

# Process-Centric Analysis of Agentic Software Systems

SHUYANG LIU, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

YANG CHEN, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

RAHUL KRISHNA, IBM Research, USA

SAURABH SINHA, IBM Research, USA

JATIN GANHOTRA, IBM Research, USA

REYHANEH JABBARVAND, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Agentic systems are modern software systems: they consist of orchestrated modules, expose interfaces, and are deployed in software pipelines. Unlike conventional programs, their execution, i.e., trajectories, is inherently stochastic and adaptive to the problem they are solving. Evaluation of such systems is often outcome-centric, i.e., judging their performance based on success or failure *at the final step*. This narrow focus overlooks detailed insights about such systems, failing to explain how agents reason, plan, act, or change their strategies over time. Inspired by the structured representation of conventional software systems as graphs, we introduce GRAPHECTORY to systematically encode the temporal and semantic relations in such software systems. GRAPHECTORY facilitates the design of process-centric metrics and analyses to assess the quality of agentic workflows independent of final success.

Using GRAPHECTORY, we analyze 4000 trajectories of two dominant agentic programming workflows, namely SWE-agent and OpenHands, with a combination of four backbone Large Language Models (LLMs), attempting to resolve SWE-bench Verified issues. Our fully automated analyses reveal that: (1) agents using richer prompts or stronger LLMs exhibit more complex GRAPHECTORY, reflecting deeper exploration, broader context gathering, and more thorough validation before patch submission; (2) agents' problem-solving strategies vary with both problem difficulty and the underlying LLM—for resolved issues, the strategies often follow coherent localization–patching–validation steps, while unresolved ones exhibit chaotic, repetitive, or backtracking behaviors; (3) even when successful, agentic programming systems often display inefficient processes, leading to unnecessarily prolonged trajectories.

## 1 Introduction

Agentic systems powered by large language models (LLMs) have recently emerged as a promising paradigm for autonomously solving complex, multi-step tasks across diverse domains, including software engineering [41, 51, 54, 56], web navigation [36], virtual assistance [19], scientific discovery [10], and robotic navigation [5, 42]. Similar to traditional software systems, agentic systems are built from modules (LLMs, tools, APIs, and memory), and have inputs, internal states, execution logic, and outputs. Instead of a deterministic implementation, however, these software systems operate by producing trajectories—chronological sequences of intermediate reasoning, action, and observation steps—that collectively implement the execution logic for task completion [55]. Evaluation of agentic software systems has been mostly outcome-centric: the correctness and quality of the produced trajectory are determined by whether they can solve a problem.

An outcome-centric evaluation overlooks the intermediate steps that lead there, masking recurrent inefficiencies and preventing us from understanding whether success came from systematic reasoning or by chance. For example, consider the trajectory traces of SWE-agent [54] with Devstral-Small (Figure 1-a) and DeepSeek-V3 (Figure 1-b) for repairing the issue `django-10973` in SWE-bench [22]. From an outcome-centric perspective, both agents, *SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub>* and *SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub>*, successfully repair this issue, and the patches are almost similar. However, their trajectories,

---

Authors' Contact Information: Shuyang Liu, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA, [sl225@illinois.edu](mailto:sl225@illinois.edu); Yang Chen, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA, [yangc9@illinois.edu](mailto:yangc9@illinois.edu); Rahul Krishna, IBM Research, USA, [rkrnsn@ibm.com](mailto:rkrnsn@ibm.com); Saurabh Sinha, IBM Research, USA, [sinhas@us.ibm.com](mailto:sinhas@us.ibm.com); Jatin Ganhotra, IBM Research, USA, [jatinganhotra@us.ibm.com](mailto:jatinganhotra@us.ibm.com); Reyhaneh Jabbarvand, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA, [reyhaneh@illinois.edu](mailto:reyhaneh@illinois.edu).




Fig. 1. Raw trajectories of (a) SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> and (b) SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> when resolving django-10973

i.e., the sequence of reasoning about how to solve the problem and taking the appropriate actions, are different: SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> starts by localizing the bug to `client.py` file (steps 1–4), creating a reproduction test (step 5), and editing multiple locations of the `client.py` (steps 6–8). After two additional repetitive failed edits (step 9–10), it re-views and edits a different block of `client.py` file (steps 11 and 12), executes the previously created reproduction test (step 13) to validate the patch, and concludes with patch submission (steps 14–15). SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub>, also starts the process by localizing the bug to `client.py` file (steps 1–6), but it only edits the file once (step 7) and prepares the final submission of the patch without any validation (steps 8–9). Despite final success, both agents suffer from several strategic pitfalls:

- (1) SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> edits `client.py` line by line in steps 6–8, followed by repeating a failed edit twice in steps 9–10, and the final edit at step 12, compared to SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub>, which generates the patch in one attempt at step 7.
- (2) SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> explores the project structure instinctively, zooming in (step 1), zooming out (step 2), and zooming in again (steps 3–6), until it localizes the bug, compared to SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub>, which zooms in on the project hierarchy step by step to localize the bug.
- (3) None of the agents runs regression tests for patch validation, with SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> only checking if reproduction tests pass on the patch (step 13), and SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> only thinking about the correctness of the patch through edge cases (step 8).

As demonstrated by this example, process-centric analysis, which focuses on trajectories, can provide additional insights about how agents solve or cannot solve a given problem. Recently, there have been several attempts at analyzing agentic workflows [11, 12, 15, 23, 29], with a focus on deriving a taxonomy of failure modes through manual, expert analysis of agentic trajectories. While the failure mode taxonomies are valuable, manual analysis is subject to human bias and incompleteness, and also does not scale to analyses of new agentic systems. More importantly, trajectories in their raw format only represent steps as a linear sequence in chronological order, failing to effectively capture *semantics* of agentic behavior, such as execution flow and problem-solving strategies, and whether they are efficient or follow the expected planning. Systematic

analysis of linear trajectories at scale across different problems to determine *common strategies or pitfalls* is also non-trivial.

To promote systematic and scalable process-centric analysis of agent trajectories, this paper proposes GRAPHECTORY, a rich graph that can be automatically generated from linear trajectory logs. The nodes in GRAPHECTORY are agent actions, and two nodes are connected through an edge if (1) one action temporally follows another in the trajectory log or (2) the two actions operate on subsuming entities within the problem space (§2). In addition to GRAPHECTORY, this paper also introduces LANGUTORY, a human-readable abstract of GRAPHECTORY that represents *language* of trajectories. GRAPHECTORY enables a systematic characterization and quantitative comparison of trajectories given graph properties (§2.2). More importantly, GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY allow a range of process-centric analyses that are not possible with linear trajectory logs, i.e., *Phase Flow Analysis* (§2.3.1) and *Pattern Detection* (§2.3.2), supporting systematic evaluation of how agents solve problems and their inefficiencies, not just whether they succeed or fail.

While GRAPHECTORY applies broadly to any agentic system, we study agentic programming systems, namely SWE-agent [54] and OpenHands [51], due to their rich and diverse trajectories: they involve cycles of planning, bug localization, code modification, and patch validation, all of which can be programmatically assessed. For our experiments, we run these agentic systems with four LLMs as the backbone (DeepSeek-V3 [14], DeepSeek-R1 [18], Devstral-small-2505 [7], and Claude Sonnet 4 [9]), solving real-world GitHub issues across 12 repositories from the SWE-Bench Verified benchmark [37]. Our comprehensive systematic analysis reveals that:

- **Unsuccessful runs are longer and full of inefficiencies.** Across agents and backbone models, GRAPHECTORY of unresolved issues are consistently larger than that of resolved ones, with more back edges, demonstrating more repetitions §3.2.3 and inefficient patterns §3.4.
- **Trajectory complexity grows with task difficulty.** As problems become harder for human developers, agents also explore deeper and wider §3.2.4, with more frequent strategy shifts to sustain progress §3.3.3.
- **Adaptive strategy refinement.** Though agents primarily follow the global plan outlined in the system prompt, they also change their strategy at intermediate turns §3.3. This often requires additional searching and gradual debugging for harder problems.
- **Imbalance between efficiency and Success.** Even when successful in issue repair, agents still exhibit significant inefficiency during problem solving §3.4, showing the importance of process-centric evaluation for highlighting the imbalance between efficiency with repair success.

As agents have shown remarkable performance improvements across a wide range of use cases, specifically on SWE tasks, an in-depth analysis of their capabilities beyond the final outcome has taken a back seat. GRAPHECTORY enables us to dive deeper and further analyze the strengths and weaknesses of today’s agents. Our notable contributions are: (1) A novel structural representation of agent trajectories, i.e., GRAPHECTORY; (2) A novel human-readable abstraction of GRAPHECTORY, representing the language of trajectories, LANGUTORY; (3) A series of process-centric metrics that quantify the complexity of agentic trajectories; (4) A series of process-centric analyses to investigate problem-solving strategies and inefficiency patterns of agents; and (5) systematic evaluation of 4000 trajectories, obtained from *eight* (agent, model) pairs, providing the community with a rich dataset to explore future process-centric analyses algorithms on top of GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY.

## 2 Process-Centric Data Structures, Metrics, and Analyses

We formally define GRAPHECTORY below, and will use the notions to define process-centric evaluation metrics (§2.2) and analysis (§2.3). To illustrate the definitions and concepts, we use GRAPHECTORY examples obtained from programming agents’ trajectories.

**Definition 1 (GRAPHECTORY).** GRAPHECTORY is a cyclic directed graph  $G = (V, TE \uplus SE)$ .

- Each node  $v_x = (k_x, p_x, l_x, S_x, O_x, B_x) \in V$  corresponds to a distinct action taken by the agent in the trajectory to accomplish a task.<sup>1</sup>  $k_x$  represents the *unique key* that distinguishes  $v_x$  from other nodes as a combination of *action type* and *action arguments*;  $p_x$  denotes the problem-specific *logical phase* that the action belongs to;  $l_x$  represents the structural navigation level at which the action is taken;  $S_x$  is a list of incoming edges to  $v_x$ , each representing a *trajectory step*  $s_x^i$ , at which the action is taken;  $O_x$  is a list such that the binary value  $o_x^i$  represents the *outcome of action* at trajectory step  $s_x^i$ ; and  $B_x$  is a list such that the  $b_x^i$  determines agent’s *observations* at trajectory step  $s_x^i$ .
- A *temporal edge*  $e_{x,y} = (v_x, u_y, s_x^i) \in TE$  encodes a transition at trajectory step  $s_x^i$  from action  $v_x$  to action  $u_y$  in the chronological execution order. A *structural edge*  $e'_{x,y} = (v_x, u_y) \in SE$ , where  $l_x \geq l_y$ , represents a subsuming navigation relationship, which can vary depending on the problem domain: directory  $\mapsto$  file  $\mapsto$  block in software engineering, room  $\mapsto$  zone  $\mapsto$  object in robotics, or theory  $\mapsto$  hypothesis  $\mapsto$  experiment in scientific discovery.  $TE$  captures the temporal problem-solving progress, whereas  $SE$  demonstrates navigation in the problem space.

