

---

# SpatialBench: Can Agents Analyze Real-World Spatial Biology Data?

---

Kenny Workman

Zhen Yang

Harihara Muralidharan

Hannah Le

LatchBio, San Francisco, CA

Correspondence: [kenny@latch.bio](mailto:kenny@latch.bio)

## Abstract

Spatial transcriptomics assays are rapidly increasing in scale and complexity, making computational analysis a major bottleneck in biological discovery. Although frontier AI agents have improved dramatically at software engineering and general data analysis, it remains unclear whether they can extract biological insight from messy, real-world spatial datasets. We introduce SpatialBench, a benchmark of 146 verifiable problems derived from practical spatial analysis workflows spanning five spatial technologies and seven task categories. Each problem provides a snapshot of experimental data immediately prior to an analysis step and a deterministic grader that evaluates recovery of a key biological result. Benchmark data on frontier models shows that base model accuracy remains low (20-38% across model families), with strong model–task and model–platform interactions. Harness design has a large empirical effect on performance, indicating that tools, prompts, control flow, and execution environment should be evaluated and improved as first-class objects. SpatialBench serves both as a measurement tool and a diagnostic lens for developing agents that can interact with real spatial datasets faithfully, transparently, and reproducibly.

## 1 Introduction

Modern biology experiments increasingly rely on spatial assays: data-intensive measurement tools that capture molecular state *in situ* to enable the study of disease, development, and tissue organization within their native spatial context [Ståhl et al., 2016, Chen et al., 2015, Moses and Pachter, 2022, Liu et al., 2024]. The raw outputs of these assays are rapidly growing in both scale and complexity [Moses and Pachter, 2022, Liu et al., 2024], making it difficult for classically trained biologists to draw scientific conclusions without skill in programming and data analysis. As a result, unanalyzed spatial data is creating a growing bottleneck in biological discovery.

Over the past year, AI agents have advanced rapidly in software engineering and general data analysis [Jimenez et al., 2024, Yang et al., 2024, Yao et al., 2023]. Biology-specific analogues are now beginning to emerge, with the promise of enabling scientists to drive complex analyses using natural-language instructions, allowing questions to be answered directly from raw data without requiring procedural coding or data analysis skills [Yao et al., 2023, Schick et al., 2023].

However, in their current form, agents for biological data remain both unreliable and underpowered. They are prone to scientific inaccuracies and misleading behavior (including hallucinations) [Huang et al., 2023, Singhal et al., 2023], and frequently fail to complete domain-specific analysis tasks unique to spatial workflows. Quantitative benchmarks will therefore be essential for measuring progress, comparing systems, and guiding model improvement. Yet existing evaluations focus primarily on general biological knowledge [Tsatsaronis et al., 2015, Jin et al., 2019, Singhal et al., 2023] and are not representative of real-world tasks that manipulate and draw conclusions from messy data.

We introduce SpatialBench, a suite of 146 verifiable problems distilled from real spatial analysis workflows, where each item snapshots an analysis state immediately before a target step and is paired with a deterministic grader. We quantify how frontier models behave on messy spatial data—revealing strong model–task and model–platform interactions—and show that harness design (tools, prompts, control flow, execution environment) can change outcomes as much as the choice of base model. SpatialBench is both a yardstick to measure progress and a diagnostic tool to scaffold test-driven development of agents that analyze real spatial datasets faithfully, transparently, and reproducibly.

## 2 Results

### 2.1 SpatialBench is a Suite of Verifiable Problems Constructed from Real Workflows

To construct a benchmark that approximates real-world tasks in spatial data analysis (Figure 1), we collaborated with scientists and spatial technology manufacturers across diverse tissue types and disease contexts. We decomposed end-to-end analysis workflows into gradeable steps, such as quality control, normalization, and cell typing. At each step, we sought to extract the key biological idea and formalize tacit and artisanal pattern recognition into deterministic heuristics.

The final evaluation suite consists of 146 problems spanning five spatial transcriptomics technologies and seven task categories (Figure 2). Each problem includes a snapshot of real experimental data taken immediately prior to a target analysis step, a description of the task through a high-level scientific lens, and a deterministic grader (e.g., Jaccard similarity of sets) that evaluates recovery of the key biological result in a verifiable manner.

To ensure robustness, all problems underwent manual quality control, including inspection of agent trajectories across multiple runs and adversarial testing against agents instructed to exploit shortcuts or prior knowledge.

The benchmark is designed to test durable biological reasoning rather than method-specific implementation details.




Figure 1: Overview of SpatialBench.




Figure 2: SpatialBench benchmark construction.

Correct answers are generally robust to reasonable choices of algorithms and hyperparameters. For example, early principal components in dimensionality reduction tasks are expected to separate broad biological programs that are specific to the dataset yet invariant to reasonable preprocessing choices. A good SpatialBench problem therefore tests scientific interpretation of these stable patterns; for instance, asking which of two cell populations is more strongly separated along the first principal component.

In addition, tasks explicitly require empirical interaction with the data. Agents that rely on prior biological knowledge or pattern matching without performing the requisite data manipulation and inspection fail to complete many tasks correctly, even when the underlying biological concepts are well known.

All results are reported over triplicate runs [Jimenez et al., 2024], with confidence intervals constructed by aggregating uncertainty over pooled per-task mean scores.

## 2.2 SpatialBench Stratifies Frontier Models on Performance and Efficiency

Across the full benchmark (Figure 3, Table 1), Opus-4.5 attains the highest mean accuracy (38.4%), followed by GPT-5.2 (34.0%) and Sonnet-4.5 (28.3%), while Gemini-2.5-Pro (20.1%) and Grok variants (22–25%) consistently underperform. In contrast to accuracy, efficiency metrics exhibit substantially stronger separation across model families. GPT-5.1 and GPT-5.2 operate at markedly lower cost (approximately \$0.02–\$0.04 per evaluation) and lower latency (56–89 s) than Anthropic, Gemini, and Grok models, whose costs exceed \$0.08 and whose latencies typically exceed 115 s. Differences in control flow are even more pronounced: GPT and Anthropic models complete tasks in approximately 2–3 steps on average, whereas Grok variants require nearly fourfold more steps (~10) and frequently approach the maximum step budget, coinciding with the highest latencies observed. As a result, differences in efficiency metrics dominate their associated uncertainty, yielding a clear trade-off between peak accuracy (Opus-4.5) and cost-effective performance (GPT-5.2).




Figure 3: Aggregate model performance across SpatialBench.

Table 1: Aggregate performance and efficiency across the full SpatialBench benchmark. Reported values are mean  $\pm$  95% confidence intervals.

Model	Accuracy (%)	Steps	Latency (s)	Cost (USD)
Opus-4.5	38.36 [31.27, 45.44]	2.84 [2.51, 3.17]	123.8 [104.8, 142.9]	0.143 [0.121, 0.165]
Sonnet-4.5	28.31 [22.22, 34.40]	2.43 [2.17, 2.70]	115.6 [98.0, 133.2]	0.081 [0.068, 0.093]
GPT-5.2	34.02 [27.57, 40.47]	2.10 [1.89, 2.30]	89.2 [76.9, 101.4]	0.037 [0.031, 0.042]
GPT-5.1	27.40 [21.30, 33.50]	2.38 [2.18, 2.58]	55.8 [48.2, 63.5]	0.020 [0.017, 0.023]
Gemini-2.5-Pro	20.09 [14.75, 25.43]	3.61 [3.11, 4.10]	193.5 [168.2, 218.7]	0.188 [0.157, 0.219]
Grok-4	22.83 [17.68, 27.98]	9.90 [7.68, 12.11]	173.2 [148.0, 198.3]	0.048 [0.030, 0.067]
Grok-4.1	24.66 [19.78, 29.54]	9.93 [8.09, 11.78]	196.4 [175.4, 217.3]	0.077 [0.047, 0.107]

### 2.3 Grouping on Task Category Reveals Strong Model-Task Interactions

Stratifying performance by task category reveals large differences that are not visible in aggregate accuracy (Figure 4, Table 2). Mean accuracy ranges from approximately 10–22% on QC tasks to roughly 40–53% on dimensionality reduction and spatial analysis for the best-performing models. Model rankings vary substantially across task classes: Opus-4.5 performs best on spatial analysis (52.9%) and ties GPT-5.2 on clustering (33.3%), while Sonnet-4.5 achieves the highest accuracy on dimensionality reduction (53.3%). In contrast, all models perform poorly on QC and cell typing, with several models’ QC confidence intervals overlapping near zero; we examine the behavioral factors underlying these failures in the trajectory analysis below. Gemini-2.5-Pro underperforms across all categories, most notably on spatial analysis (9.8%), more than 20 percentage points below the next lowest model.




Figure 4: Model accuracy stratified by task category.

Table 2: Accuracy stratified by task category. Values are mean accuracy (%) with 95% confidence intervals.

