard reads official aggregate pass/fail labels for reporting, then combines them with sanitized public trajectory evidence: branch-decision records, patch structure, public regression state, verifier scores, route audits, scope-reduction plans, and public obligation gaps. It does not inspect raw hidden traces or assertion diffs. The attribution layer assigns likely workflow causes such as localization miss, verifier false positive, route instability, scope bloat, missing public coverage, debug overreach, or candidate-selection error. These labels are not a hidden oracle; they are offline calibration targets for checkpoint thresholds and branch budgets.

4 Experimental Setup

Tasks and baselines. We use a local 28-task SWE-bench Pro development suite for method development and a 36-task local suite for additional holdout-style checks. Baselines include mini-swe-agent with GPT-5.4 and GPT-5.4-mini, evaluated on the same 28-task manifest with official aggregate results.

Metrics. Primary outcome is official pass count from aggregate `eval_results.json`. Secondary metrics include token count, LLM calls, branch starts, branch observed utility, public-regression/official disagreement, patch bytes, changed-file count, fallback events, and disabled model audit.




Figure 3: **Hybrid online checkpoint verifier.** Deterministic public rules and verifier/process judgments meet at workflow checkpoints. The verifier does not inspect hidden evaluator artifacts; it issues bounded correction actions before final aggregate evaluation.

Fairness controls. Runs use fair mode, no memory retrieval during the current measurement phase, and official aggregate eval only for pass counts. Hidden eval details are not used in online decision making.

5 Results

5.1 Main Result

Table 4 summarizes the main pass-count evidence. On the 28-task development suite, the strongest public-portfolio WeaveGuard run solves 19/28 tasks. Local mini-swe-agent baselines solve 4/28 with GPT-5.4 and 3/28 with GPT-5.4-mini. The 36-task local selector experiments reach 15/36 for both PRM and LLM-as-judge selector variants, which is useful additional evidence but not yet a final frozen holdout claim.

5.2 Ablations and Negative Evidence

The ablations show that not every branch-control change helps. The branch-off control reaches 15/28. A proactive-light setting reaches 13/28. Evidence closure, despite cleaner branch accounting, reaches 14/28. The hard route predicate reaches 16/28, recovering from the fallback-only route-hold regression but still below the 19/28 best run. The fallback-only route hold reaches 10/28, showing that fallback count alone is not a sufficient hold or suppression condition.

5.3 Cost-Quality Trade-off

Figure 6 summarizes the cost and route-stability lesson. The evidence-closure and route-hard runs spend substantially more tokens than the best public-portfolio run while scoring lower. This supports cost-normalized controller design:

Trajectory event	Counted as method?	Reason
Always-on TestWriter overlap	No	Execution substrate; no predicted public condition is required.
Fixed parallel worker fan-out	No	Parallelism alone does not define the paper mechanism.
Read-only critic after public-pass risk	Yes, if logged	Predicted public condition maps to a bounded lightweight intervention.
File-owned writer split	Yes, if condition-triggered	Split is justified by predicted independent ownership and merged through the conductor.
Full extra candidate	Ablation by default	It is counted only if an explicit public condition selects it as the bounded intervention.

Table 2: **Novelty accounting.** The audit boundary prevents WeaveGuard from being presented as generic multi-agent repair.

RQ	Question	Evidence in this draft
RQ1	Does WeaveGuard outperform a local mini-swe-agent baseline on the same 28-task suite?	Table 4 and Appendix Table 5.
RQ2	Do lightweight branches and checkpoint controls matter?	Branch-off and public-portfolio comparison.
RQ3	Does more branch/debug compute always help?	Negative ablations and Figure 5.
RQ4	Is the controller cost- and route-aware?	Cost/route analysis in Figure 6.
RQ5	Are online decisions fair?	Fairness boundary and Appendix checklist.

Table 3: **Evaluation questions.** The current paper draft reports the supported local evidence and marks broader holdout claims as remaining gates.

predicted branches should change a stop, shrink, repair, rollback, or selection decision rather than merely add more context.

5.4 What the Negative Runs Teach

The evidence-closure run logs the branch contract correctly, with method-counted lightweight branches and many local utility reports. However, it also creates many deferred branch-evidence items and unresolved scope plans, and official pass count falls to 14/28. The lesson is that branch evidence must be actionable: it should close a public obligation, shrink a risky patch, repair a failing public check, or justify a stop.