While GRAPHECTORY provides a rich representation of an agentic software system in-depth semantics analysis, graphs alone can be overly detailed and challenging to compare across agents, backbone LLMs, or problems. To complement the structural view, we define LANGUTORY, a compact, human-readable abstraction of the GRAPHECTORY that represents *language* of trajectories.

**Definition 2 (LANGUTORY).** Given a GRAPHECTORY  $G = (V, TE \uplus SE)$ , the corresponding LANGUTORY is defined as  $\mathcal{L}(G, \Phi) = \prod_{v_i \in V} \pi(v_i)$ , where  $\pi : V \rightarrow \Phi$  is a projection that maps each node  $v_x$  to a symbol in the alphabet  $\Phi$ .

By varying the alphabet  $\Phi$  and using different vocabularies, we can examine agents from various perspectives. For example, when the alphabet symbols correspond to logical, problem-specific phases, LANGUTORY provides a compact summary of the phase sequences that agents follow while solving problems, and an overview of their problem-solving strategy. This enables *rapid* identification of shared or divergent strategies, and systematic comparison of how different agents structure their problem-solving processes.

Another important benefit of LANGUTORY is determining agents’ planning deviations from the *expected plan*, introduced to the agents by the system’s prompts. For example, SWE-agent instructs agents to resolve the issue [45] by finding the code relevant to the issue description, generating a reproduction test to confirm the error, editing the source code, running tests to validate the fix, and thinking about edge cases to ensure the issue is resolved. OpenHands provides more detailed instructions [38]: read the problem and reword it in clearer terms, install and run the tests, find the files that are related to the problem, create a script to reproduce and verify the issue before implementing fix, state clearly the problem and how to fix it, edit the source code, test the changes, and perform a final analysis and check. These instructions can serve as the *problem grammar*, providing us a ground truth to check LANGUTORY of agents against to determine whether their *local* step-by-step ReAct is correct or not.

## 2.1 GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY Construction

Given a trajectory log, GRAPHECTORY defines the nodes as trajectory actions. Agents may bundle multiple low-level actions into one composite action [21, 33, 44]. Hence, to better capture trajectory

<sup>1</sup>We only consider actions as nodes, and not reasoning, since agents follow the ReAct principle [55], and all actions are due to a prior reasoning. Because reasonings are hard to distinguish, adding generic reasoning nodes is not useful and increases the graph size and complexity.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Phase Labeling of GRAPHECTORY
 

---

**Input:** Phase-agnostic GRAPHECTORY  $G' = ((k_x, \perp, S_x, O_x, B_x) \in V, TE \cup SE)$ , Phase Map  $map$

**Output:** GRAPHECTORY  $G = ((k_x, p_x, S_x, O_x, B_x) \in V, TE \cup SE)$

```

1: for all  $v_x \in G'.V$  do
2:   if  $|map[k_x.action]| == 1$  then                                 $\triangleright$  Checks if  $map$  contains a unique phase for the action
3:      $p_x \leftarrow \text{getPhase}(map, k_x.action)$ 
4:     continue
5:    $\text{isTest} \leftarrow \text{isTestFile}(v_x.k_x.args)$                      $\triangleright$  Checks if the action is performed on a test file
6:    $\text{afterPatch} \leftarrow \text{patchingPerformed}(\langle v_0, \dots, v_{x-1} \rangle)$   $\triangleright$  Checks if any patching is done by prior actions
7:   if  $a \in \{\text{create, str\_replace, insert, sed, touch}\}$  or redirection then
8:      $p_x \leftarrow \text{isTest} ? (\text{afterPatch} ? V : L) : P$ 
9:     continue
10:  if  $\text{cmd} \in \{\text{grep, cat, find, ls, echo}\}$  then
11:     $p_x \leftarrow (\text{isTest} \wedge \text{afterPatch}) ? V : L$ 
12:    continue
13:  if  $\text{cmd} \in \{\text{python, pytest}\}$  then
14:     $p_x \leftarrow \text{afterPatch} ? V : L$ 
15:    continue
16:   $p_x \leftarrow \text{general}$ 
17:  $G \leftarrow G'$ 
18: return  $G$ 

```

---

semantics, e.g., strategy changes or repeated actions, GRAPHECTORY disaggregates the composite actions into individuals. After defining the nodes, GRAPHECTORY adjusts the edges based on whether an action temporally follows another in the trajectory log or the two actions operate on subsuming entities within the problem space. GRAPHECTORY allows multiple temporal edges between the same node pairs to represent repeated action transitions at different steps. To reflect the agent’s logical workflow, GRAPHECTORY groups nodes into color-coded subgraphs based on logical problem-solving phases, assuming a provided action-phase mapping. If an action does not fit into such phases, GRAPHECTORY considers that as a *general* action.

For programming agents and in the context of the issue repair problem, we follow the best practices in software engineering to determine three logical phases [25, 28, 32, 52]: **Localization** phase, which should pinpoint the location of the issue in the code; **Patching** phase, which modifies the code at the specified locations to resolve the issue; and **Validation** phase, which ensures the modification resolves the issue without any regression. For the actions, where the corresponding tool or command does not fit into any of these problem-related categories, e.g., `submit` command in SWE-agent prepares the patch for submission, we label the phase as **General**.

To map the logical phases to GRAPHECTORY nodes, we adopted the following systematic annotation procedure: two authors and a frontier LLM, i.e., GPT-5,<sup>2</sup> independently labeled each action with at least one of the predefined phases (or *general* if inapplicable). Human annotators relied on domain knowledge and existing tool documentation [20, 46] or command manual (e.g., `man [action-name]`) rather than LLMs, to avoid contamination of decisions across annotators. This procedure balances human expertise, automated support, and reproducibility, while mitigating bias from any single annotator. When all annotators agreed, we assigned the consensus label to a given action; otherwise, the two human annotators met to reach consensus, considering the LLM thought process in the discussion.<sup>3</sup> All annotators noted that some tools can be used in different phases:

<sup>2</sup>We chose GPT-5 as the annotator as it was not used as a backbone LLM in our experiments.

<sup>3</sup>The details of labeling by annotators are available in our artifacts.

**Algorithm 2:** LANGUTORY Construction**Input:** GRAPHECTORY  $G = (V, TE \uplus SE)$ , alphabet  $\Phi = \{L, P, V\}$ **Output:** LANGUTORY  $\mathcal{L}$ 


---

```

1:  $PO, RL \leftarrow [], vocabIndex \leftarrow 1$ 
2:  $FG \leftarrow \text{flattenGraphectomy}(V:V.S, TE)$   $\triangleright$  Sort nodes according to step index  $s_x^i$  along temporal edges
3: for all  $v_x \in FG$  do
4:   if  $p_x \in \Phi$  then
5:      $vocab \leftarrow \text{assignVocabulary}(FG[x].p_x, \Phi)$ 
6:     if  $vocabIndex = 1$  or  $vocab \neq PO[vocabIndex - 1]$  then  $\triangleright$  Start or new phase
7:        $PO[vocabIndex] \leftarrow vocab$ 
8:        $RL[vocabIndex] \leftarrow 1$ 
9:        $vocabIndex \leftarrow vocabIndex + 1$ 
10:    else
11:       $RL[vocabIndex - 1] \leftarrow RL[vocabIndex - 1] + 1$   $\triangleright$  Extend run length
12:  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \text{constructLanguage}(PO, RL)$ 
13: return  $\mathcal{L}$ 

```

---

- File editing tools, for example, `create`, `str_replace`, and `insert` can be used to create or modify a *test* file for the purpose of *reproducing the issue* (Localization), an *application* file for the purpose of fixing the bug (Patching), or a *test* file for the purpose of validating a generated patch (Validation).
- Some commands that are primarily used for viewing file contents can also be used to modify or create a file. For example, `cat [FILE_PATH]` tells the shell to read a file identified by the `FILE_PATH`. In its commonly used form, the agents may use it to read an application code to pinpoint the buggy line (Localization phase) or determine the set of proper regression tests to be executed (Validation phase). However, commands such as `cat`, `grep`, and `echo` can use redirection (`>` or `>>`) to create or modify existing files. Depending on the context for creating or modifying a file, the command can be used in Localization, Patching, and Validation, similar to the first scenario.
- For debugging, testing can be used for bug localization or validating the generated patch. The agents use python for executing newly generated reproduction or regression tests, or pytest for executing existing regression tests. Again, depending on the context, the same tool/command usage can be used for different purposes and, consequently, assigned to different phases.

As a result of the post-annotation discussions, we devise Algorithm 1 for *phase labeling*: given the phase-agnostic GRAPHECTORY  $G'$  (constructed with empty phase labels) and the phase map *map* derived by annotators, the algorithm goes over all the GRAPHECTORY nodes  $v_x$  and directly assigns the phase from *map*, if a unique phase exists for an action (lines 2–4); otherwise, it analyzes the context, i.e., whether the action is performed on a test file (line 5) or any patching is done by prior actions (line 6), and assigns the phase according to the consensus among the annotators (lines 7–16). This algorithm enables the construction of GRAPHECTORY for any agentic programming system. For agents with different tools, the users can update the phase map with minimal overhead compared to the initial effort.

Algorithm 2 describes the LANGUTORY construction by extracting a compressed sequence of phases from GRAPHECTORY. It goes through each node in temporal order and compresses consecutive identical phases into a compact representation with run-length encoding. For example, Figure 2-a is compressed to  $L_5P_5LPV$ , with  $[L, P, L, P, V]$  as the phase skeleton  $PO$ ,  $[5, 5, 1, 1, 1]$  as the run length  $RL$ . Figure 2-b is compressed to  $L_6P$ , with  $[L, P]$  as the phase skeleton  $PO$ ,  $[6, 1]$  as the run length  $RL$ .