Model	QC	Norm.	Dim. Red.	Clustering	Cell Typing	Diff. Expr.	Spatial
Opus-4.5	21.7 [4.7, 38.7]	61.9 [16.8, 100.0]	51.1 [25.1, 77.1]	33.3 [14.1, 52.5]	35.9 [22.2, 49.6]	37.2 [19.2, 55.2]	52.9 [30.2, 75.7]
Sonnet-4.5	10.0 [0.0, 20.3]	71.4 [34.0, 100.0]	53.3 [27.4, 79.3]	17.5 [5.1, 29.8]	21.4 [11.3, 31.4]	28.2 [11.7, 44.7]	41.2 [22.5, 59.9]
GPT-5.2	10.0 [0.0, 21.4]	76.2 [41.9, 100.0]	46.7 [23.7, 69.6]	33.3 [18.9, 47.7]	32.5 [19.7, 45.2]	30.8 [14.7, 46.9]	45.1 [21.7, 68.5]
GPT-5.1	11.7 [0.0, 23.3]	52.4 [5.8, 99.0]	37.8 [13.7, 61.8]	20.6 [5.9, 35.4]	22.2 [12.8, 31.6]	30.8 [13.4, 48.2]	43.1 [20.7, 65.6]
Gemini-2.5-Pro	16.7 [0.3, 33.1]	66.7 [26.9, 100.0]	24.4 [3.0, 45.9]	17.5 [3.4, 31.6]	20.5 [9.5, 31.5]	16.7 [7.2, 26.2]	9.8 [1.8, 17.9]
Grok-4	10.0 [0.0, 20.3]	66.7 [23.1, 100.0]	26.7 [9.3, 44.0]	23.8 [8.5, 39.1]	19.7 [11.2, 28.1]	18.0 [7.7, 28.2]	31.4 [11.8, 51.0]
Grok-4.1	13.3 [1.6, 25.1]	61.9 [29.0, 94.9]	33.3 [14.9, 51.8]	20.6 [10.5, 30.8]	21.4 [13.0, 29.8]	23.1 [9.5, 36.7]	31.4 [16.0, 46.8]

### 2.4 Grouping on Vendor Suggests Spatial Technology Dependent Performance

Accuracy varies substantially by experimental platform (Figure 5, Table 3), with individual models differing by 15–20 percentage points across datasets. Despite this variation, relative performance is stable: Opus-4.5 leads on four of five platforms, while GPT-5.2 leads on Seeker and ranks second elsewhere. Gemini-2.5-Pro and Grok variants underperform across all platforms. Seeker exhibits

uniformly low accuracy across models (approximately 19–31%), despite having the largest number of evaluations, indicating higher intrinsic task difficulty.




Figure 5: Model accuracy stratified by experimental platform.

Table 3: Accuracy stratified by experimental platform. Values are mean accuracy (%) with 95% confidence intervals.

Model	AtlasXomics	MERFISH	Seeker	Visium	Xenium
Opus-4.5	43.5 [24.8,62.1]	42.6 [21.5,63.7]	27.9 [15.1,40.8]	39.6 [23.3,55.9]	45.6 [29.1,62.1]
Sonnet-4.5	29.0 [11.4,46.5]	25.9 [5.8,46.1]	24.8 [14.1,35.6]	24.0 [11.3,36.6]	38.9 [24.6,53.2]
GPT-5.2	37.7 [20.1,55.2]	33.3 [13.6,53.0]	31.0 [18.9,43.1]	30.2 [17.1,43.3]	40.0 [23.9,56.2]
GPT-5.1	27.5 [11.5,43.6]	24.1 [7.2,41.0]	25.6 [14.4,36.7]	26.0 [12.1,39.9]	33.3 [18.0,48.7]
Gemini-2.5-Pro	21.7 [9.0,34.5]	13.0 [0.1,25.9]	20.9 [9.7,32.1]	20.8 [9.1,32.6]	21.1 [8.3,34.0]
Grok-4	23.2 [12.2,34.2]	24.1 [6.3,41.9]	19.4 [10.6,28.1]	22.9 [11.3,34.5]	26.7 [12.7,40.7]
Grok-4.1	24.6 [10.8,38.5]	27.8 [12.5,43.1]	20.9 [12.0,29.9]	26.0 [14.7,37.4]	26.7 [16.1,37.2]

## 2.5 Agent Harness Choice Materially Affects Benchmark Performance

We examined the effect of the agent *harness*—the execution environment, tools, prompts, and programmatic control flow that wrap a base model—on performance (Figure 6, Table 4). Comparing Opus-4.5 across a slightly modified Mini-SWE-Bench setup, Claude Code, and the Latch agent shows that harness design has a large effect on outcomes. Within the Latch harness, Opus-4.5 attains 61.7% overall accuracy, exceeding Opus-4.5 with Claude Code (48.1%) and the base configuration (38.4%). The absolute uplift from base to Latch is 23.3 percentage points, and from Claude Code to Latch is 13.6 points, exceeding the Opus–Sonnet gap under Claude Code (48.1% vs. 45.1%).

Task-stratified results (Figure 7, Table 5) suggest that the Latch and Claude Code harnesses primarily improve performance on tasks that require many steps and intermediate programming. Clustering (65.9% vs. 33.3%), differential expression (64.1% vs. 37.2%), and dimensionality reduction (75.6% vs. 51.1%) are representative examples (Latch vs. Opus-4.5 base).

Harness improvements are also robust across spatial platforms (Figure 8, Table 6), mirroring patterns seen in other analyses. This suggests that effective harnesses provide models with a general ability to manipulate and reason about spatial data, likely by stabilizing exploration and analysis over longer time horizons. Platform-specific difficulty, however, will require special care (e.g., deliberate prompt engineering and tool selection) and is unlikely to resolve accidentally with base model improvements alone.




Figure 6: Aggregate accuracy comparison across agent harnesses.

Table 4: Aggregate accuracy across agent harnesses. Reported values are mean accuracy with 95% confidence intervals. Latch results are available only for Opus-4.5.

Model / Harness	Accuracy (%)	95% CI
Opus-4.5 (Latch)	61.7	[55.3, 68.1]
Opus-4.5 (Claude Code)	48.1	[40.9, 55.3]
Sonnet-4.5 (Claude Code)	45.1	[38.0, 52.2]
Opus-4.5 (Base)	38.4	[31.3, 45.4]
Sonnet-4.5 (Base)	28.3	[22.2, 34.4]




Figure 7: Harness performance stratified by task category.

Table 5: Accuracy stratified by task category for different agent harnesses. Values are mean accuracy (%) with 95% confidence intervals. Latch results are available only for Opus-4.5.

Condition	QC	Norm.	Dim. Red.	Clustering	Cell Typing	Diff. Expr.	Spatial
Opus-4.5 (Latch)	55.8 [37.7, 74.0]	73.8 [38.4, 100.0]	75.6 [56.1, 95.2]	65.9 [48.5, 83.3]	57.7 [44.0, 71.4]	64.1 [49.6, 78.6]	57.4 [36.5, 78.3]
Opus-4.5 (Claude Code)	30.0 [11.8, 48.2]	52.4 [9.3, 95.5]	62.2 [37.2, 87.3]	60.3 [39.6, 81.0]	38.9 [25.6, 52.1]	46.2 [27.1, 65.2]	66.7 [45.7, 87.7]
Sonnet-4.5 (Claude Code)	26.7 [8.7, 44.6]	61.9 [24.5, 99.4]	63.3 [38.6, 88.1]	50.8 [32.5, 69.1]	38.5 [25.0, 51.9]	43.6 [24.6, 62.5]	56.9 [33.6, 80.2]
Opus-4.5 (Base)	21.7 [4.7, 38.7]	61.9 [16.8, 100.0]	51.1 [25.1, 77.1]	33.3 [14.1, 52.5]	35.9 [22.2, 49.6]	37.2 [19.2, 55.2]	52.9 [30.2, 75.7]
Sonnet-4.5 (Base)	10.0 [0.0, 20.3]	71.4 [34.0, 100.0]	53.3 [27.4, 79.3]	17.5 [5.1, 29.8]	21.4 [11.3, 31.4]	28.2 [11.7, 44.7]	41.2 [22.5, 59.9]




Figure 8: Harness performance stratified by experimental platform.

Table 6: Accuracy stratified by spatial transcriptomics platform. Values are mean accuracy (%) with 95% confidence intervals. Latch results are available only for Opus-4.5.

Condition	AtlasXomics	Visium	MERFISH	Xenium	Seeker
Opus-4.5 (Latch)	66.7 [52.3, 81.1]	66.7 [53.4, 80.0]	64.7 [44.9, 84.5]	61.7 [45.6, 77.7]	54.3 [41.6, 66.9]
Opus-4.5 (Claude Code)	50.7 [32.9, 68.6]	52.6 [36.5, 68.7]	57.4 [34.8, 80.0]	48.9 [32.0, 65.8]	38.8 [25.2, 52.4]
Sonnet-4.5 (Claude Code)	50.7 [33.4, 68.0]	44.8 [27.9, 61.7]	48.2 [26.7, 69.6]	52.2 [34.7, 69.7]	36.1 [23.7, 48.4]
Opus-4.5 (Base)	43.5 [24.8, 62.1]	39.6 [23.3, 55.9]	42.6 [21.5, 63.7]	45.6 [29.1, 62.1]	27.9 [15.1, 40.8]
Sonnet-4.5 (Base)	29.0 [11.4, 46.5]	24.0 [11.3, 36.6]	25.9 [5.8, 46.1]	38.9 [24.6, 53.2]	24.8 [14.1, 35.6]

## 2.6 Agent Trajectories Reveal Distinct Behavioral Patterns

Manual inspection of agent trajectories (session logs containing reasoning traces, tool invocations, and terminal standard output and error) revealed qualitative behavioral patterns that explain performance differences between frontier models more mechanistically (Table 7).