The route-hold run demonstrates a separate failure mode. Under timeout-heavy routing, fallback-only pressure fired broadly and suppressed recovery on nearly every selection, dropping the result to 10/28. The repaired route-hard run reduces over-firing and reaches 16/28, but still loses tasks relative to the best portfolio. This motivates treating route instability as infrastructure uncertainty: it should suppress optional late compute only when the public state is already clean or when a concrete public repair target is absent.

6 Related Work

Repository-level repair benchmarks and agents. SWE-bench established real GitHub issue resolution as a benchmark for language agents [Jimenez et al., 2024], and SWE-bench Pro extends this style of evaluation to longer-horizon tasks [Deng et al., 2025]. SWE-agent showed that an agent-computer interface can improve automated repair [Yang et al., 2024]. Agentless argues that constrained localization-repair-validation pipelines can outperform unconstrained agents on some settings [Xia et al., 2024]. WeaveGuard adopts this caution: branches are constrained by public conditions, file ownership, read-only roles, checkpoint verifiers, and scope guards.




Figure 4: **Post-failure attribution.** After final aggregate evaluation, sanitized trajectory evidence is mapped to workflow-level failure causes and fed back into future controller calibration. The attribution path is offline and does not expose workers or verifiers to hidden evaluator details.

Method / setting	Tasks	Official pass	Pass rate
mini-swe-agent GPT-5.4-mini	28	3	10.7%
mini-swe-agent GPT-5.4	28	4	14.3%
WeaveGuard branch-off	28	15	53.6%
WeaveGuard public portfolio	28	19	67.9%
WeaveGuard local36 rule-base selector	36	14	38.9%
WeaveGuard local36 PRM selector	36	15	41.7%

Table 4: **Headline local results.** The 28-task suite is the development comparison; the 36-task rows are preliminary follow-up evidence.

Process supervision and verifier feedback. Process supervision motivates evaluating intermediate reasoning rather than only final answers [Lightman et al., 2023]. SWE-Gym and related verifier work study training agents and verifiers from trajectories [Pan et al., 2025]. SWE-RM studies execution-free feedback for SWE agents [Shum et al., 2025]. WeaveGuard uses verifier-like public process signals not as hidden-label oracles, but as checkpoint-control signals that decide whether to continue, branch, shrink, roll back, or stop.

Test-time scaling for software engineering. Recent SWE repair systems explore full-trajectory replay, candidate search, and reward-model scoring. SWE-Replay is particularly close in its focus on efficient test-time scaling [Ding and Zhang, 2026]. WeaveGuard is complementary: it asks how a single long-horizon workflow should be guarded by checkpoint decisions and when it should open a small branch inside the current repair attempt. Full extra candidates remain explicit ablations unless a predicted condition chooses them as the bounded intervention.

Verbal feedback and self-correction. Reflexion showed that language agents can use verbal feedback to improve later decisions [Shinn et al., 2023]. WeaveGuard uses feedback in a narrower systems sense: public branch evidence becomes an auditable control obligation, and official aggregate results are used after the run to attribute workflow




Figure 5: **Result story.** The generated figure summarizes the evidence pattern without embedding fragile numeric labels: WeaveGuard’s best public-portfolio run is stronger than local mini-swe-agent baselines, while some higher-compute ablations regress. Exact pass counts are in Table 4.

failures and calibrate which obligations actually improved repair outcomes.

7 Limitations

The current strongest results are from a local development suite. The 36-task results are useful but not yet a locked, final holdout after all policy tuning. Several related-work entries and future baselines need exact bibliographic verification before submission. The GPT2Img figures are useful for academic storytelling but must be repeatedly checked for text artifacts before final submission. Finally, mixed-model routing must be reported transparently; gains should not be attributed solely to checkpoint control unless model-route controls and 429 audits support that claim.

8 Conclusion

WeaveGuard frames software repair as a checkpointed long-horizon control problem. The system opens lightweight multi-strength branches only when public evidence predicts useful intervention, uses a hybrid online verifier to correct workflow checkpoints, and attributes final failures back to workflow causes. Local SWE-bench Pro evidence shows a strong best run relative to mini-swe-agent baselines, while negative ablations show why the contribution cannot be generic multi-agent scale-out. The central lesson is selective correction: branch when public evidence predicts a useful intervention, and stop, shrink, or roll back when more workers would only amplify uncertainty.

A Artifact and Reproducibility Notes

A.1 Paper Artifact Layout

The paper artifact in this repository is intentionally small:




Figure 6: **Cost and route stability.** The generated figure visualizes the qualitative trade-off: extra branch/debug compute and route instability can reduce official performance. WeaveGuard therefore treats branch utility as a public process signal that must be outcome-calibrated.