Figure 2 demonstrates the GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY of SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> (Figure 2-a) and SWE-agent<sub>DSK-v3</sub> (Figure 2-b) to solve problem `django-10973` of SWE-bench. The phases are color-coded as **Localization**, **Patching**, **Validation**, and **General**. The solid black lines and green






Fig. 2. GRAPHECTORY of SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> (a) and SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> (b) for problem django-10973

dashed lines demonstrate temporal edges (*TE*) and structural edges (*SE*), respectively. The alphabet of LANGUTORY is  $\Phi = \{L, P, V\}$ , representing the initial of unique logical phases in program repair: Localization, Patching, and Validation. GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY promptly provide the following insights about the agents' behavior:

- In the GRAPHECTORY of SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub>, there is a *self-back edge* 9 and *back edge* 10, both indicating potential inefficiencies in agent reasoning or tool usage, resulting in repeating failed edits or refining the localization plan (first pitfall in §1).
- In the GRAPHECTORY of SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub>, we observe opposite directions of *structural* edges and *temporal* edges during the bug localization. This immediately suggests inefficiency in the analysis of issue description, causing the agent to go deep and come back and go deep again into the code base hierarchy (second pitfall in §1).
- Comparing LANGUTORY of SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> ( $L_5P_5LPV$ ) and SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> ( $L_6P$ ) with the expected planning introduced to agents by SWE-agent [54] ( $LPV$ ), we can observe that SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> performs no validation on the generated patch, and only *thinks* that the patch resolved the issue. Relying solely on regression tests without performing reproduction testing (or even worse, not performing any testing) is flawed because it verifies only that no new issues are introduced, but fails to confirm whether the original failure has actually been resolved [27, 32].

As we discussed before, agentic systems, in general, and agentic programming systems, in particular, can be viewed as modern software systems. For classic software systems, the interprocedural control flow graph (CFG) captures the execution semantics. Similarly, GRAPHECTORY serves as a structured representation of agentic trajectories, where execution of each step forms the functionality of the agents. Inspired by this relationship, we present a series of process-centric metrics (§2.2) and process-centric analyses (§2.3) using GRAPHECTORY.

## 2.2 Metrics

GRAPHECTORY enables computation of process-centric metrics for analysis of agentic systems. Table 1 lists six metrics supported by the current implementation of GRAPHECTORY,<sup>4</sup> along with their formal definitions capturing how they can be computed from a given GRAPHECTORY. These

<sup>4</sup>The rich semantic structure of GRAPHECTORY enables the introduction of an unlimited number of metrics and analyses, similar to CFGs for classic software. This paper discusses the metrics that we believe are more general yet representative.

Table 1. Process-centric metrics and their formal definition for GRAPHECTORY  $G = (V, TE \uplus SE)$ .

Metric	Formal Definition	Description
Node Count ( $NC$ )	$ V  = \sum_{v_x \in V} v_x$	Number of distinct actions.
Temporal Edge Count ( $TEC$ )	$ TE  = \sum_{e_{x,y} \in TE} e_{x,y}$	Total number of temporal transitions.
Loop Count ( $LC$ )	$\sum_{v_m=v_n} \{ (v_m \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_n) \mid (v_{i-1}, v_i) \in TE \}$	Number of times the agent decides to repeat a previously executed action.
Average Loop Length ( $ALL$ )	$\frac{\sum_{v_m=v_n} \{ (v_m \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_n) \mid (v_{i-1}, v_i) \in TE \}}{\sum_{v_m=v_n} \{ (v_m \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow v_n) \mid (v_{i-1}, v_i) \in TE \}}$	The average number of actions involved before an agent decides to repeat a previously executed action.
Structural Edge Count ( $SEC$ )	$ SE  = \sum_{e'_{x,y} \in SE} e'_{x,y}$	Total number of structural connections.
Structural Breadth ( $SB$ )	$\max_{v_x \in V}  \{v_y \in V \mid (v_x, v_y) \in SE\} $	Maximum out-degree considering structural edges, indicating effort focus.

metrics capture *the extent of effort* an agent performs to resolve a task. Alone, their values cannot reveal whether the effort is useful or useless. But they can be used to assess how the effort is aligned with the difficulty of the problems agents are trying to solve, or whether agents succeed in solving them. We explain each metric and the intuition about its importance below:

- **Node Count ( $NC$ )**. This metric measures the number of distinct actions the agent makes in the trajectory. A larger  $NC$  value indicates that the agent needed to execute more diverse actions to solve the problem. From the example of Figure 2, we can see that SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> executes more actions compared to SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> (13 versus 9). As we show later,  $NC$  is positively correlated with the strength of the backbone LLM (§3.2.2) or problem difficulty (§3.2.4), each of which entails exploration of a wider range of actions.
- **Temporal Edge Count ( $TEC$ )**. This metric measures the total number of temporal transitions between actions. A higher  $TEC$  reflects a longer execution path to termination. Figure 2 shows a longer execution chain for SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> (14) compared to SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> (8). Similar to  $NC$ , the values of  $TEC$  are positively correlated with the problem difficulty, aligning the overall GRAPHECTORY complexity with problem difficulty.
- **Loop Count ( $LC$ )**. This metric measures the number of times the agent decides to repeat a previously executed action. As we demonstrate later (§3.2), larger  $LC$  can indicate a non-optimized strategy resulting in the agent being stuck by unsuccessful actions, e.g., the self-loop of edge 9 in Figure 2-a, or needing to refine a previous reasoning and planning after a series of actions that cannot solve the problem, e.g., back edge 10 in Figure 2-a (§3.3.2). Alternatively, the agent may need to re-execute an action (or series of actions) to solve a complex problem gradually.  $LC$  is similar to the Cyclomatic Complexity [35] for classic software, which measures the degree of branching and the number of unique execution paths. In the context of GRAPHECTORY, branching indicates that local reasoning redirects execution flow to a different path.
- **Average Loop Length ( $ALL$ )**. This metric measures the average number of actions involved before an agent decides to repeat a previously executed action. Intuitively, the longer it takes for an agent to realize its reasoning and corresponding actions are not effective in solving the problem, the weaker its reasoning or ability to gather proper contexts for reasoning is. As our results show, agents that invest in collecting a richer context during localization are less likely to have long loops, i.e., they can quickly determine reasoning inefficiency and change their strategies accordingly (§3.2.1 and §3.3.2).



- **Structural Edge Count (SEC).** This metric measures the total number of structural edges in GRAPHECTORY, reflecting the number of structural regions that the agent explores until termination. A higher number of SEC for SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> in Figure 2 demonstrates that it took longer for this agent to find the correct edit location, compared to SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub>. Our results show that stronger LLMs exhibit more exploration of structural regions, collecting more context to increase the likelihood of problem-solving (§3.2.2).
- **Structural Breadth (SB).** This metric measures the maximum out-degree considering structural edges seen in GRAPHECTORY, indicating the navigation effort focus. A higher number for SB indicates the agent’s difficulty in converging to the correct code regions for solving the problem. In the example of Figure 2-b, SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> scans two sibling subdirectories ( $SB = 2$ ), indicating its subpar reasoning or tool/command usage to localize the bug in the first attempt. As we discuss later,  $SB > 1$  can also indicate more dedicated context gathering, which eventually helps the model to find the correct edit location faster (§3.2.1).

### 2.3 Process-centric Analyses

We categorize the process-centric semantic analyses of agents’ behavior into two categories: Phase Flow Analyses (§2.3.1) and Pattern Detection (§2.3.2).

**2.3.1 Phase Flow Analyses.** Phase Flow Analyses aim to study problem-solving strategies of agents independent of low-level actions. Specifically, these analyses take the GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY as input, and focus on analyzing phase transitions, strategy changes, and shared strategies.

**2.3.1.1. Phase Transition Analysis.** Phase transition sequence is the abstract representation of an agent’s LANGUTORY, and an overview of its problem-solving strategy.

**Definition 3 (Phase Transition Sequence).** Given a LANGUTORY  $\mathcal{L}(G, \Phi)$ , phase transition analysis aggregates consecutive identical phases in LANGUTORY, and provides a phase transition sequence as  $\mathcal{PTS}(G, \Phi) = \prod_{p_j \neq p_{j+1}} p_j \in \Phi$ .

In the example of Figure 2-a, the phase transition sequence that SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> goes through to solve the problem of `django-10973` is *LPLPV*. This representation signals that the agent, after attempting to localize the bug and patch it, decides to make another attempt at localization to repair the issue completely, corroborated by the subsequent validation. In addition to analyzing the phase transitions in individual runs, our pipeline can also aggregate them across all trajectories of an agent and present them as a Sankey diagram, revealing the dominant strategic flows (§3.3.1).

**2.3.1.2. Strategy Change Analysis.** Considering a set of  $n$  phases, the phase transition sequence may represent up to  $n(n - 1)$  unique phase transitions. The phase transition sequence *LPLPV* of SWE-agent<sub>Dev</sub> demonstrates three unique phase transitions:  $L \rightarrow P$  (repeated twice),  $P \rightarrow L$ , and  $P \rightarrow V$ . For a phase transition  $p_i \rightarrow p_j$ , the transition follows the logical phase flow if  $p_j$  is the expected immediate successor of  $p_i$ . In the context of agentic programming systems and  $p_i \in \Phi = \{L, P, V\}$ , the logical phase flow is  $L \rightarrow P \rightarrow V$  (first localize the bug, next patch, and finally validate). The phase transition may also represent a strategic *shortcut* or *backtrack*. A strategic shortcut happens when agents skip one or multiple logical phases in the phase transition, e.g.,  $L \rightarrow V$ . A strategic backtrack happens when  $p_j$  is a predecessor of  $p_i$ , e.g.,  $P \rightarrow L$  or  $V \rightarrow P$ .