Table 7: Summary of agent behavioral characteristics across models. Metrics characterize typical control flow, error patterns, and domain calibration observed across SpatialBench evaluations.

Model	Accuracy (%)	Mean Steps	Max Steps	6+ Steps (%)	Format Errors	min_genes (med.)
Opus-4.5	38.4	2.8	13	10.6	0.04	10
GPT-5.2	34.0	2.1	9	2.7	0.00	200
Sonnet-4.5	28.3	2.4	17	7.8	0.05	200
GPT-5.1	27.4	2.4	7	4.6	0.01	200
Grok-4.1	24.7	9.9	100	33.1	7.16	200
Grok-4	22.8	9.8	100	23.9	6.74	200
Gemini-2.5	20.1	3.6	26	21.5	0.06	100

**Steps.** Claude and GPT models complete tasks in approximately 2–3 steps on average (mean 2.1–2.8), whereas Grok variants require nearly four times as many steps (mean 9.8–9.9), with Gemini intermediate (3.6). Extremely high step counts generally indicate thrashing: all 119 instances of 100-step limit exhaustion occurred exclusively in Grok runs, and all resulted in failure. More steps are not always bad, so we also examine step productivity as a more informative metric (Figure 9, Table 8). For Opus-4.5, pass rate increases monotonically with step count, rising from 26.0% for one-step runs to 50.0% for runs with six or more steps, indicating capacity for productive exploration. In contrast, Grok-4 exhibits nearly flat pass rates across step buckets (~27–31%), suggesting retry-driven behavior rather than incremental progress; Grok-4.1 shows some uplift at intermediate step counts but still suffers from high step exhaustion and format error rates. Gemini exhibits bimodal behavior: while 50.6% of runs complete in a single step, 21.5% require six or more steps, reflecting inconsistent problem-solving strategies or prolonged failure loops.




Figure 9: Pass rate stratified by agent step count.

Table 8: Pass rate stratified by agent step count. Values are mean pass rate (%) with standard error (SE) in parentheses;  $n$  denotes the number of evaluation instances in each bucket.

Model	1 step	2–3 steps	4–5 steps	6+ steps
Opus-4.5	26.0 (3.5) [n=154]	45.9 (4.0) [n=157]	47.9 (5.8) [n=73]	50.0 (7.7) [n=42]
GPT-5.2	29.5 (3.1) [n=217]	45.4 (4.2) [n=141]	29.5 (5.8) [n=61]	25.0 (12.5) [n=12]
Sonnet-4.5	31.5 (3.4) [n=184]	29.4 (3.8) [n=143]	27.0 (5.6) [n=63]	22.6 (7.5) [n=31]
GPT-5.1	22.6 (3.3) [n=164]	33.5 (3.7) [n=164]	32.5 (5.3) [n=77]	15.0 (8.0) [n=20]
Grok-4.1	28.4 (4.6) [n=95]	24.8 (4.2) [n=105]	45.8 (7.2) [n=48]	37.5 (5.2) [n=88]
Grok-4	28.5 (4.0) [n=130]	30.5 (4.7) [n=95]	30.9 (6.2) [n=55]	27.0 (5.6) [n=63]
Gemini-2.5	20.4 (3.4) [n=142]	30.6 (5.9) [n=62]	47.1 (8.6) [n=34]	32.9 (5.5) [n=73]

**Instruction following.** Instruction-following failures strongly differentiate model families. Grok variants average more than seven format errors per evaluation, accumulating over 6,000 total errors across both variants. These errors consume steps on syntax compliance rather than analysis and frequently lead to runaway retry loops. In contrast, GPT-5.2 produces zero format errors, and Claude and Gemini models exhibit near-perfect compliance ( $\leq 0.06$  errors per evaluation). Manual quality control confirmed that these formatting issues reflect legitimate reasoning failures rather than ambiguities in harness prompts or infrastructure bugs.

**Domain knowledge.** Models exhibit systematic differences in domain calibration, particularly for quality control thresholds. In some targeted and imaging-based spatial assays—where per-cell gene counts are intrinsically low—reasonable `min_genes` thresholds lie between 5 and 20. Opus-4.5 applies spatially calibrated cutoffs (median 10), whereas other models default to scRNA-seq-like thresholds (median 100–200). This calibration difference aligns with Opus-4.5’s substantially higher QC pass rate ( $\sim 25\%$ ) relative to GPT and Grok models ( $\sim 5\%$ ).

**Productive exploration.** Models differ in how effectively they explore and use intermediate findings. While Opus-4.5 checks `adata.uns` most frequently (34.0% of evaluations vs. 17–18% for GPT models), the key distinction is utilization: when Opus inspects `adata.uns`, its pass rate increases by 26 percentage points (56.6% vs. 30.7%), compared to just 4–6 percentage points for Grok despite similar inspection rates ( $\sim 26\%$ ). This suggests that finding pre-computed results is insufficient—models must also recognize their relevance and integrate them into downstream analysis.

**Behavioral regimes by model family.** Taken together, these patterns reveal distinct behavioral regimes. Opus-4.5 benefits substantially from multi-step execution (pass rate increases from 26% at one step to 50% at six or more steps) and productively applies domain knowledge such as spatially appropriate thresholds. GPT models (5.1, 5.2) execute efficiently with near-perfect instruction following but leverage less domain-specific knowledge and productive exploration. Grok models (4, 4.1) struggle with instruction compliance, leading to high step counts without corresponding accuracy gains. Gemini-2.5-Pro displays inconsistent behavior: despite moderate step counts and low format error rates, it achieves the lowest overall accuracy, suggesting fundamental gaps in domain knowledge and analytical reasoning.

### 3 Methods

#### 3.1 Overview of Problem Construction

SpatialBench is constructed from real spatial transcriptomics analysis workflows [Moses and Pachter, 2022] provided by domain scientists and technology vendors. For each workflow, we identify analysis steps that (i) arise in practice, (ii) require interaction with messy, high-dimensional data objects, and (iii) yield a biologically meaningful intermediate result that can be verified automatically. We then convert each step into an evaluation problem by snapshotting the analysis state immediately prior to the target step and writing a natural-language prompt that asks for a scientific conclusion or decision that a competent analyst would make from that state (e.g., choosing a QC threshold, identifying a cell type from marker patterns, or determining which populations separate along an embedding axis).

Each candidate problem is iteratively refined with the contributing experts to ensure that the intended answer is stable under reasonable analysis choices and does not depend on a single implementation detail. Finally, we apply manual quality control that includes inspection of multi-run agent trajectories and adversarial “shortcut” attempts (e.g., agents instructed to guess from prior knowledge without interacting with the data) to remove problems that can be solved without performing the intended analysis.

#### 3.2 Anatomy of a Problem

Each SpatialBench item consists of (1) a workspace containing the relevant data objects (typically an `AnnData` object [Virshup et al., 2024, Wolf et al., 2018, Palla et al., 2022, Marconato et al., 2024] and associated files), (2) a task prompt describing the goal at a scientific level, (3) an answer format specification (to enforce a gradeable output), and (4) a deterministic grader that maps the agent’s final answer to pass/fail (and, when useful, auxiliary diagnostics). Importantly, the input state is a *snapshot*: it reflects the information that would be available to an analyst at that point in an end-to-end workflow (e.g., prior preprocessing already applied, but the target analysis not yet performed).

To encourage empirical interaction with the dataset, prompts are written so that domain knowledge alone is insufficient: correct answers typically require computing summary statistics, inspecting distributions, testing marker genes, or reading structured results stored in the analysis object (e.g., `adata.obs`, `adata.var`, `adata.uns`). This design reduces the viability of pattern matching and promotes behaviors closer to practical analysis.

#### 3.3 Properties of a Good SpatialBench Test

We follow three core design criteria. **Verifiability:** each task must admit an automatically checkable success condition (e.g., a set overlap, a numerical interval check, or a structured label match) implemented as a deterministic grader. **Scientific durability:** the intended conclusion should remain correct across reasonable algorithmic choices and hyperparameters, so the benchmark measures biological interpretation rather than brittle implementation details. **Anti-shortcut structure:** tasks are phrased to require interacting with the provided data artifacts, and we remove items that can be reliably solved via trivial heuristics or prior knowledge.

These criteria lead to problems that are intentionally closer to real analysis: agents must navigate data objects, generate plots or summaries, and make context-aware decisions under noise and ambiguity, while still producing outputs that can be graded reproducibly.

### 3.4 Verifiable Graders

Each problem is paired with a grader that evaluates whether the agent recovered the key biological result in a verifiable manner. Graders operate on the agent’s final structured answer and do not inspect intermediate reasoning. We use several grader families, including: exact or near-exact match for discrete labels, set similarity (e.g., Jaccard) for gene lists or cluster membership, interval-based checks for numeric thresholds, and consistency checks for multi-field outputs. Where appropriate, graders include conservative tolerances to avoid over-penalizing scientifically equivalent answers (e.g., synonyms for cell types, or small deviations around an empirically chosen threshold).

To reduce brittleness, graders are validated during problem development by running multiple independent baselines and manually inspecting failures to distinguish grader bugs from legitimate reasoning errors. Problems whose grading logic cannot be made robust without re-introducing subjectivity are excluded from the benchmark.