- `paper/main.tex`: main ICLR-style draft.
- `paper/appendix.tex`: reproducibility notes and additional evidence tables.
- `paper/references.bib`: bibliography seed.
- `paper/scripts/build_result_figures.py`: standard-library script that regenerates result CSVs and archival SVG diagnostics from public trajectory reports. The main draft uses GPT2Img figures for the visual story and LaTeX tables for exact values.
- `paper/scripts/generate_yunwu_gpt2img.py`: Yunwu OpenAI-compatible GPT-to-image helper for the paper figures.

A.2 Official Result Sources

Table 5 lists the main result evidence used in the draft. Pass counts are taken from documented official aggregate `eval_results.json` results when available; trajectory reports provide mechanism and cost diagnostics only.

A.3 Fairness Checklist

The online repair and selection path must satisfy:

- `PATCHWEAVE_FAIR_MODE=1`.

Setting	Run directory	Pass	Role in paper
mini-swe-agent GPT-5.4-mini	baseline-mini-gpt54mini-28-r1	3/28	baseline
mini-swe-agent GPT-5.4	baseline-mini-gpt54-28-r1	4/28	baseline
WeaveGuard branch-off	patchweave-mixed-28-branchoff-r1	15/28	no-branch control
WeaveGuard public portfolio	patchweave-mixed-28-publicportfolio-r1	19/28	best 28-task result
WeaveGuard evidence closure	patchweave-mixed-28-evidenceclosure-r1	14/28	negative ablation
WeaveGuard route hard	patchweave-mixed-28-routehard-r1	16/28	partial recovery
WeaveGuard route hold	patchweave-mixed-28-routehold-r1	10/28	negative ablation
WeaveGuard local36 PRM selector	patchweave-local36-gpt54-prm-r1	15/36	preliminary holdout

Table 5: Primary local evidence used in the draft. Directory names are under /home/zhangtong/self-improving/swebench-pro/runs/.

- PATCHWEAVE_DISABLE_EXPERIENCE_READ=1 during the current no-memory measurement phase.
- No hidden tests, hidden test paths, raw hidden traces, raw hidden assertion diffs, hidden-gate internals, `_output.json`, or `/work/eval` are used by workers, branch controllers, or verifiers.
- Official aggregate pass counts are read only after a run completes.
- Non-protected model 429 removals are recorded in route audits; protected GPT-5.4 routing is preserved.

A.4 Remaining Submission Gates

Before a serious ICLR submission, the following gates should be closed:

1. Compile the draft in an environment with the official ICLR 2027 style file once released. The current repository includes a lightweight local shim.
2. Freeze a final policy and run a disjoint holdout without memory retrieval, then report it separately from the 28-task development suite.
3. Verify every bibliography entry against primary sources and replace placeholder author fields.
4. Add a sensitivity table for branch thresholds or explicitly label the threshold study as future work.
5. Add final token and wall-clock accounting for the baselines if the original run artifacts contain enough evidence.

References

- Xiang Deng, Jeff Da, Edwin Pan, Yannis Yiming He, Charles Ide, Kanak Garg, Niklas Lauffer, Andrew Park, Nitin Pasari, Chetan Rane, Karmini Sampath, Maya Krishnan, Srivatsa Kundurthy, Sean Hendryx, Zifan Wang, Chen Bo Calvin Zhang, Noah Jacobson, Bing Liu, and Brad Kenstler. SWE-bench Pro: Can ai agents solve long-horizon software engineering tasks? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.16941*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2509.16941>.
- Yifeng Ding and Lingming Zhang. SWE-Replay: Efficient test-time scaling for software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.22129*, 2026. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2601.22129>.
- Carlos E. Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. SWE-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.06770>.
- Hunter Lightman, Vineet Kosaraju, Yura Burda, Harrison Edwards, Bowen Baker, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, John Schulman, Ilya Sutskever, and Karl Cobbe. Let’s verify step by step. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.20050*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.20050>.

Jiayi Pan, Xingyao Wang, Graham Neubig, Navdeep Jaitly, Heng Ji, Alane Suhr, and Yizhe Zhang. Training software engineering agents and verifiers with SWE-Gym. In *Proceedings of the 42nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.21139>. arXiv:2412.21139.

Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.11366*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11366>.

KaShun Shum, Binyuan Hui, Jiawei Chen, Lei Zhang, X. W., Jiayi Yang, Yuzhen Huang, Junyang Lin, and Junxian He. SWE-RM: Execution-free feedback for software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.21919*, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2512.21919>.

Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Sam Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01489*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01489>.

John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. SWE-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.15793*, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.15793>.