The strategy change analysis takes the phase transition sequence as input, determines the number of unique phase transitions, and flags strategic shortcuts or backtracks for further investigation. As our results show, the strategic shortcut of  $L \rightarrow V$  is common in strong models such as Claude 4, indicating the review of the generated patch and its dependencies to create and execute validation tests (§3.3.2). Strategic backtracks also happen due to two main reasons: agents may require multiple revisits of logical phases to gradually solve a difficult problem, or reasoning inefficiency that requires

**Algorithm 3:** Shared Strategy Analysis**Input:** List of LANGUTORY  $[\mathcal{L}_i]_{i=1}^n$ **Output:** Longest Common Shared Strategy Pattern  $\mathcal{LCP}$ 


---

```

1:  $[\mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}] \leftarrow []$ 
2: for all  $\mathcal{L}_i \in [\mathcal{L}_i]_{i=1}^n$  do
3:    $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}_i \leftarrow \text{getPhaseTransitionSequence}(\mathcal{L}_i)$ 
4:    $[\mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}] \leftarrow \text{append}([\mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}], \mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}_i)$ 
5:  $\pi^* \leftarrow \text{generalizedSequentialPattern}([\mathcal{P}\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}_i]_{i=1}^n)$ 
6:  $B_j \leftarrow []$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, |\pi^*|\}$  ▷ Initialize buckets to collect phase durations
7: for all  $\mathcal{L}_i \in [\mathcal{L}_i]_{i=1}^n$  do
8:    $(\text{match}, k) \leftarrow \text{findMatch}(\pi^*, \mathcal{L}_i)$  ▷ Find the inception of  $\pi^*$  in the LANGUTORY
9:   if  $\text{match}$  then
10:     for  $j = 1$  to  $|\pi^*|$  do
11:        $B_j \leftarrow \text{append}(B_j, \text{phaseSize}(\mathcal{L}_i.\pi(v_{k_j})))$ 
12:  $\text{RL} \leftarrow [\min B_j \text{ if } B_j \neq \emptyset \text{ else } 1]_{j=1}^{|\pi^*|}$  ▷ Minimum run-length bounds
13:  $\mathcal{LCP} \leftarrow \text{getLCP}(\pi^*, \text{RL})$ 
14: return  $\mathcal{LCP}$ 

```

---

an agent to refine its local planning and explore a different strategy to solve the problem. The root cause can be automatically detected by looking at the *outcome*  $o_x$  of the last action in the phase before transition: if the outcome, which is a binary variable (Definition 1), is false, the backtrack is triggered due to a reasoning or tool usage inefficiency. Otherwise, the agent revisits logical phases as part of its normal problem-solving process (§3.3.2). For example, in the strategic backtrack of  $P \rightarrow L$ , if the outcome of the last patching action is false, the agent attempts a better localization. But if it was successful, the agent likely reviews the source code to find or generate validation tests.

**2.3.1.3. Shared Strategy Analysis.** The last step of the Phase Flow Analyses (shown in Algorithm 3) extracts shared strategic subsequences for a given agent across different trajectories, obtained by executing actions to solve different problems. Taking a list of LANGUTORY instances as input, Algorithm 3 first computes their corresponding phase transition sequences (lines 1–3), and then uses the Generalized Sequential Pattern (GSP) algorithm [43] to find the longest common subsequences across all phase transition sequences (line 4).<sup>5</sup> At the next step, it finds the inception of the identified common pattern in each LANGUTORY (line 7) to determine phase lengths corresponding to the run-length encoding (lines 8–10). To account for the difference in phase lengths, Algorithm 3 takes the minimum run-length across all LANGUTORY (line 11) to adjust the common strategy pattern (line 12).

Consider the two agents whose GRAPHECTORY is shown in Figure 2. Given the two LANGUTORY of these agents,  $L_5P_3LPV$  and  $L_6P$ , and their phase transition sequences,  $LPLPV$  and  $LP$ , Algorithm 3 determines  $LP$  as the longest common pattern. Next, it checks the run-length of the common pattern in the LANGUTORY, and returns  $L_5P$  as the shared strategic pattern between these two agents. As we will see (§3.3.3), the common problem-solving strategies in agents vary based on problem difficulty, whether or not the problem is solved successfully, and the strength of the backbone LLM.

**2.3.2 Pattern Detection.** GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY are rich structures that enhance the mining of both *known* and *unknown but common* patterns. Phase Flow Analysis, and specifically Shared Strategy Analysis, demonstrates the usefulness of the structures in mining common unknown patterns. Pattern Detection Analysis complements that by enabling the search for known patterns

<sup>5</sup>We set `min_support` to 0.3 in the GSP algorithm for our experiments. This threshold ensures statistical robustness while capturing meaningful behavioral patterns, consistent with established pattern mining practices [26].

in GRAPHECTORY or LANGUTORY of agents. The prominent use case of pattern detection is finding known failure modes or suspected strategic inefficiencies in GRAPHECTORY. As we show later (§3.4), this enables a systematic and large-scale analysis of programming agents’ failure modes: users can sample a relatively small number of failures, manually investigate them to determine a list of (anti-)patterns with respect to the sampled data, and then search for these patterns among other runs systematically and without manual effort.

### 3 Experiments

We demonstrate the usefulness of GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY in enabling systematic analysis of agentic programming systems through the following research questions:

- RQ1. Process-centric Metrics.** What are the GRAPHECTORY characteristics of programming agents concerning process-centric metrics? What factors impact the metric values?
- RQ2. Analysis of Problem-solving Strategies.** What are the most common problem-solving strategies in programming agents? What factors impact their strategic behavior? To what extent LANGUTORY of agents follows the expected planning? To what extent do agents evolve or change their problem-solving strategies during execution?
- RQ3. Inefficiency Pattern Analysis.** What are the common GRAPHECTORY (anti-)patterns consistent among the agents’ behavior? How prevalent are these patterns?

#### 3.1 Experiment Setup

We study two autonomous, open-process, and widely used programming agents: SWE-agent (SA) and OpenHands (OH) for the evaluation.<sup>6</sup> We follow each framework’s default configurations to run the experiments: SWE-agent uses a per-instance cost cap of \$2; OpenHands runs for a maximum of 100 trajectory iterations; both use their default file-viewing and code-editing tools. We pair the agents with four LLMs: **DeepSeek-V3** 671B MoE (DSK-V3) [14], **DeepSeek-R1** (DSK-R1) [18], **Devstral-small-2505** 24B coding-specialized open weights (Dev) [7], and **Claude Sonnet 4** (CLD-4) [9]. Our choice of LLMs includes both general and reasoning models, as well as frontier and open-source models, providing *eight* ⟨agent, model⟩ settings and enabling analysis of results concerning different training strategies.

We report *Pass@1* results, i.e., the first submission per issue. LLMs are inherently non-deterministic, which can impact their trajectories and outcomes over multiple runs. We account for this inherent non-determinism by performing cross-analysis of the trajectories over multiple problems with different levels of difficulty, reporting the median and interquartile range values, and analyzing the aggregated results over all problems in addition to individual analysis of ⟨agent, model⟩ pairs. All experiments use **SWE-Bench Verified** [37], which consists of 500 real GitHub issues (a human-validated subset of SWE-Bench), providing a total of  $4000 = 500 \times 8$  trajectories for analysis.

#### 3.2 RQ1: Process-centric Metrics

In this research question, we compute the values of process-centric metrics (Table 1 in §2.2) for each ⟨agent, model⟩ pair. Figure 3 shows the collected values across resolved (green columns marked with R) and unresolved (pink columns marked with U) issues. The top blue row reports the *resolution rate*, and each heatmap cell shows the *median* of the metric and *Interquartile Range (IQR)*, representing the spread around the median. Darker colors correspond to higher metric values.

**3.2.1 Analysis Across Agents.** Overall, we can observe that the GRAPHECTORY of OpenHands are more complex compared to that of SWE-agent, corroborated by the higher values of metrics. This

<sup>6</sup>We do not study pipelines such as Agentless [53], as the defined pipeline denotes the agent’s strategies. We also do not include Refact [40] due to known persistent technical issues during setup and execution.




Fig. 3. Process-centric metrics by agent-model pair. Columns are grouped by *agent* and *model*; within each pair, the left column **R** summarizes *resolved* runs and the right column **U** summarizes *unresolved* runs. The top blue row reports the resolution rate. Each heatmap cell reports  $\langle \frac{Median}{IQR} \rangle$  for the metric in that row.

indicates that OpenHands puts more effort into solving the problem, likely due to the detailed instructions in its system prompt [38] compared to SWE-agent [45] (detailed discussion in §2).

Figure 4 shows the GRAPHECTORY of OpenHands<sub>DSK-V3</sub> (left) and SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> (right) for solving SWE-bench issue `djanga-13820`. Both agents resolve the issue. However, the GRAPHECTORY of OpenHands<sub>DSK-V3</sub> is more complex compared to SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub>. Looking more closely, OpenHands<sub>DSK-V3</sub> first runs a test to localize the issue, searches and inspects related files, executes additional tests to ensure proper localization (step 7), then navigates back to the source to read the buggy code and generate the patch. It finally runs tests to validate the fix. OpenHands also issues composite shell commands within single steps (e.g., `cd && python` chained), showing denser reasoning per step and more frequent navigation switches. In contrast, the GRAPHECTORY of SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> (Figure 4-b) is simple: it narrows quickly to the target file via a few views and applies a single edit (step 4) and then submits that patch with no test execution for validation. The two behaviors illustrate a trade-off: both solve the problem, OpenHands invests extra effort to gather context and validate, whereas SWE-agent relies on concise localization and a direct edit patch.

**3.2.2 Analysis Across LLMs.** Stronger LLMs, e.g., Claude Sonnet 4, which consistently ranks among the top-performing LLMs on different tasks, tend to have a more complex GRAPHECTORY. As we will discuss in more detail (§3.3), this is because they tend to gather more context and run extra tests to ensure the patch works and avoid regressions. The Devstral model, which is a relatively small open-source model, also has a more complex GRAPHECTORY, specifically when used with OpenHands. We believe this is because it has been trained using the OpenHands agent scaffold for software tasks [6], encouraging extra searches and test runs before committing edits.

**3.2.3 Analysis Across Repair Status.** We further want to see if there is a correlation between the process-centric metrics and repair status, i.e., whether the agent can resolve the issue. To that end,




Fig. 4. GRAPHECTORY of OpenHands DSK-V3 (a) and SWE-agent DSK-V3 (b) for problem django-13820




Fig. 5.  $p$ -values of statistical tests on (a) issue repair status and (b) human difficulty alignment. Cells with  $\star$  indicates significant difference ( $p \leq 0.05$ )

we perform the Mann-Whitney U test [34] for each metric across all (agent, model) pairs. This non-parametric statistical test ranks all observations from both groups (a process-centric metric and repair status) and compares the sum of ranks between the two groups. A significant result indicates that the distributions of the two groups differ.