### 3.5 Agent Harnesses and Execution Environment

We evaluate models under multiple *harnesses* [Yang et al., 2024, Yao et al., 2023, Liu et al., 2023, Zhou et al., 2023], where a harness denotes the full execution wrapper around a base model: the system prompt, available tools, control flow (planning and retry policies), answer schema enforcement, and the runtime environment used to execute code. All harnesses provide an interactive compute setting with access to common scientific Python tooling and the local workspace containing the problem’s data snapshot. Harnesses differ primarily in their prompting strategy, tool routing, and how they structure multi-step work (e.g., whether they enforce intermediate checks, how they respond to errors, and how they decide when to stop).

To make comparisons meaningful, we use a consistent evaluation budget per item (step limits and timeouts) within each harness condition and record detailed session logs (tool calls, stdout/stderr, intermediate artifacts) to support trajectory-level analysis of failure modes.

### 3.6 Data Infrastructure: Running SpatialBench at Scale

SpatialBench is executed as batched evaluations in isolated workspaces to ensure reproducibility. Each evaluation materializes a clean workspace containing the problem snapshot and executes the agent harness under fixed resource limits. Outputs include the agent’s final structured answer, the grader decision, and a complete trajectory log. All runs are keyed by model version, harness version, and benchmark revision to support exact reruns and ablations.

### 3.7 Statistical Design

SpatialBench uses the evaluation item (*eval*) as the statistical unit. For each eval  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  we run the agent  $K = 3$  times under the same model and harness condition. Each run receives a binary outcome from the deterministic grader,  $s_{i,r} \in \{0, 1\}$  for run  $r \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .

**Terminology.** We use *pass rate* to refer to the fraction of runs that pass the grader, and *accuracy* for the aggregate estimate  $\hat{\mu}$  over eval-level means. A *step* is a single agent action (one model invocation plus any resulting tool calls); step counts measure agent effort per evaluation.

**Stage 1: per-eval mean score.** We first compute the per-eval mean pass rate

$$\bar{s}_i = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{r=1}^K s_{i,r},$$

so each eval contributes a value in  $[0, 1]$  (e.g.,  $\bar{s}_i = 2/3$  if two of three runs pass).

**Stage 2: confidence intervals over eval means.** We treat the  $\{\bar{s}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  as independent observations and compute the aggregate accuracy

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{s}_i.$$

Let

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{s}_i - \hat{\mu})^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{SE}(\hat{\mu}) = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{n}}.$$

We report 95% confidence intervals as

$$\hat{\mu} \pm t_{0.975, n-1} \text{SE}(\hat{\mu}),$$

where  $t_{0.975, n-1}$  is the 97.5th percentile of a Student- $t$  distribution with  $n-1$  degrees of freedom.

**Stratified results.** For breakdowns by task category or platform, we apply the same two-stage procedure to the subset of evals in the stratum (recomputing  $n$ ,  $\hat{\mu}$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}^2$ , and the corresponding  $t$  critical value).

**Efficiency metrics.** Steps, latency, and cost are summarized analogously by first averaging the metric within each eval across the  $K$  runs, then computing a  $t$ -based confidence interval across eval-level means.

## 4 Discussion

SpatialBench measures a capability between “knowing biology” and “writing code”: extracting biological insight from messy, real-world spatial datasets. These tasks are scientifically central and represent a distinct challenge for frontier agentic systems, requiring a blend of programming, data analysis, and domain reasoning. Across 146 verifiable problems, today’s frontier models remain unreliable, leaving substantial room for progress.

The path forward appears to be a long tail of tractable engineering and calibration. Stratifying results by task category and platform, and inspecting agent trajectories, reveals concrete mechanisms underpinning failures and successes. Some systems fail primarily through instruction-following and output-format errors, wasting steps on compliance rather than analysis. More broadly, the uniformly poor performance on quality control and cell typing indicates that steps requiring contextual—often tacit—scientific judgment are those current models handle least well. Transferring general-purpose coding or data-analysis skills is not sufficient; models will likely need exposure to representative spatial workflows across tissues, diseases, and assay types, either in training data or via harness-level scaffolding (tools, retrieval, and calibration routines).

Harness design emerges as a major determinant of performance. The same base model exhibits large accuracy variation across harnesses, indicating that what is often treated as “glue code”—tools, prompts, control flow, execution infrastructure, and verification—can unlock or suppress capability. Progress in practical biological agents will therefore require joint optimization of model and harness. Benchmarks should report harness details as rigorously as model versions, and evaluations should treat the full agent stack as the unit of study.

Performance also depends strongly on spatial technology. We observe 15–20 point swings across platforms for the same model, reflecting that spatial biology is a collection of diverse assays with distinct artifacts and conventions. Reliable agents will likely require platform-aware context, assay-specific tools, and self-calibration heuristics rather than a one-size-fits-all workflow.

SpatialBench has limitations. Deterministic graders enable verifiable evaluation, but can be brittle, and important nuance is sometimes lost when scientific judgment is discretized into automatically checkable outputs. In addition, each problem is a snapshotted step of an end-to-end workflow; longer-horizon analyses involve compounding errors and iterative revision (e.g., revisiting QC thresholds after poor clustering), which are not yet fully captured here.

We hope SpatialBench serves both as a measurement tool and a diagnostic lens, enabling the community to develop agents that interact with real spatial datasets faithfully, transparently, and reproducibly. SpatialBench is intended as a first focused contribution toward a broader benchmark family spanning major biological data classes. More broadly, we view benchmarks as evolving specifications of computational biology workflows—supporting test-driven development of agent systems whose behavior can be improved through both model training and harness engineering.

## Data and Code Availability

All benchmark materials are publicly available at <https://github.com/latchbio/spatialbench>:

- `results/` — Aggregate benchmark results with 95% confidence intervals (overall, per-task, per-platform)
- `evals_canonical/` — 10 canonical evaluation examples spanning all task categories
- `spatialbench/graders/` — Grader implementations for all five grader families

## Author Contributions

K.W. conceived the project, designed the benchmark methodology, built the evaluation infrastructure, constructed evaluations, and wrote the manuscript. Z.Y., H.M., and H.L. constructed evaluations and contributed to benchmark validation.

## References

Patrik L. Ståhl, Fredrik Salmén, Sanja Vickovic, et al. Visualization and analysis of gene expression in tissue sections by spatial transcriptomics. *Science*, 353(6294):78–82, 2016. doi: 10.1126/science.aaf2403.

Kok Hao Chen, Alistair N. Boettiger, Jeffrey R. Moffitt, Siyuan Wang, and Xiaowei Zhuang. Spatially resolved, highly multiplexed rna profiling in single cells. *Science*, 348(6233):aaa6090, 2015. doi: 10.1126/science.aaa6090.

Lambda Moses and Lior Pachter. Museum of spatial transcriptomics. *Nature Methods*, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41592-022-01409-2.

L. Liu et al. Spatiotemporal omics for biology and medicine. *Cell*, 2024. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2024.07.040.

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 (ICLR)*, 2024. arXiv:2310.06770.

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. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2024. arXiv:2405.15793.

Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023. arXiv:2210.03629.

Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools. 2023. arXiv:2302.04761.

Lei Huang, Weijiang Yu, Weitao Ma, Weihong Zhong, Zhangyin Feng, Haotian Wang, Qianglong Chen, Weihua Peng, Xiaocheng Feng, Bing Qin, and Ting Liu. A survey on hallucination in large language models: Principles, taxonomy, challenges, and open questions. 2023. arXiv:2311.05232.

Karan Singhal, Shekoofeh Azizi, Tao Tu, S. Sara Mahdavi, Jason Wei, Hyung Won Chung, Nathan Scales, et al. Large language models encode clinical knowledge. *Nature*, 2023. doi: 10.1038/s41586-023-06291-2.

George Tsatsaronis, Georgios Balikas, Prodromos Malakasiotis, Ioannis Partalas, Matthias Zschunke, Michael R. Alvers, Dirk Weissenborn, Anastasia Krithara, Sergios Petridis, Dimitris Polychronopoulos, et al. An overview of the bioasq large-scale biomedical semantic indexing and question answering competition. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2015. doi: 10.1186/s12859-015-0564-6.

Qiao Jin, Bhuwan Dhingra, Zhengping Liu, William W. Cohen, and Xinghua Lu. Pubmedqa: A dataset for biomedical research question answering. In *EMNLP*, 2019. arXiv:1909.06146.

Isaac Virshup et al. anndata: Access and store annotated data matrices. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 2024. doi: 10.21105/joss.04371.

F. Alexander Wolf, Philipp Angerer, and Fabian J. Theis. Scanpy: large-scale single-cell gene expression data analysis. *Genome Biology*, 19:15, 2018. doi: 10.1186/s13059-017-1382-0.

Giovanni Palla, Hannah Spitzer, Michal Klein, David S. Fischer, Anna C. Schaar, Lukas B. Kuemmerle, Sergei Rybakov, Ignacio L. Ibarra, Olof Holmberg, Isaac Virshup, et al. Squidpy: a scalable framework for spatial omics analysis. *Nature Methods*, 2022. doi: 10.1038/s41592-021-01358-2.

Luca Marconato, Giovanni Palla, et al. Spatialdata: an open and universal data framework for spatial omics. *Nature Methods*, 2024. doi: 10.1038/s41592-024-02212-x.