Figure 5-a shows the  $p$ -values obtained from this test: most cells show significant differences ( $p \leq 0.05$ , marked with  $\star$ ), indicating that the process-centric metrics effectively distinguish successful and unsuccessful repairs, except for Claude Sonnet 4 as the backbone LLM. As we discuss later (§3.3–§3.4), other LLMs prefer shortcuts in structural navigation, i.e., reason and jump into the suspected file location without broad exploration. On the other hand, Claude Sonnet 4 tends to visit more structural regions to collect the proper context required for effective problem solving. Similarly, other LLMs terminate with shorter trajectories as soon as they resolve the issue. In contrast, Claude Sonnet 4 consistently validates the generated patches with multiple rounds of test execution, resulting in a more complex GRAPHECTORY.

When comparing a reasoning model, DeepSeek-R1, with its general counterpart, DeepSeek-V3, we see that the correlation between process-centric metrics and repair status is overall positive; yet, the  $p$ -values for DeepSeek-R1 are smaller. Through manual investigation of the DeepSeek-R1




Fig. 6. GRAPHECTORY of SWE-agent DSK-V3 for (a) problem sympy-13480 (easy) and (b) problem scikit-learn-14053 (medium)

trajectories, we observed many early terminations due to runtime issues caused by its failure to provide model responses in the correct format, which is a known issue.<sup>7</sup>

**3.2.4 Analysis Across Problem Difficulty.** Finally, we assess, using the process-centric metrics, how problem difficulty impacts agent behavior. SWE-Bench Verified determines problem difficulty based on how long it takes a human to fix the issues: *Easy* (less than 15 minutes), *Medium* (15–60 minutes), *Hard* (1–4 hours), and *Very Hard* (more than 4 hours). For this analysis, we used Kendall’s  $\tau_b$  test [24]. Figure 5-b shows the  $p$ -values for all agent–model pairs, where most cells show significant positive trends ( $p \leq 0.05$ , marked with \*), i.e., a consistent monotonic trend between each metric and the difficulty ranking. This analysis demonstrates that, similar to humans who need more time to fix more difficult problems, agents also put more effort into resolving more difficult issues.

Figure 6 contrasts two resolved cases for SWE-agent DSK-V3. The *Easy* task (Figure 6-a, sympy-13480) converges in 10 steps: the agent jumps straight to the buggy file, creates and runs a small reproduction test, edits, re-runs the test, and submits. The *Medium* task (Figure 6-b, scikit-learn-14053) takes 15 steps: the agent first searches the directory and scrolls up and down to locate the buggy area. It also adds extra tests to cover edge cases before submitting. Together with the statistics, these examples show a clear alignment: as human difficulty increases, agents require greater effort to find the correct solution (e.g., perform more extensive searches and include more tests).

**Findings.** Process-centric metrics correlate with both repair success and human-rated difficulty. Successful runs tend to be shorter and focused, while unresolved ones exhibit longer paths and redundant loops. The GRAPHECTORY complexity is also affected by agent design and backbone LLMs. Stronger models produce a denser GRAPHECTORY with broader exploration.

### 3.3 RQ2: Analysis of Problem-solving Strategies

Beyond whether agents ultimately succeed or fail in repairing an issue, we further investigate the underlying agents’ behavior using the Phase Flow Analysis series (§2.3.1).

**3.3.1 Phase Transitions Analysis.** To better illustrate the phase flow of the studied (agent, model) pairs, we present the aggregated phase transition sequence ( $PTS$ ) of each pair across the 500 SWE-bench Verified issues for the first 10 phase transitions (Figure 7). The average number of consecutive phase transitions among the studied agents is 8.39, making the cut-off of 10 reasonable

<sup>7</sup><https://aider.chat/2024/08/14/code-in-json.html>






Fig. 7. Phase transition sequences (cut-off = 10)




Fig. 8. Distribution of terminal trajectory phases

to reflect overall phase transition flow. We also study the termination phases of  $\mathcal{PTS}$ s separately in Figure 8, covering cases with more than 10 phase changes (max = 188).

Figure 7 shows that the majority of  $\mathcal{PTS}$ s across all  $\langle \text{agent}, \text{model} \rangle$  pairs *start* with localization ( $L$ ), reflecting an initial effort to localize the bug. Using the same LLM, SWE-agent usually leaves localization  $L$  within one or two transitions (indicated by the size of  $L$  bars at each transition index) and quickly settles into short ( $P, V$ ) cycles, indicating an early attempt to generate and validate a patch. In contrast, OpenHands tends to remain in  $L$  for longer during the first ten iterations, suggesting a longer localization process. This can also explain observing SWE-agent terminating sooner than OpenHands, corroborated by higher flow density to  $T$  in earlier transition indices.

Figure 8 illustrates the terminal phase, categorized by agents’ success in repairing the problems (inner and outer donuts reflect the distribution of the terminal phase for resolved and unresolved issues, respectively). From this figure, we see that resolved trajectories almost always conclude in  $V$ , reflecting successful validation and convergence on a good patch. Unresolved runs, however, frequently end in  $L$  or  $P$ , which means the fixing process is incomplete; the agent either tries multiple rounds of bug localization or oscillates between generating patches without validation.

**3.3.2 Strategy Change Analysis.** As discussed in §2.3.1, and we observe from the phase transition sequences of Figure 7, agents frequently change phases (and hence, their strategies) to accomplish a task. We focus our analysis on the strategic shortcut ( $L \rightarrow V$ ) and backtrack ( $P \rightarrow L$ ,  $V \rightarrow P$ , and  $V \rightarrow L$ ). Figure 9 shows the number of instances per each  $\langle \text{agent}, \text{model} \rangle$  pair that their  $\mathcal{PTS}$  has one of the strategic shortcuts or backtracks. The percentages below the Venn diagrams show the




Fig. 9. Phase change distribution across agents and models: (a) Resolved and (b) Unresolved

percentage of instances that had at least one of the studied strategy changes.<sup>8</sup> From this figure, we can see that stronger pairs (SWE-agent/OpenHands with Claude Sonnet 4 or OpenHands with Devstral) exhibit a significantly higher number of  $L \leftrightarrow V$  chains than others, demonstrating their extra effort on validation and context gathering before committing new edits. Unresolved instances exhibit higher rates and overlaps across all patterns, indicating a greater need for strategy switching to address potential failures.

Figure 10 shows a snapshot of SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> trajectory (left side) and GRAPHECTORY (right side), trying to resolve the issue `sympy__sympy-19783` of SWE-bench. Our Strategy Change Analysis flagged this instance with one shortcut strategy ( $L \rightarrow V$ ) and two backtrack strategies ( $P \rightarrow L$  and  $V \rightarrow P$ ). Based on the outcome analysis, the second strategic backtrack was marked as an indicator of reasoning inefficiency (§2.3.1). Looking at the thought process of the agent confirms this analysis: this agent goes through multiple backtracking and shortcuts to ensure the correctness of the solution. At trajectory step 8, the agent modifies the code to fix a syntax error ( $P$ ). At the next step, instead of executing tests for validation, the agent reviews the code again to determine if there are additional bugs ( $P \rightarrow L$ ). Then, it reruns the previously created reproduction script to validate the patch ( $L \rightarrow V$ ). Test execution reveals that the bug persists, and the agent makes another repair attempt to fix the bug ( $V \rightarrow P$ ). The last strategic backtrack is indeed due to an inefficient reasoning at step 8, suggesting a wrong edit that did not fix the bug. SWE-agent<sub>DSK-V3</sub> ultimately fixes this issue, but at the cost of additional trajectory steps.

**3.3.3 Shared Strategy Analysis.** Table 2 shows the top  $\mathcal{LCP}$ s of studied  $\langle \text{agent}, \text{model} \rangle$  pairs for different problem difficulty levels and repair status. The `min_support` of 0.3 in GSP algorithm detects all the longest common patterns persistent among at least 30% of the instances. After finding all longest common patterns, we report the most prevalent one in Table 2, representing the

<sup>8</sup>Note that the denominator for the diagrams in Figure 9-a and Figure 9-b are different, depending on the resolved instances for each  $\langle \text{agent}, \text{model} \rangle$  pair.

Table 2. Top  $\mathcal{LCP}$ s of studied (agent, model) pairs, conditioned on repair status and problem difficulty. Phases: L= **Localization**, P= **Patching**, V= **Validation**. Superscripts denote pattern repetition and subscripts denote phase duration (run-length from LANGUTORY).

Agent	Status	Difficulty	Dev	DSK-V3	DSK-R1	CLD-4
SWE-agent	Resolved	easy	$\langle L_2, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, (V, L)^2 \rangle$
		medium	$\langle L, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L_6, P, V, L, V \rangle$
		hard	$\langle (P, V_6)^2, L_{24} \rangle$	$\langle P, V_4 \rangle$	$\langle L_3, P \rangle$	$\langle P, (V, L)^2, V_2 \rangle$
	Unresolved	easy	$\langle L_5, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L_3, P, V, L, V \rangle$
		medium	$\langle L_2, (P, V)^3 \rangle$	$\langle L, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L_7, P, V, L, V \rangle$
		hard	$\langle L_3, (P, V)^4 \rangle$	$\langle L_3, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L_4, P, V, L, V \rangle$
OpenHands	Resolved	easy	$\langle L_8, P, V, L, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L_4, P, (V, L)^2 \rangle$
		medium	$\langle L_{10}, P, V, L, V \rangle$	$\langle L_2, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L, P, V \rangle$	$\langle L_3, P, (V, L)^2 \rangle$
		hard	$\langle P, L, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle (L_8, P)^2, (V, L)^2 \rangle$	$\langle P_2, (L_2, P, V_2)^2 \rangle$	$\langle V, L_2, (P, V)^2 \rangle$
	Unresolved	easy	$\langle L_{18}, P, V, L, V \rangle$	$\langle L_3, (P, V)^2 \rangle$	$\langle (L_2, P)^2 \rangle$	$\langle L_8, P, (V, L)^2 \rangle$
		medium	$\langle L_8, P, V, L, V \rangle$	$\langle L_2, P, V \rangle$	$\langle (L_3, P)^2, V \rangle$	$\langle L_5, P, V, L, V \rangle$
		hard	$\langle (L_{27}, P)^3 \rangle$	$\langle (L_2, P)^2 \rangle$	$\langle (L, P)^2 \rangle$	$\langle P, (V, L)^2, V \rangle$




Fig. 10. Strategy changes of SWE-agent  $_{\text{DSK-V3}}$  while attempting to resolve sympy-19783 problem

dominant problem-solving strategy. Overall, *resolved instances of easy problems* exhibit structured and well-ordered phase transitions, typically following concise  $\langle L, P, V \rangle$  cycles that reflect a disciplined pipeline of localization, patch generation, and validation. As task difficulty increases, these sequences extend moderately (e.g.,  $\langle L_6, P, V, L, V \rangle$ ), indicating deeper, yet still coherent strategy chains. In contrast, *unresolved trajectories* show greater redundancy and longer  $(P, V)$  or  $(L, P)$  repetitions, such as  $\langle L_3, (P, V)^4 \rangle$  for SWE-agent  $_{\text{Dev}}$ . Across backbone models within each agent, stronger models like Claude Sonnet 4 demonstrate broader phase exploration with all three phases in longer and more diverse sequences, while weaker ones (e.g., DeepSeek-V3) tend to produce shorter, less exploratory flows, which may limit their ability to handle more complex cases and result in lower repair rates in the end.

Table 3. Identified anti-patterns from the manual analysis of sampled GRAPHECTORY. The first four rows belong to the **Localization** phase, and the last five rows belong to the **Patching** phase.

ID	Pattern	Description	Heuristic Patterns
RV	REPEATEDVIEW	Agent revisits the same structural region	H1, H3
ZO	ZOOMOUT	The temporal order of view actions contradicts the structural hierarchy from a deeper to a shallower level in the project structure	H2, H3
S	SCROLL	Multiple overlapping views on the same file	H2 (potential), H3
DZ	OVERLYDEEPZOOM	A sequence of view actions on a specific file or directory, may or may not be followed by patching	H3, H4 (optional)
UR	UNRESOLVEDRETRY	Multiple consecutive failed edits (same file) with no later success	H1, H3, H4
ER	EDITREVERSION	Reverting a previous successful edit	H3
NF	STRNOTFOUND	Edit fails because the specified old string does not exist in the file	H3, H4
NE	NOEFFECTEDIT	Edit has no effect due to identical old and new strings	H3, H4
AT	AMBIGUOUSTARGET	The target string occurs in multiple locations	H3, H4

**Findings.** Successful runs typically follow structured localization, patching, and validation flows that align with the agents’ intended plans. As task difficulty increases, the resolved trajectories extend but remain coherent, while unresolved ones exhibit repetitive or disordered phase transitions. Stronger LLMs demonstrate richer and more adaptive strategies.

### 3.4 RQ3: Inefficiency Pattern Analysis

Unlike prior work [29] that relies solely on manual analysis of trajectories, the rich structure of GRAPHECTORY enables us to mine meaningful patterns systematically (§2.3.2). In this research question, we are interested in identifying *anti-patterns* that reflect inefficient or regressive behavior. To this end, we first identify a series of heuristics that can *potentially* (but not necessarily) indicate an inefficient or regressive behavior. These heuristics are:<sup>9</sup>

- **H1.** A large loop, i.e., a series of consecutive actions connected by a back edge: indicates an agent performed a series of actions that did not solve the issue, requiring a change of strategy.
- **H2.** A misalignment between the temporal edges and structural edges: shows an agent going back and forth in the project structure, rather than steady exploration.
- **H3.** A long phase length: indicates the agent tries a sequence of actions without progress.
- **H4.** A failure outcome for any node: shows potential inefficiencies in reasoning or tool usage.

Next, we sample 15% of the studied GRAPHECTORY, *equally* from resolved and unresolved instances for each <agent,model> pair, accounting for project diversity to avoid sampling bias. This provides us with 600 samples across agents and models, ensuring that patterns we find in these samples persist in  $\geq 10\%$  of all studied trajectories, with 95% confidence interval. We automatically flag sampled instances that contain at least one of the mentioned heuristic patterns. Then, we manually review the thoughts, actions, and observations at each step to identify anti-patterns. Finally, we systematically search for the anti-patterns in all 4000 GRAPHECTORY and report prevalence.

Table 3 summarizes the identified anti-patterns, found only in the localization and the patching phase. None of the automatically detected anti-patterns during the validation phase was identified as an inefficiency through manual analysis. Below, we explain these anti-patterns in more detail and with qualitative examples.

<sup>9</sup>We make no claim that our heuristics, and hence, identified anti-patterns are complete. However, this study serves as one of a kind to systematically analyze agents’ trajectories for inefficiency patterns, motivating future analyses.




Fig. 11. Example of anti-patterns Scroll (a) and OverlyDeepZoom (b)

**RepeatedView** occurs when the agent revisits the same structural region, e.g., a file, multiple times during navigation, reflecting redundant inspections of identical code, often after unsuccessful edits or incomplete localization. As shown in Figure 2-a, after two failed edit attempts (step 9), the agent reopens `client.py` (the back edge 10 to the same view) for better localization.

**ZoomOut** refers to cases where the temporal order of *view* actions contradicts the structural hierarchy, meaning the agent moves from a deeper to a shallower level in the project structure. This pattern indicates a backward navigation, i.e., the agent realizes it is exploring a wrong subdirectory or file. As shown in Figure 2-b, after entering the wrong directory `postgres` (step 3), the agent goes back to the parent folder `/testbed/db` (step 4) and then navigates into the correct sibling `/testbed/db/postgresql` (step 5) to locate the buggy file `client.py` (step 6).

**Scroll** occurs when multiple *view* actions target overlapping line ranges within the same file. Figure 11-a shows SWE-agent `DSK-V3` performs several consecutive *view(path, range)* actions on `dataarray.py`, first inspecting lines 2820 – 2850, then lines 2827 – 2850, and finally lines 2827 – 2900, each overlapping the previous view. Such redundant scrolling occurs when the agent is unaware of function definition boundaries, requiring repeated views to capture the complete function body.

**OverlyDeepZoom** happens when no edit actions follow *view* actions on the same file path. This can be due to inefficient issue-based localization, causing the agent to explore several files in the same directory until it finds the bug location. As a result, the agent may never find the correct location to edit, make an unsuccessful edit, or successfully edit after an extended time. Figure 11-b shows an instance of last case, where the SWE-agent `DSK-V3`, after narrowing down to the directory `coordinates` (step 2), sequentially inspects four sibling files (`itrs.py`, `altaz.py`, `hadec.py`, and `icrs_observed_transforms.py`) to finally finds the buggy location (steps 3–6) and repair (step 7).

**UnresolvedRetry** represents the scenario where an agent performs multiple consecutive edits on the same file, but all of which fail to yield a successful modification. Figure 12-a shows an example of such a case, where SWE-agent `Dev` repeatedly executes `str_replace` commands on `utils.py` for 183 times, reaching the cost limit without any success.

**EditReversion** captures cases where a previously successful edit is later reverted. Figure 12-b shows SWE-agent `DSK-V3` first modifies `transform.py` (step 14), leading to a series of test execution failures (steps 15–16, not shown in the figure) and reverting to the original file (step 17).




Fig. 12. Example of anti-patterns UnresolvedRetry (a) and EditReversion (b)




Fig. 13. Editor failure modes of (a) STRNotFound, (b) NoEffectEdit, and (c) AmbiguousTarget

**StrNotFound** occurs when an edit fails because the specified old string cannot be found in the file (Figure 13-a). Such failures typically happen due to formatting issues or minor text differences.

**NoEffectEdit** happens because the old and new strings are identical, producing a meaningless replacement. Figure 13-b illustrates an example of this, where the command replaces a string with itself, resulting in no change to the file and wasting execution cost.

**AmbiguousTarget** captures cases where the specified old string appears multiple times in the file, leading to ambiguity about which occurrence should be replaced. Figure 13-c illustrates an example of this, where multiple identical `if` statements cause the editor to fail in applying the replacement deterministically, showing a key limitation of string-based editing mechanisms.

As mentioned, we formalized the identified patterns and searched them in 4000 studied GRAPHEC-TORY. Figure 14 summarizes the distribution of four localization inefficiency patterns across all agents and models for resolved (Figure 14-a) and unresolved instances (Figure 14-b). The percentages below the Venn diagrams show the percentage of instances that had at least one of the localization inefficiency patterns.






Fig. 14. Localization inefficiency patterns among Resolved (a) and Unresolved (b) instances

An important observation is that inefficiencies, although to a lesser extent, are prevalent in resolved instances as well. This highlights the importance of process-centric analysis to raise awareness about the behavior of agents. Unresolved cases often involve multiple inefficiency patterns within a single trajectory. Interestingly, stronger models such as Claude Sonnet 4 achieve higher success rates yet exhibit more of these patterns. Manual analysis suggests that the model tends to engage in extended internal reasoning before producing a solution. Although this can be helpful when solving difficult problems (as evidenced by the model’s higher success rate), it also leads to inefficiency when the additional steps do not contribute to better solutions.

Figure 15 shows the distribution and overlap of patching inefficiency patterns for resolved (Figure 15-a) and unresolved (Figure 15-b) instances. For resolved instances, anti-patterns appear less frequently across categories compared with unresolved instances. *Unresolved instances have more inefficient patterns*, particularly *StrNotFound* and *EditReversion*, indicating the agents often fail to locate target code or oscillate between inconsistent edits. OpenHands variants tend to show stronger accumulation of inefficiencies than SWE-agent, and *weaker models suffer from more editing failures* than stronger models like Claude-4. Overall, existing agents still struggle with simplistic string-based editing. Future repair tools that incorporate syntax-aware modifications and stronger planning mechanisms may strike a better balance between accuracy and efficiency in resolving issues.

**Findings.** Inefficiencies are common even in resolved runs, though to a lesser extent. Unresolved runs often accumulate multiple localization or editing anti-patterns within a single trajectory. Despite their higher success rate, stronger models (e.g., Claude-4) exhibit more inefficiencies, likely due to their greater internal exploration.