Xiao Liu, Hao Yu, Hanchen Zhang, Yifan Xu, Xuanyu Lei, Hanyu Lai, et al. Agentbench: Evaluating llms as agents. 2023. arXiv:2308.03688.

Shuyan Zhou, Frank F. Xu, Hao Zhu, Xuhui Zhou, Robert Lo, Abishek Sridhar, Xianyi Cheng, Yonatan Bisk, Daniel Fried, Uri Alon, and Graham Neubig. Webarena: A realistic web environment for building autonomous agents. 2023. arXiv:2307.13854.

## A.1 Full Benchmark Inventory

This section provides the complete inventory of all 146 evaluations in SpatialBench, organized by platform and task category.

### Summary Statistics

SpatialBench comprises 146 evaluations spanning 5 spatial transcriptomics platforms and 7 task categories. Table 9 shows the distribution of evaluations across platforms and task categories.

Table 9: Distribution of evaluations across platforms and task categories.

Platform	QC	Norm.	Dim. Red.	Clust.	Cell Type	Diff. Expr.	Spatial	Total
AtlasXomics	6	—	—	1	11	5	—	<b>23</b>
MERFISH	2	2	2	3	4	4	2	<b>19</b>
Xenium	3	2	3	4	6	7	5	<b>30</b>
Visium	5	1	4	5	8	4	5	<b>32</b>
Seeker	4	2	6	9	10	6	6	<b>43</b>
<b>Total</b>	20	7	15	22	39	26	18	<b>146</b>

### Grader Distribution

Evaluations use five grader families to assess agent outputs:

- **MultipleChoice** (45 evals): Single correct answer from predefined options
- **MarkerGenePrecisionRecall** (45 evals): Precision@K for gene list recovery
- **NumericTolerance** (36 evals): Numeric values within absolute tolerance bounds
- **LabelSetJaccard** (18 evals): Set overlap using Jaccard similarity threshold
- **DistributionComparison** (3 evals): Cosine similarity for distribution matching

## Tissue Coverage

The benchmark covers five tissue types across the platforms:

- **Kidney** (Xenium): 27 evaluations — acute kidney injury, fibrosis, tubular cell states
- **Ovary** (Seeker): 43 evaluations — follicle development, granulosa cell subtypes, ovulation response
- **Bone** (Visium): 32 evaluations — bone remodeling, trabecular microenvironment, immune infiltration
- **Brain** (MERFISH, AtlasXomics): 30 evaluations — aging signatures, glial cell states, neuronal populations
- **Liver** (AtlasXomics): 15 evaluations — cirrhosis, hepatic stellate cells, fibrosis pathways

## Complete Evaluation Inventory

Table 10 provides the complete list of all 146 evaluations with their metadata. Description provides a concise summary of each evaluation task. Platform indicates the spatial technology. Task denotes the analysis category. Tissue specifies the biological sample type. Grader indicates the evaluation method: MCQ (multiple choice), P@K (precision at K for gene lists), Numeric (numeric tolerance), Jaccard (label set Jaccard similarity), or Cosine (distribution cosine similarity). Params shows key grader parameters where applicable.

Table 10: Complete inventory of SpatialBench evaluations.

Description	Platform	Task	Tissue	Grader	Params
Astrocyte clusters	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Astrocyte markers	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Cell type distribution	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 10.0$
Endothelial clusters	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Endothelial markers	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Microglia markers	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Neuron clusters	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Neuron markers	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Oligodendrocyte clusters	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Oligodendrocyte markers	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Stellate cell clusters	AtlasXomics	Cell Type	Liver	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Fibrosis clustering	AtlasXomics	Clust.	Liver	P@K	P@5
Confound detection	AtlasXomics	Diff. Expr.	—	MCQ	—
Disease signature	AtlasXomics	Diff. Expr.	Liver	P@K	P@5
Hepatocyte DE	AtlasXomics	Diff. Expr.	Liver	P@K	P@5
Lost pathway analysis	AtlasXomics	Diff. Expr.	Liver	MCQ	—
Pathway analysis	AtlasXomics	Diff. Expr.	Liver	MCQ	—
Cell filtering	AtlasXomics	QC	Liver	Numeric	$\pm 3892$
FRIP filtering	AtlasXomics	QC	Liver	Numeric	$\pm 6265$
Fragment count filtering	AtlasXomics	QC	Liver	Numeric	$\pm 1960$
Fragment distribution	AtlasXomics	QC	Liver	Numeric	$\pm 8.0$
Mitochondrial filtering	AtlasXomics	QC	Liver	Numeric	$\pm 1709$
TSS enrichment filtering	AtlasXomics	QC	Liver	Numeric	$\pm 2741$
Astrocyte markers	MERFISH	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Cell type distribution	MERFISH	Cell Type	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 5.0$
Microglia markers	MERFISH	Cell Type	Brain	P@K	P@5
Spatial heterogeneity	MERFISH	Cell Type	Brain	MCQ	—
Astrocyte clustering	MERFISH	Clust.	Brain	MCQ	—
Cluster enrichment	MERFISH	Clust.	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 0.1$
Niche cluster markers	MERFISH	Clust.	Brain	P@K	P@5
Aging/inflammatory DE	MERFISH	Diff. Expr.	Brain	MCQ	—

Continued on next page

Table 10 – continued

Description	Platform	Task	Tissue	Grader	Params
Aging/inflammatory DE	MERFISH	Diff. Expr.	Brain	MCQ	—
Aging/inflammatory DE	MERFISH	Diff. Expr.	Brain	P@K	P@5
Cell type changes	MERFISH	Diff. Expr.	Brain	Jaccard	J $\geq$ 0.5
PCA cell separation	MERFISH	Dim. Red.	Brain	MCQ	—
PCA cell separation	MERFISH	Dim. Red.	Brain	MCQ	—
Log z-score normalization	MERFISH	Norm.	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 0.05$
Scaling normalization	MERFISH	Norm.	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 80$
Min UMI filtering	MERFISH	QC	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 50$
Min genes filtering	MERFISH	QC	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 50$
Proximity analysis	MERFISH	Spatial	Brain	MCQ	—
Spatial activation	MERFISH	Spatial	Brain	MCQ	—
Cell subtyping	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 10.0$
Cell type distribution	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 15.0$
Endothelial clusters	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	Jaccard	J $\geq$ 0.5
Endothelial markers	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Granulosa clusters	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	Jaccard	J $\geq$ 0.5
Granulosa markers	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Mesenchymal clusters	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	Jaccard	J $\geq$ 0.5
Mesenchymal markers	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Oocyte clusters	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	Jaccard	J $\geq$ 0.5
Oocyte markers	Seeker	Cell Type	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Antral cluster markers	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Antral cluster markers	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Atretic cluster markers	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Cumulus cluster markers	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
HVG selection	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Major subtype ID	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	MCQ	—
Mitotic cluster markers	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Spatial cluster coherence	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	MCQ	—
Spatial morphology	Seeker	Clust.	Ovary	MCQ	—
Apoptosis trends	Seeker	Diff. Expr.	Ovary	Jaccard	J $\geq$ 0.5
DE markers	Seeker	Diff. Expr.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Differential expression	Seeker	Diff. Expr.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Follicle markers	Seeker	Diff. Expr.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Follicle markers	Seeker	Diff. Expr.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Follicle markers	Seeker	Diff. Expr.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Dim. reduction	Seeker	Dim. Red.	Ovary	MCQ	—
PC gene interpretation	Seeker	Dim. Red.	Ovary	P@K	P@5
PC loading interpretation	Seeker	Dim. Red.	Ovary	MCQ	—
PC loading interpretation	Seeker	Dim. Red.	Ovary	MCQ	—
PC pathway association	Seeker	Dim. Red.	Ovary	MCQ	—
PC population separation	Seeker	Dim. Red.	Ovary	MCQ	—
Count scaling	Seeker	Norm.	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 0.1$
Count transformation	Seeker	Norm.	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 0.1$
Background removal	Seeker	QC	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 2000$
Min UMI filtering	Seeker	QC	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 680$
Min genes filtering	Seeker	QC	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 690$
Mitochondrial filtering	Seeker	QC	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 582$
Follicle counting	Seeker	Spatial	Ovary	Numeric	$\pm 20$
LR directionality	Seeker	Spatial	Ovary	MCQ	—
LR temporal changes	Seeker	Spatial	Ovary	MCQ	—
Ligand-receptor analysis	Seeker	Spatial	Ovary	P@K	P@5
Receptor family analysis	Seeker	Spatial	Ovary	MCQ	—