Fig. 15. Patching inefficiency patterns among Resolved (a) and Unresolved (b) instances

#### 4 Related Work

**SWE Agents.** In the last year, numerous autonomous agents [1–3, 13, 31, 51, 54, 56] have emerged for automated issue resolution and software engineering tasks. SWE agents can be broadly categorized into two architectural approaches: single-agent and multi-agent systems. Single-agent systems, such as SWE-agent [54] and OpenHands [51], utilize a unified ReAct loop, while multi-agent systems like CodeR [13], Magis [48], MASAI [49], employ multiple specialized agents for distinct tasks which map to the different phases outlined in Section 2.1 — such as searchers that collect relevant code snippets, reproducers that create and verify reproduction scripts ( **Localization** ), programmers that implement code modifications ( **Patching** ) and testers that validate changes ( **Validation** ). GRAPHECTORY can be easily applied to multi-agent systems by merging the individual trajectories from sub-agents into one trajectory.

**SWE Agents’ Tools (nodes in GRAPHECTORY).** Another dimension for categorizing SWE-agents is their tool usage. Some agents e.g., Agentless [53] operate without any external tools, relying solely on LLM prompting strategies. Other agents [3, 54] employ RAG-based approaches - traditional retrieval mechanisms (BM25) and embeddings for semantic search to identify relevant files. TRAE [4], CGM [47] and MarsCode Agent [31] use code knowledge graphs and language server protocols for project understanding and code entity retrieval capabilities. Without GRAPHECTORY, it would be a herculean task to compare and contrast these approaches. The combination of GRAPHECTORY and LANGUTORY allows all of these sophisticated tools to be mapped under the common bucket of **Localization** phase. Since the release of Claude 3.5 Sonnet, SWE agents such as SWE-agent, OpenHands and others have converged to using bash commands for code search and ‘str\_replace\_editor’ tool to view files, and make changes (create and edit) to existing files. This prompted us to use SWE-agent and OpenHands as our choice of SWE agents for our experiments.

However, GRAPHECTORY can be easily applied to other tools by building an extended phase map and employing Algorithm 1 for *phase labeling*.

**Analysis of SWE Agents.** There has been preliminary effort to identify areas where SWE-agents excel and where they perform poorly. Analysis of agent performance on multi-file issues [16] and single-file saturation studies [17] reveal that state-of-the-art SWE-agents struggle significantly with multi-file issues. Recent works have called for richer evaluation paradigms that account for efficiency, robustness, and reasoning quality [11, 29, 30, 39, 41, 50]. Further research [12, 15] have explored the failure modes of SWE-agents by analyzing their trajectories, identifying various reasons for failure including incorrect fault localization, inability to understand complex code dependencies, and challenges in maintaining context across multiple files. Deshpande et al. [15] release TRAIL (Trace Reasoning and Agentic Issue Localization), a taxonomy of errors and a corresponding benchmark of 148 large human-annotated traces from GAIA and SWE-Bench Lite. Cemri et al. [12] propose MAST (Multi-Agent System Failure Taxonomy) for multi-agent systems. They collect 150 traces spanning 5 multi-agent systems across 5 benchmarks, but require human-annotations for their taxonomy and analysis.

Ceka et al. [11] build a flow graph where nodes represent agent actions categorized by project understanding, context understanding and patching and testing actions. However, their analysis is manual and limited in scope. For instance, their analysis for bug localization was performed manually on 20 issues out of 500 issues in SWE-Bench Verified. Liu et al. [29] develop a taxonomy of LLM failure modes for SWE tasks comprising of 3 primary phases, 9 main categories, and 25 fine-grained subcategories. They use the taxonomy to identify why and how tools fail and pinpoint issues like unproductive iterative loops in agent-based tools. However, their underlying cause analysis is conducted manually on 150/500 issues.

A common theme across prior work is their reliance on manual annotations and thereby limiting the number of annotations available for further analysis. GRAPHECTORY does not rely on manual annotations for the entire and once the phase map *map* has been updated to incorporate any new tools, we can proceed to *phase labeling* and analyze any number of trajectories (1000s) across any number of agents using LANGUTORY. We will support additional agents per request as the industry evolves from single-agent to multi-agent systems, e.g. multi-agent research system in Claude.ai [8]

## 5 Conclusion

This paper presents GRAPHECTORY, a structured representation of agentic trajectories to move beyond outcome-centric evaluation. Our experiments of analyzing two agentic programming frameworks demonstrate that GRAPHECTORY enables richer forms of analysis and paves the way for novel evaluation metrics that reflect not only the agent’s success, but how it proceeds through a task. This perspective highlights opportunities for designing more efficient and robust agentic systems. We believe GRAPHECTORY opens several research directions, which we plan to explore as the next step: Developing structure-aware program analysis tools for symbolic navigation, targeted context retrieval, and AST-based editing to reduce the inefficiencies exposed by GRAPHECTORY. Another avenue is constructing trajectory graphs online to detect stalls and adapt strategies in real time, and incorporating efficiency-aware training objectives that optimize trajectory quality and cost in addition to success.

## References

- [1] 2024. Aider: AI pair programming in your terminal. <https://aider.chat/>
- [2] 2024. Composio’s SWE agent advances open-source on SweBench with a 48.6% score using LangGraph and LangSmith. <https://blog.langchain.com/composio-swekit/>
- [3] 2024. Moatless tools. <https://github.com/aorwall/moatless-tools>

- [4] 2025. Trae Agent reached #1 on SWE-bench Verified, with Claude 4. [https://www.trae.ai/blog/product\\_update\\_0625](https://www.trae.ai/blog/product_update_0625)
- [5] Michael Ahn et al. 2022. Do As I Can, Not As I Say: Grounding language in robotic affordances. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01691* (2022).
- [6] Mistral AI. 2025. Introducing the best open-source model for coding agents. <https://mistral.ai/news/devstral>
- [7] Mistral AI. 2025. Upgrading agentic coding capabilities with the new Devstral models. <https://mistral.ai/news/devstral-2507>
- [8] Anthropic. 2025. How we built our multi-agent research system. <https://www.anthropic.com/engineering/multi-agent-research-system> Article.
- [9] Anthropic. 2025. System Card: Claude Opus 4 & Claude Sonnet 4. <https://www-cdn.anthropic.com/4263b940cabb546aa0e3283f35b686f4f3b2ff47.pdf>
- [10] Andres Bran et al. 2023. ChemCrow: Augmenting large-language models with chemistry tools. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.05376* (2023).
- [11] Ira Ceka, Saurabh Pujar, Shyam Ramji, Luca Buratti, Gail Kaiser, and Baishakhi Ray. 2025. Understanding Software Engineering Agents Through the Lens of Traceability: An Empirical Study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2506.08311* (2025).
- [12] Mert Cemri, Melissa Z Pan, Shuyi Yang, Lakshya A Agrawal, Bhavya Chopra, Rishabh Tiwari, Kurt Keutzer, Aditya Parameswaran, Dan Klein, Kannan Ramchandran, et al. 2025. Why do multi-agent llm systems fail? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.13657* (2025).
- [13] Dong Chen, Shaoxin Lin, Muhan Zeng, Daoguang Zan, Jian-Gang Wang, Anton Cheshkov, Jun Sun, Hao Yu, Guoliang Dong, Artem Aliev, et al. 2024. Coder: Issue resolving with multi-agent and task graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.01304* (2024).
- [14] DeepSeek-AI, Aixin Liu, Bei Feng, Bing Xue, Bingxuan Wang, Bochao Wu, Chengda Lu, Chenggang Zhao, Chengqi Deng, Chenyu Zhang, Chong Ruan, Damai Dai, Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Deli Chen, Dongjie Ji, Erhang Li, Fangyun Lin, Fucong Dai, Fuli Luo, Guangbo Hao, Guanting Chen, Guowei Li, H. Zhang, Han Bao, Hanwei Xu, Haocheng Wang, Haowei Zhang, Honghui Ding, Huajian Xin, Huazuo Gao, Hui Li, Hui Qu, J. L. Cai, Jian Liang, Jianzhong Guo, Jiaqi Ni, Jiashi Li, Jiawei Wang, Jin Chen, Jingchang Chen, Jingyang Yuan, Junjie Qiu, Junlong Li, Junxiao Song, Kai Dong, Kai Hu, Kaige Gao, Kang Guan, Kexin Huang, Kuai Yu, Lean Wang, Lecong Zhang, Lei Xu, Leyi Xia, Liang Zhao, Litong Wang, Liyue Zhang, Meng Li, Miaojuan Wang, Mingchuan Zhang, Minghua Zhang, Minghui Tang, Mingming Li, Ning Tian, Panpan Huang, Peiyi Wang, Peng Zhang, Qiancheng Wang, Qihao Zhu, Qinyu Chen, Qiushi Du, R. J. Chen, R. L. Jin, Ruiqi Ge, Ruisong Zhang, Ruizhe Pan, Runji Wang, Runxin Xu, Ruoyu Zhang, Ruyi Chen, S. S. Li, Shanghao Lu, Shangan Zhou, Shanhua Chen, Shaoqing Wu, Shengfeng Ye, Shengfeng Ye, Shirong Ma, Shiyu Wang, Shuang Zhou, Shuiping Yu, Shunfeng Zhou, Shuting Pan, T. Wang, Tao Yun, Tian Pei, Tianyu Sun, W. L. Xiao, Wangding Zeng, Wanjia Zhao, Wei An, Wen Liu, Wenfeng Liang, Wenjun Gao, Wenqin Yu, Wentao Zhang, X. Q. Li, Xiangyue Jin, Xianzu Wang, Xiao Bi, Xiaodong Liu, Xiaohan Wang, Xiaojin Shen, Xiaokang Chen, Xiaokang Zhang, Xiaosha Chen, Xiaotao Nie, Xiaowen Sun, Xiaoxiang Wang, Xin Cheng, Xin Liu, Xin Xie, Xingchao Liu, Xingkai Yu, Xinnan Song, Xinxia Shan, Xinyi Zhou, Xinyu Yang, Xinyuan Li, Xuecheng Su, Xuheng Lin, Y. K. Li, Y. Q. Wang, Y. X. Wei, Y. X. Zhu, Yang Zhang, Yanhong Xu, Yanhong Xu, Yanping Huang, Yao Li, Yao Zhao, Yaofeng Sun, Yaohui Li, Yaohui Wang, Yi Yu, Yi Zheng, Yichao Zhang, Yifan Shi, Yiliang Xiong, Ying He, Ying Tang, Yishi Piao, Yisong Wang, Yixuan Tan, Yiyang Ma, Yiyuan Liu, Yongqiang Guo, Yu Wu, Yuan Ou, Yuchen Zhu, Yudian Wang, Yue Gong, Yuheng Zou, Yujia He, Yukun Zha, Yunfan Xiong, Yunxian Ma, Yuting Yan, Yuxiang Luo, Yuxiang You, Yuxuan Liu, Yuyang Zhou, Z. F. Wu, Z. Z. Ren, Zehui Ren, Zhangli Sha, Zhe Fu, Zhean Xu, Zhen Huang, Zhen Zhang, Zhenda Xie, Zhengyan Zhang, Zhewen Hao, Zhibin Gou, Zhicheng Ma, Zhigang Yan, Zhihong Shao, Zhipeng Xu, Zhiyu Wu, Zhongyu Zhang, Zhuoshu Li, Zihui Gu, Zijia Zhu, Zijun Liu, Zilin Li, Ziwei Xie, Ziyang Song, Ziyi Gao, and Zizheng Pan. 2025. DeepSeek-V3 Technical Report. *arXiv:2412.19437* [cs.CL] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.19437>
- [15] Darshan Deshpande, Varun Gangal, Hersh Mehta, Jitin Krishnan, Anand Kannappan, and Rebecca Qian. 2025. TRAIL: Trace Reasoning and Agentic Issue Localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.08638* (2025).
- [16] Jatin Ganhotra. 2025. Do SWE-Agents Solve Multi-File Issues Like Humans? A Deep Dive into SWE-Bench Verified. <https://jatinganhotra.dev/blog/swe-agents/2025/01/05/swe-bench-multiple-files/> Blog post.
- [17] Jatin Ganhotra. 2025. The Multi-File Frontier: Why SWE-Bench Verified Doesn't Reflect Real-World Programming Challenges. <https://jatinganhotra.dev/blog/swe-agents/2025/03/30/swe-bench-verified-single-file-saturation/> Blog post.
- [18] Daya Guo, Dejian Yang, Haowei Zhang, Junxiao Song, Ruoyu Zhang, Runxin Xu, Qihao Zhu, Shirong Ma, Peiyi Wang, Xiao Bi, et al. 2025. Deepseek-r1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948* (2025).
- [19] Izzeddin Gur et al. 2023. Survey of Conversational Agents Powered by Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06641* (2023).
- [20] All Hands. 2024. OpenHands tools for viewing, creating and editing files. [https://github.com/All-Hands-AI/OpenHands/blob/main/openhands/agenthub/codeact\\_agent/tools/str\\_replace\\_editor.py](https://github.com/All-Hands-AI/OpenHands/blob/main/openhands/agenthub/codeact_agent/tools/str_replace_editor.py).

- [21] Tatsuro Inaba, Hirokazu Kiyomaru, Fei Cheng, and Sadao Kurohashi. 2023. MultiTool-CoT: GPT-3 Can Use Multiple External Tools with Chain of Thought Prompting. In *ACL (Short)*. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.acl-short.130/>
- [22] Carlos E Jimenez, John Yang, Alexander Wettig, Shunyu Yao, Kexin Pei, Ofir Press, and Karthik Narasimhan. 2023. Swe-bench: Can language models resolve real-world github issues? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06770* (2023).
- [23] NVJK Kartik, Garvit Sapra, Rishav Hada, and Nikhil Pareek. 2025. AgentCompass: Towards Reliable Evaluation of Agentic Workflows in Production. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.14647* (2025).
- [24] Maurice G Kendall. 1938. A new measure of rank correlation. *Biometrika* 30, 1-2 (1938), 81–93.
- [25] Dongsun Kim, Jaechang Nam, Jaewoo Song, and Sunghun Kim. 2013. Automatic patch generation learned from human-written patches. In *2013 35th international conference on software engineering (ICSE)*. IEEE, 802–811.
- [26] R. Uday Kiran and P. Krishna Reddy. 2010. Mining periodic-frequent patterns with maximum items’ support constraints. In *Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Bangalore Conference (Bangalore, India) (COMPUTE ’10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1754288.1754289>
- [27] Claire Le Goues, ThanhVu Nguyen, Stephanie Forrest, and Westley Weimer. 2011. Genprog: A generic method for automatic software repair. *Ieee transactions on software engineering* 38, 1 (2011), 54–72.
- [28] Kui Liu, Shangwen Wang, Anil Koyuncu, Kisub Kim, Tegawendé F Bissyandé, Dongsun Kim, Peng Wu, Jacques Klein, Xiaoguang Mao, and Yves Le Traon. 2020. On the efficiency of test suite based program repair: A systematic assessment of 16 automated repair systems for java programs. In *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering*. 615–627.
- [29] Simiao Liu, Fang Liu, Liehao Li, Xin Tan, Yinghao Zhu, Xiaoli Lian, and Li Zhang. 2025. An Empirical Study on Failures in Automated Issue Solving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.13941* (2025).
- [30] Xiao Liu et al. 2023. AgentBench: Evaluating LLMs as Agents. In *NeurIPS*.
- [31] Yizhou Liu, Pengfei Gao, Xincheng Wang, Jie Liu, Yexuan Shi, Zhao Zhang, and Chao Peng. 2024. MarsCode Agent: AI-native Automated Bug Fixing. *CoRR* (2024).
- [32] Fan Long and Martin Rinard. 2016. Automatic patch generation by learning correct code. In *Proceedings of the 43rd annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on principles of programming languages*. 298–312.
- [33] Pan Lu, Baolin Peng, Hao Cheng, Michel Galley, Kai-Wei Chang, Ying Nian Wu, Song-Chun Zhu, and Jianfeng Gao. 2023. Chameleon: Plug-and-play compositional reasoning with large language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2023), 43447–43478.
- [34] Henry B Mann and Donald R Whitney. 1947. On a test of whether one of two random variables is stochastically larger than the other. *The annals of mathematical statistics* (1947), 50–60.
- [35] Thomas J. McCabe. 1976. A Complexity Measure. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering* SE-2, 4 (1976), 308–320. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSE.1976.233837>
- [36] Reiichiro Nakano et al. 2021. WebGPT: Browser-assisted question-answering with human feedback. In *NeurIPS*.
- [37] OpenAI. 2024. OpenAI: Introducing SWE-bench Verified. <https://openai.com/index/introducing-swe-bench-verified/>
- [38] OpenHands. 2025. OpenHands System Prompt. [github.com/All-Hands-AI/OpenHands/blob/08118d742b564add3e970921ac8910c265ece975/evaluation/benchmarks/swe\\_bench/prompts/swe\\_default.j2](https://github.com/All-Hands-AI/OpenHands/blob/08118d742b564add3e970921ac8910c265ece975/evaluation/benchmarks/swe_bench/prompts/swe_default.j2)
- [39] Joon Sung Park et al. 2023. Generative Agents: Interactive Simulacra of Human Behavior. In *ACM CHI*.
- [40] Refact.ai. 2025. Refact.ai, Your Open-Source, Autonomous AI Agent. <https://refact.ai/>.
- [41] Noah Shinn et al. 2023. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *NeurIPS*.
- [42] Mohit Shridhar et al. 2023. SayCan: Grounding language models with affordances for robotic control. In *ICRA*.
- [43] Ramakrishnan Srikant and Rakesh Agrawal. 1996. Mining Sequential Patterns: Generalizations and Performance Improvements. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Extending Database Technology: Advances in Database Technology (EDBT ’96)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 3–17.
- [44] Didac Suris, Sachit Menon, and Carl Vondrick. 2023. Vipergpt: Visual inference via python execution for reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*. 11888–11898.
- [45] SWE-agent. 2024. SWE-agent System Prompt. <https://github.com/SWE-agent/SWE-agent/blob/main/config/default.yaml>.
- [46] SWE-agent. 2024. SWE-agent tools for viewing, creating and editing files. [https://github.com/SWE-agent/SWE-agent/blob/main/tools/edit\\_anthropic/config.yaml](https://github.com/SWE-agent/SWE-agent/blob/main/tools/edit_anthropic/config.yaml).
- [47] Hongyuan Tao, Ying Zhang, Zhenhao Tang, Hongen Peng, Xukun Zhu, Bingchang Liu, Yingguang Yang, Ziyin Zhang, Zhaogui Xu, Haipeng Zhang, et al. 2025. Code Graph Model (CGM): A Graph-Integrated Large Language Model for Repository-Level Software Engineering Tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.16901* (2025).
- [48] Wei Tao, Yucheng Zhou, Yanlin Wang, Wenqiang Zhang, Hongyu Zhang, and Yu Cheng. 2024. Magis: Llm-based multi-agent framework for github issue resolution. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 37 (2024), 51963–51993.
- [49] Nalin Wadhwa, Atharv Sonwane, Daman Arora, Abhav Mehrotra, Saiteja Utpala, Ramakrishna B Bairi, Aditya Kanade, and Nagarajan Natarajan. 2024. MASAI: Modular architecture for software-engineering AI agents. In *NeurIPS 2024*

*Workshop on Open-World Agents.*

- [50] Shunyu Wang et al. 2023. A Survey on Large Language Model based Autonomous Agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07864* (2023).
- [51] Xingyao Wang, Boxuan Li, Yufan Song, Frank F. Xu, Xiangru Tang, Mingchen Zhuge, Jiayi Pan, Yueqi Song, Bowen Li, Jaskirat Singh, Hoang H. Tran, Fuqiang Li, Ren Ma, Mingzhang Zheng, Bill Qian, Yanjun Shao, Niklas Muennighoff, Yizhe Zhang, Binyuan Hui, Junyang Lin, Robert Brennan, Hao Peng, Heng Ji, and Graham Neubig. 2025. OpenHands: An Open Platform for AI Software Developers as Generalist Agents. *arXiv:2407.16741* [cs.SE] <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.16741>
- [52] Westley Weimer, ThanhVu Nguyen, Claire Le Goues, and Stephanie Forrest. 2009. Automatically finding patches using genetic programming. In *2009 IEEE 31st International Conference on Software Engineering*. IEEE, 364–374.
- [53] Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. 2024. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.01489* (2024).
- [54] John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. 2025. SWE-agent: agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (*NIPS '24*). Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, Article 1601, 125 pages.
- [55] Shunyu Yao et al. 2022. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *NeurIPS*.
- [56] Yuntong Zhang, Haifeng Ruan, Zhiyu Fan, and Abhik Roychoudhury. 2024. AutoCodeRover: Autonomous Program Improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05427* (April 2024). Autonomous program repair agent demonstrating code generation and debugging capabilities..