Continued on next page

Table 10 – continued

Description	Platform	Task	Tissue	Grader	Params
Signaling diversity	Seeker	Spatial	Ovary	MCQ	—
Cell deconvolution	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Fibroblast ID	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	P@K	P@5
Macrophage ID	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	P@K	P@5
Monocyte ID	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	P@K	P@5
NK cell ID	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	P@K	P@5
NK cell ID	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	P@K	P@5
Osteoclast ID	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	P@K	P@5
RUNX2 correlation	Visium	Cell Type	Bone	Numeric	—
Cluster functions	Visium	Clust.	Bone	MCQ	—
Clustering	Visium	Clust.	Bone	P@K	P@5
Niche cluster markers	Visium	Clust.	Bone	P@K	P@5
Niche cluster markers	Visium	Clust.	Bone	P@K	P@5
Spatial cluster coherence	Visium	Clust.	Bone	MCQ	—
DE gene markers	Visium	Diff. Expr.	Bone	P@K	P@5
Enrichment analysis	Visium	Diff. Expr.	Bone	MCQ	—
Gradient ranking	Visium	Diff. Expr.	Bone	MCQ	—
Spatial gradient pathways	Visium	Diff. Expr.	Bone	MCQ	—
HVG selection	Visium	Dim. Red.	Bone	P@K	P@5
UMAP interpretation	Visium	Dim. Red.	Bone	MCQ	—
UMAP neighbor analysis	Visium	Dim. Red.	Bone	MCQ	—
UMAP proximity	Visium	Dim. Red.	Bone	MCQ	—
Variance normalization	Visium	Norm.	Bone	Numeric	$\pm 1$
Min UMI filtering	Visium	QC	Bone	Numeric	$\pm 600$
Min genes filtering	Visium	QC	Bone	Numeric	$\pm 600$
QC filtering	Visium	QC	Bone	Numeric	$\pm 800$
Sparse gene filtering	Visium	QC	Bone	Numeric	$\pm 2000$
Stressed cell filtering	Visium	QC	Bone	Numeric	$\pm 200$
Ligand-receptor analysis	Visium	Spatial	Bone	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Niche pathways	Visium	Spatial	Bone	P@K	P@5
Spatial dependency	Visium	Spatial	Bone	MCQ	—
Spatial niches	Visium	Spatial	Bone	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Spatial niches	Visium	Spatial	Bone	P@K	P@5
Cell type distribution	Xenium	Cell Type	Kidney	Cosine	$\cos \geq 0.8$
Cell type distribution	Xenium	Cell Type	Kidney	Cosine	$\cos \geq 0.8$
Cell type distribution	Xenium	Cell Type	Kidney	Numeric	—
Cell type distribution	Xenium	Cell Type	Kidney	Cosine	$\cos \geq 0.8$
Cell type markers	Xenium	Cell Type	Kidney	P@K	P@5
Interstitial typing	Xenium	Cell Type	Kidney	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Cluster enrichment	Xenium	Clust.	Kidney	Numeric	$\pm 0.2$
Injury niche clustering	Xenium	Clust.	Kidney	MCQ	—
Interstitial clustering	Xenium	Clust.	Kidney	MCQ	—
Niche cluster markers	Xenium	Clust.	Kidney	P@K	P@5
Cell type changes	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
Cell type changes	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
DE gene identification	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	Jaccard	$J \geq 0.5$
DE gene identification	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	P@K	P@5
ECM pathway analysis	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	MCQ	—
Pathway analysis	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	MCQ	—
Signaling programs	Xenium	Diff. Expr.	Kidney	MCQ	—
PC loading interpretation	Xenium	Dim. Red.	Kidney	MCQ	—
PC module pairing	Xenium	Dim. Red.	Kidney	MCQ	—
PCA cell separation	Xenium	Dim. Red.	Kidney	MCQ	—

Continued on next page

Table 10 – continued

Description	Platform	Task	Tissue	Grader	Params
Log1p normalization	Xenium	Norm.	Kidney	Numeric	$\pm 0.1$
Normalization	Xenium	Norm.	Kidney	Numeric	$\pm 0.1$
Detection summary	Xenium	QC	—	Numeric	$\pm 20$
Min UMI filtering	Xenium	QC	—	Numeric	$\pm 50$
Min genes filtering	Xenium	QC	—	Numeric	$\pm 50$
Colocalization patterns	Xenium	Spatial	Kidney	MCQ	—
Neighborhood dynamics	Xenium	Spatial	Kidney	MCQ	—
Niche identity	Xenium	Spatial	Kidney	MCQ	—
Spatial analysis	Xenium	Spatial	Kidney	MCQ	—
Spatial signaling	Xenium	Spatial	Kidney	MCQ	—

## A.2 Canonical Problem Examples

This section presents 10 canonical examples from SpatialBench that illustrate the diversity of tasks, platforms, and grader types in the benchmark. These examples are included in the public release to demonstrate the evaluation format without exposing the full benchmark. Each example includes the task prompt, platform, grader type, and expected answer format.

### Overview

Table 11 summarizes the 10 canonical examples.

Table 11: Overview of canonical examples included in SpatialBench.

#	Task Category	Platform	Tissue	Grader	Key Parameter
1	Quality Control	Xenium	Kidney	Numeric	$\pm 50$ cells
2	Normalization	MERFISH	Brain	Numeric	$\pm 0.05$
3	Dim. Reduction	Seeker	Ovary	MCQ	—
4	Clustering	Visium	Bone	P@K	P@5
5	Clustering	MERFISH	Brain	MCQ	—
6	Cell Typing	Xenium	Kidney	Cosine	$\geq 0.8$
7	Cell Typing	MERFISH	Brain	P@K	P@5
8	Diff. Expression	Seeker	Ovary	P@K	P@5
9	Spatial Analysis	Visium	Bone	Jaccard	$\geq 0.5$
10	Spatial Analysis	Xenium	Kidney	MCQ	—

### Example 1: Quality Control (Xenium)

**ID:** `xenium_qc_filter_min_umi_counts`

**Task:** Filter cells with very low total UMI counts. Return a JSON object with field: `cells_after_filtering` (number remaining after filter).

**Grader:** NumericTolerance with absolute tolerance of  $\pm 50$  cells.

**Rationale:** Tests whether the agent can apply standard quality control thresholds appropriate for spatial transcriptomics data. Spatial platforms typically have lower UMI counts per cell than dissociated single-cell RNA-seq, requiring calibrated filtering thresholds.

### Example 2: Normalization (MERFISH)

**ID:** `merfish_brain_log_zscore_gad2_mean`

**Task:** Using the raw MERFISH brain dataset, first normalize per cell by scaling so that the sum of gene expression values per cell equals 250. Then log-transform the scaled values using log1p. Next, Z-score each gene independently across cells. After z-scoring, compute the mean Z-scored expression of gene ‘Gad2’ across all cells. Return: `{"mean_gene_value": <float>}`.

**Grader:** NumericTolerance with absolute tolerance of  $\pm 0.05$ .

**Rationale:** Tests multi-step normalization pipeline execution. The expected answer (mean z-score  $\approx 0$ ) validates correct implementation of the z-scoring step, which by definition produces zero-mean values per gene.

### Example 3: Dimensionality Reduction (Seeker)

**ID:** seeker\_3x3\_ovary\_1hr\_pc1\_cell\_populations

**Task:** PC1 primarily separates which two cell populations?

- A) Oocytes vs Granulosa cells
- B) Granulosa cells vs Theca/Stroma cells
- C) Theca cells vs Stromal fibroblasts
- D) Endothelial cells vs Smooth muscle

Return: {"answer": "<letter>"}.

**Grader:** MultipleChoice.

**Rationale:** Tests interpretation of PCA results in biological context. The agent must perform PCA, examine loadings or cell distributions along PC1, and identify which cell populations are separated by the dominant axis of variation.

### Example 4: Clustering (Visium)

**ID:** bone\_visium\_c21\_niche\_bone\_formation\_markers

**Task:** Attached is a human bone spatial dataset with estimated cell-type abundance and gene expression. Cluster spots to identify niches, then find the bone-formation niche (active osteogenesis) and return its top 10 enriched marker genes; if none is identified, return an empty list. Return: {"top\_marker\_genes": [...]}.

**Grader:** MarkerGenePrecisionRecall at P@5.

**Rationale:** Tests spatial niche identification and marker gene discovery. The agent must cluster Visium spots based on cell-type composition, identify the biologically relevant niche, and extract differentially expressed markers.

### Example 5: Clustering (MERFISH)

**ID:** merfish\_brain\_clustering\_astro2\_vs\_astro

**Task:** Using filtered, normalized MERFISH brain data, perform clustering based solely on expression data. Compare how Astro-2 cells distribute relative to other astrocyte states. Which pattern best matches?

- A) Astro-2 cells are evenly scattered across multiple astrocyte clusters
- B) Astro-2 cells are enriched in a single dominant cluster transcriptionally distinct from Astro-1
- C) Astro-2 cells form their own isolated cluster with no overlap
- D) Astro-2 cells cluster with non-astrocyte cell types

Return: {"answer": "<letter>"}.

**Grader:** MultipleChoice.

**Rationale:** Tests clustering analysis and biological interpretation. The agent must cluster cells, cross-reference with known cell type annotations, and evaluate cluster composition to determine the correct biological pattern.

### Example 6: Cell Typing (Xenium)

**ID:** classify\_pt\_distribution\_advanced

**Task:** Infer PT subtypes from gene expression (marker-based) and assign each cell exactly one label from: PTS1 (S1 segment), PTS2 (S2 segment), PTS3 (S3 segment), Inj-PT (injured), FR-PT (failed repair). Report the subtype distribution as percentages of total PT cells. Return: {"total\_cells": <int>, "cell\_type\_distribution": {...}}.

**Grader:** DistributionComparison with cosine similarity threshold  $\geq 0.8$ .

**Rationale:** Tests marker-based cell type classification in disease context. The agent must use known PT segment markers and injury-associated genes to classify cells and report accurate population proportions in a kidney injury model.

### Example 7: Cell Typing (MERFISH)

**ID:** merfish\_brain\_astrocyte\_aging\_markers

**Task:** Using MERFISH brain data without cell type labels, identify astrocytes and distinguish an aging/inflammation-associated astrocyte state from baseline astrocyte states based on expression and clustering. Select a small set of significantly enriched marker genes for the aging-associated state. Return: {"top\_marker\_genes": [...]}.

**Grader:** MarkerGenePrecisionRecall at P@5.

**Rationale:** Tests de novo cell type identification and state-specific marker discovery. The agent must first identify astrocytes without labels, then find a biologically meaningful substate and its characteristic markers.

### Example 8: Differential Expression (Seeker)

**ID:** ovary\_mural\_gc\_atretic\_follicle\_markers

**Task:** Using mouse ovary spatial data with cell type annotations, find the top 20 differentially expressed genes in Atretic follicle mural granulosa cells compared to other follicle types (Antral, Preantral). Subset to mural granulosa cells from Immature ovary samples only. Exclude ribosomal genes (Rps\*, Rpl\*, Mrp\*) from results. Return: {"top\_marker\_genes": [...]}.

**Grader:** MarkerGenePrecisionRecall at P@5.

**Rationale:** Tests conditional differential expression analysis. The agent must correctly subset data based on multiple criteria, perform DE analysis, and filter results appropriately.

### Example 9: Spatial Analysis (Visium)

**ID:** visium\_spatial\_niches\_bone\_meslin

**Task:** Using human bone Visium data with cell2location deconvolution results, identify exactly 2 spatial niches using clustering. Determine which cell types are enriched in the osteogenic niche. Return: {"osteogenic\_enriched\_celltypes": [...]}.

**Grader:** JaccardLabelSet with threshold  $\geq 0.5$ .

**Rationale:** Tests spatial niche identification and cell type enrichment analysis. The agent must integrate deconvolution results with spatial clustering to identify biologically meaningful tissue compartments.

### Example 10: Spatial Analysis (Xenium)

**ID:** xenium\_kidney\_cn3\_pts3\_neighborhood\_dynamics

**Task:** Based on annotated cell types, how does the fraction of cells assigned to CN3 change over the ischemia–reperfusion injury time course?

- A) Present at all timepoints with stable abundance

- B) Absent during mid-injury phase (hour 12 and day 2) and reappears during repair
- C) Present only at 6 weeks post-injury
- D) Restricted to the medulla at all timepoints with no temporal change

Return: {"answer": "<letter>"}.

**Grader:** MultipleChoice.

**Rationale:** Tests temporal dynamics analysis in spatial context. The agent must track cell neighborhood composition changes across injury and repair phases, requiring integration of spatial annotations with temporal metadata.

### Evaluation Format

All evaluations follow a standardized JSON format:

```
{
  "id": "evaluation_identifier",
  "task": "Natural language task description...",
  "data_node": "latch://path/to/dataset.h5ad",
  "grader": {
    "type": "grader_type",
    "config": {
      "ground_truth": {...},
      "tolerances": {...}
    }
  },
  "metadata": {
    "task": "task_category",
    "kit": "platform_name"
  }
}
```

The canonical examples are available in the `evals_canonical/` directory of the SpatialBench repository, organized by task category.

## A.3 Grader Specification

This section documents the grader system used in SpatialBench, including grader families, tolerance rules, answer normalization, and validation methodology.

### Overview

SpatialBench implements a modular grading system with 5 primary grader families covering different answer types encountered in spatial biology analysis. Each grader inherits from a base class that handles answer extraction from agent responses and delegates evaluation to type-specific logic.

Table 12: Distribution of grader types across SpatialBench evaluations.

Grader Family	Evaluations	Primary Use Cases
MultipleChoiceGrader	45	Interpretation, biological pattern identification
MarkerGenePrecisionRecallGrader	45	Marker discovery, differential expression
NumericToleranceGrader	36	QC metrics, counts, expression values
LabelSetJaccardGrader	18	Cell type prediction, niche composition
DistributionComparisonGrader	3	Cell population proportions

## Grader Families

### 1. NumericToleranceGrader

Evaluates numeric answers against ground truth values with configurable tolerance.

#### Input format:

```
{"field_name": <numeric_value>}
```

#### Tolerance types:

- **absolute**: Pass if  $|x_{\text{pred}} - x_{\text{true}}| \leq \epsilon$
- **relative**: Pass if  $\frac{|x_{\text{pred}} - x_{\text{true}}|}{|x_{\text{true}}|} \leq \epsilon$
- **min**: Pass if  $x_{\text{pred}} \geq x_{\text{true}}$  (lower bound)
- **max**: Pass if  $x_{\text{pred}} \leq x_{\text{true}}$  (upper bound)

**Multi-field evaluation:** When multiple fields are specified, all must pass for overall success.

#### Example configuration:

```
{
  "type": "numeric_tolerance",
  "config": {
    "ground_truth": {"cells_after_filtering": 1374915},
    "tolerances": {
      "cells_after_filtering": {"type": "absolute", "value": 50}
    }
  }
}
```

**Tolerance rationale:** Absolute tolerances are calibrated to the expected variance from reasonable implementation choices. For cell counts, tolerances of 50–100 cells accommodate minor differences in filtering order or edge cases. For normalized expression values (e.g., z-scores), tolerances of 0.05 account for floating-point precision and minor algorithmic differences.

### 2. MultipleChoiceGrader

Evaluates discrete answer selection from predefined options.

#### Input format:

```
{"answer": "<letter>"}
```

#### Matching rules:

- Case-insensitive comparison (“a”, “A”, and “A” all match)
- Whitespace trimming applied before comparison
- Exact single-character match required

#### Example configuration:

```
{
  "type": "multiple_choice",
  "config": {
    "correct_answer": "B"
  }
}
```

**Design rationale:** Multiple-choice questions test biological interpretation rather than exact computation. Each question includes 3–4 plausible distractors designed to capture common misconceptions or analysis errors.

### 3. MarkerGenePrecisionRecallGrader

Evaluates marker gene lists using precision and recall at K.

**Input format:**

```
{"top_marker_genes": ["Gene1", "Gene2", ...]}
```

**Metrics:**

$$\text{Precision@K} = \frac{|\text{Predicted} \cap \text{Canonical}|}{K} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Recall@K} = \frac{|\text{Predicted} \cap \text{Canonical}|}{|\text{Canonical}|} \quad (2)$$

**Matching rules:**

- Case-insensitive gene name comparison (COL1A1 matches col1a1)
- No synonym expansion (gene symbols must match exactly after case normalization)
- Set-based comparison (order within the predicted list does not affect scoring)

**Default thresholds:** Precision@K  $\geq 0.60$ , Recall@K  $\geq 0.50$

**Example configuration:**

```
{
  "type": "marker_gene_precision_recall",
  "config": {
    "canonical_markers": ["COL1A1", "COL1A2", "SPP1", "SPARC", "BGLAP", "IBSP"],
    "scoring": {
      "pass_thresholds": {
        "precision_at_k": 0.0,
        "recall_at_k": 0.5
      }
    }
  }
}
```

**Threshold rationale:** Recall thresholds are set based on the number of canonical markers and biological redundancy. For small canonical sets (5–10 genes), recall  $\geq 0.5$  ensures that the agent identifies the core biological signal. Precision thresholds are often relaxed (0.0–0.3) to allow discovery of valid but unlisted markers.

### 4. LabelSetJaccardGrader

Evaluates predicted label sets against ground truth using Jaccard similarity.

**Input format:**

```
{"cell_types_predicted": ["Type1", "Type2", ...]}
```

**Metric:**

$$J(A, B) = \frac{|A \cap B|}{|A \cup B|} \quad (3)$$

**Matching rules:**

- Exact string matching (case-sensitive)
- No partial matching or synonym expansion
- Both false positives and false negatives penalized symmetrically

**Default threshold:** Jaccard  $\geq 0.90$

**Example configuration:**

```
{  
  "type": "jaccard_label_set",  
  "config": {  
    "ground_truth_labels": ["Mesenchymal lineage"],  
    "scoring": {  
      "pass_threshold": 1.0  
    }  
  }  
}
```

**Threshold rationale:** High thresholds (0.9–1.0) are used when the ground truth set is small and unambiguous. Lower thresholds (0.5–0.7) accommodate tasks where multiple valid label sets exist.

## 5. DistributionComparisonGrader

Evaluates predicted cell type distributions against ground truth proportions.

**Input format:**

```
{  
  "total_cells": <integer>,  
  "cell_type_distribution": {  
    "Type1": <percentage>,  
    "Type2": <percentage>,  
    ...  
  }  
}
```

**Matching rules:**

- Per-category absolute tolerance on percentages (typically  $\pm 3\text{--}5\%$ )
- Optional total cell count validation
- Missing categories treated as failures
- Extra categories (not in ground truth) flagged but may not fail depending on configuration

**Example configuration:**

```
{  
  "type": "distribution_comparison",  
  "config": {  
    "ground_truth": {  
      "cell_type_distribution": {  
        "Inj_PT": 48.55, "PTS2": 5.02, "PTS1": 42.06,  
        "PTS3": 0.9, "FR_PT": 3.47  
      }  
    },  
    "tolerances": {  
      "cell_type_percentages": {"type": "absolute", "value": 5.0}  
    }  
  }  
}
```

**Tolerance rationale:** Percentage tolerances of  $\pm 5\%$  accommodate variation from different marker thresholds and assignment algorithms while ensuring the agent captures the correct rank ordering and approximate proportions.

## Answer Extraction

All graders use a common answer extraction mechanism from agent responses:

1. Scan assistant messages in reverse chronological order
2. Locate `submit_response` tool calls
3. Extract JSON from `<EVAL_ANSWER>...</EVAL_ANSWER>` tags
4. Parse JSON and validate required fields

If answer extraction fails (no tags found, malformed JSON, or missing fields), the evaluation automatically fails with an explanatory message.

## Tolerance Design Principles

### Numeric Tolerances

Numeric tolerances are calibrated based on:

1. **Biological variance:** Expected variation from legitimate methodological choices (e.g., exact filtering threshold)
2. **Computational precision:** Floating-point differences from library versions or implementation details
3. **Discrimination:** Tight enough to distinguish correct from incorrect approaches

For example, the QC cell count tolerance of  $\pm 50$  cells on a dataset of 1.4M cells (<0.004%) is calibrated to:

- Accept minor threshold variations (e.g.,  $<10$  vs  $\leq 10$  UMIs)
- Reject fundamentally wrong approaches (e.g., filtering 40% of cells)

### Gene Name Normalization

Gene names are normalized to lowercase before comparison. This handles:

- Species conventions (`COL1A1` in human vs `Col1a1` in mouse)
- Database variations (`HGNC` vs `Ensembl` symbol formatting)
- Agent output variations

Synonym expansion (e.g., `CD4`  $\leftrightarrow$  `Cd4 antigen`) is deliberately not implemented to:

- Maintain reproducibility across synonym database versions
- Avoid ambiguous many-to-many mappings
- Encourage agents to use canonical nomenclature from the dataset

### Multiple-Choice Normalization

Answer normalization includes:

- Uppercase conversion
- Whitespace trimming
- Single-character extraction

This accepts variations like “`b`”, “`B`”, “ `B` ”, and “`B)`” as equivalent.

### Validation and Quality Control

Grader correctness and robustness were validated through multiple mechanisms:

## 1. Ground Truth Verification

Each evaluation's ground truth was independently computed by:

1. Manual analysis following the task specification
2. Cross-validation against published results where available
3. Verification by a second analyst for complex evaluations

## 2. Tolerance Calibration

Tolerances were calibrated by:

1. Computing ground truth with multiple valid approaches
2. Measuring the range of correct answers
3. Setting tolerances to accept all valid approaches while rejecting incorrect ones
4. Testing with adversarial edge cases (e.g., off-by-one errors, wrong gene)

## 3. Grader Unit Testing

Each grader includes test coverage for:

- Exact match (pass)
- Within tolerance (pass)
- Outside tolerance (fail)
- Missing fields (fail with message)
- Type errors (fail gracefully)
- Edge cases (empty lists, zero values, special characters)

## 4. Anti-Gaming Measures

Evaluations are designed to resist trivial exploitation:

- Numeric answers require actual computation (cannot be guessed from task wording)
- Gene lists require analysis of the specific dataset (canonical markers vary by context)
- Multiple-choice distractors are biologically plausible
- Distribution tasks require correct identification of all categories

## 5. Manual Trajectory Review

A random sample of agent trajectories was manually reviewed to verify that:

- Passing evaluations reflect genuine understanding
- Failing evaluations identify real errors
- Edge cases are handled appropriately

### Grader Configuration Schema

All graders follow a consistent JSON schema:

```
{  
  "type": "<grader_type>",  
  "config": {  
    "ground_truth": {...},      // Expected answer(s)  
    "tolerances": {...},        // Type-specific tolerance config  
    "scoring": {...}           // Thresholds and pass criteria  
  }  
}
```

Valid grader types:

- `numeric_tolerance`
- `multiple_choice`
- `marker_gene_precision_recall`
- `jaccard_label_set`
- `distribution_comparison`

### Extensibility

New graders can be added by:

1. Subclassing `BinaryGrader`
2. Implementing the `evaluate_answer(agent_answer, config)` method
3. Registering in `GRADER_REGISTRY`

The grader system is designed to be framework-agnostic, accepting any JSON-serializable answer format.

## A.4 Statistical Methods

This section details the statistical procedures used for computing confidence intervals, handling missing data, and aggregating results across models and evaluation categories.

### Experimental Design

Each model configuration was evaluated on 146 evaluations across 3 independent runs. Runs were executed with identical evaluation sets but independent random seeds for any stochastic agent behavior. The total sample comprises 9 model configurations  $\times$  3 runs  $\times$  146 evaluations = 3,942 individual evaluation attempts.

### Confidence Interval Procedure

#### Two-Stage Aggregation

Confidence intervals are computed using a two-stage aggregation procedure:

**Stage 1: Per-evaluation averaging.** For each evaluation  $e$ , compute the mean score across runs:

$$\bar{s}_e = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R s_{e,r} \quad (4)$$

where  $s_{e,r} \in \{0, 1\}$  is the pass/fail indicator for evaluation  $e$  in run  $r$ , and  $R$  is the number of runs (typically 3).

**Stage 2: Cross-evaluation inference.** Treat the  $N$  per-evaluation means  $\{\bar{s}_1, \dots, \bar{s}_N\}$  as the sample for inference. Compute the overall accuracy as:

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{e=1}^N \bar{s}_e \quad (5)$$

### Confidence Interval Construction

We use a t-distribution-based interval to account for uncertainty in the variance estimate:

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{e=1}^N (\bar{s}_e - \hat{\mu})^2 \quad (6)$$

$$SE = \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{N}} \quad (7)$$

$$CI_{95\%} = \hat{\mu} \pm t_{0.975, N-1} \times SE \quad (8)$$

where  $t_{0.975, N-1}$  is the 97.5th percentile of the Student's t-distribution with  $N - 1$  degrees of freedom.

**Rationale:** This procedure treats evaluations as the unit of analysis, acknowledging that evaluations vary in difficulty and that the benchmark's coverage of the evaluation space is the primary source of uncertainty. CIs computed over runs would underestimate uncertainty by ignoring evaluation-level variance.

### Subgroup Analysis

For task-specific and platform-specific accuracy, the same procedure is applied within each subgroup:

- Task categories: QC, Normalization, Dimensionality Reduction, Clustering, Cell Typing, Differential Expression, Spatial Analysis
- Platforms: Xenium, Visium, MERFISH, Seeker, AtlasXomics

Subgroup CIs have larger widths due to smaller sample sizes (e.g.,  $N = 7$  for Normalization vs  $N = 39$  for Cell Typing).

### Efficiency Metrics

The same two-stage procedure is applied to efficiency metrics:

#### Steps per evaluation:

$$\bar{k}_e = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R k_{e,r} \quad (9)$$

where  $k_{e,r}$  is the number of agent steps for evaluation  $e$  in run  $r$ .

**Duration and cost:** Analogous formulas for  $\bar{t}_e$  (seconds) and  $\bar{c}_e$  (USD).

### Handling of Missing Data

#### Timeouts and Crashes

Evaluations that exceed the step limit (100 steps) or crash are recorded with:

- `passed: false`
- `missing: true` (for crashed evaluations only)
- Efficiency metrics: recorded up to the point of timeout/crash

Missing evaluations are included in accuracy calculations as failures. This is conservative: it penalizes models that crash rather than treating missing data as ignorable.

### Reference-Based Imputation

When aggregating across runs, missing evaluations are imputed from a reference run:

1. Identify the set of expected evaluations from a complete reference run
2. For each missing evaluation, insert a failure record
3. Proceed with standard aggregation

This ensures consistent evaluation counts across models and runs.

## Bounded Metrics

### Accuracy Bounds

Accuracy is naturally bounded in  $[0, 1]$ . Confidence intervals computed via the t-interval formula may extend below 0 or above 1 when accuracy is near the boundaries and variance is high. For presentation, reported intervals are clipped to  $[0, 100]\%$ .

### Step Count Bounds

Step counts are bounded below by 1 (minimum one step to attempt the task) and above by 100 (the step limit). The step limit is a hard constraint; evaluations reaching 100 steps are recorded as 100 regardless of whether additional steps would have been attempted.

**Clipping rationale:** The step limit represents a practical constraint on agent computation budget, not a true upper bound on difficulty. We report step counts as-is without adjustment.

### Cost Bounds

Cost is bounded below by 0 and has no explicit upper bound. However, cost correlates with step count, so the step limit implicitly bounds cost per evaluation. A small number of evaluations ( $<2\%$ ) had missing cost data due to API logging issues; these were excluded from cost aggregates but included in accuracy calculations.

### Multiple Comparisons

We do not apply multiple comparison corrections to the reported confidence intervals for several reasons:

1. **Exploratory analysis:** The benchmark is intended for model comparison and capability assessment, not hypothesis testing.
2. **Dependent structure:** Evaluations within task categories share systematic difficulty, violating independence assumptions of standard corrections.
3. **Interpretability:** Uncorrected 95% CIs are directly interpretable as reflecting sampling uncertainty.

Readers should interpret overlapping CIs as indicating plausible equivalence, not definitive equality.

### Tie-Breaking

For model rankings (e.g., “best model by task”), ties are broken by:

1. Point estimate (higher is better for accuracy)
2. Confidence interval width (narrower is preferred)
3. Alphabetical order (as a last resort)

In practice, point estimates differ sufficiently that tie-breaking is rarely needed.