

The Verifier is the Curriculum: Precision Sets the Return on Search in Code Self-Distillation

Chenyu Zhou¹ Qiliang Jiang² Shuning Wu³ Xu Zhou^{3*}

¹School of Engineering, Institute of Science Tokyo, Japan

²College of Control Science and Engineering, Zhejiang University, China

³Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, Singapore

zhou.c.76d6@m.isct.ac.jp jiangqiliang@zju.edu.cn

shuningwu@u.nus.edu zhouxu_nus@u.nus.edu

Abstract

Post-training a code generator against a learned judge can optimize proxy features that raise the score without improving the artifact. We study the opposite signal: a *deterministic, judge-free* filter that asks only whether a generated project launches cleanly under a headless engine (STRICT-LAUNCH). Under this gate, rejection-sampling self-distillation *compounds* out-of-family generalization: on GameCraft-Bench, a 14B model raises the per-candidate clean-launch rate on four held-out families from 8.8% to **42.2%**, and coverage at 32 candidates from 84% to **100%**, the gold references’ own ceiling, beating the supervised model on **every one** of the 25 held-out tasks; retraining under three independent seeds reproduces the three-round climb at 13.3, 26.4, and 43.7%. The gate costs one engine invocation per candidate: no reward model, no judge.

At a fixed admitted count, what governs the loop is **verifier precision**. Swapping only the gate for a lenient BUILD check erases the gain ($p=0.0012$); a matched gold-duplication control regresses below the supervised model ($p=0.018$). Under a *semantic* gate on APPS, dialing fuel precision π from 1.0 to 0.25 at fixed candidate count prices that fuel linearly: over 23 training seeds, half-clean fuel returns +3.59 percentage points (pp) against the +3.69 a linear rate predicts.

Under count-matched rejection-SFT only one direction of verifier error carries a measurable cost. Masking three quarters of every problem’s correct candidates moves held-out transfer by -0.03pp $[-0.74, +0.63]$, while admitting a quarter of false positives moves it by -1.58pp . Search obeys the same gate: quadrupling the harvest budget is worth +1.62pp behind a STRICT gate and nothing distinguishable from zero behind a PARTIAL one. Recall is nearly free; search pays only through a precise gate: the verifier is the curriculum.

1 Introduction

Post-training a code-generation model requires a signal that says whether a candidate is good. The dominant choice for open-ended generation is a *learned judge*, an LLM or multimodal model prompted to score the output. This is convenient and correlates with human preference, but it has a structural failure mode: a learned judge maps an output to a score through whatever surface features drive its prediction, and if any of those features is cheap to manipulate without improving the artifact, a model optimized against the judge will find it. GameCraft-Bench’s official judge has exactly such a feature (§4): an agent lifts the judge’s art score to $1.8\times$ by swapping solid-color placeholders for real assets with the game’s code frozen.

This paper takes the opposite stance on *which signal to train against*. Rather than chase a better learned judge, we make the training filter a *deterministic, judge-free* execution check that exposes no scalar score to optimize, and make it the gate of an iterative self-distillation loop. A candidate passes only if the materialized project launches cleanly under a headless engine: the engine returns exit code 0 with no parse, load, or resource error (STRICT-LAUNCH)—a property of the artifact under a fixed engine, not an opinion.

The GameCraft-Bench task (Luo et al., 2026) maps a one-paragraph brief to a *complete* Godot project from scratch (§3). A scene referencing a missing script, or a script with a parse error, yields nothing that runs: an artifact must execute, not merely look plausible.

Our central finding is that under the STRICT-LAUNCH gate, rejection-sampling self-distillation *compounds*: each round’s gain accrues on top of the last at a fixed harvest budget. Starting from a supervised model that launches cleanly on held-out families only 8.8% of the time, three rounds of “generate on the training families, keep what launches

*Corresponding author: zhouxu_nus@u.nus.edu

cleanly, retrain” lift the per-candidate clean-launch rate to 42.2% and push coverage of the 25 held-out tasks, at the full 32-candidate budget, from 84% to 100%, the gold-reference ceiling. The gains are significant at every round and come from the self-generated fuel rather than from mere duplication of gold: an exactly duplicated gold control hurts. In self-distillation the acceptance filter defines the next training distribution, so what it certifies is what the model learns: the verifier is the curriculum.

Contributions. We introduce a deterministic, judge-free launch gate: one engine invocation, no reward model to train, no judge to query. Under it self-distillation compounds out-of-family, beating the supervised model on **every one** of the 25 held-out tasks; an execution-grounding readout that the gate never optimizes rises over the same rounds (§6). We identify **verifier precision** as the causal variable under two verifier *classes* (execution and semantic), and measure its conversion rate: admitted correctness converts into held-out gain at an approximately constant rate over fuel precision $\pi \in [0.25, 1]$ (§7, §8). And we give the error accounting for that axis. Under count-matched rejection-SFT the cost is carried almost entirely by false positives, so a gate may spend three quarters of its recall for free as long as the surviving pool still fills the quota. The harvest budget K_h , by contrast, pays only through a precise gate: STRICT at $K_h = 8$ beats PARTIAL at 32 on a quarter of the generation and verification (§10). Finally, we locate that accounting in the learning *interface*: swap the optimizer for GRPO at a matched Youden index (TPR – FPR) and the training signal reverses, the false-negative arm drawing *more* gradient and spending it pushing away from trajectories that in fact passed (§8).

2 Related work

Self-training and verifier quality. Bootstrapping a model on its own filtered generations is well established, in STaR (Zelikman et al., 2022), V-STaR (Hosseini et al., 2024), ReST and ReST-EM (Gulcehre et al., 2023; Singh et al., 2024), and rejection-sampling fine-tuning for math (Yuan et al., 2023), with recent on-policy, code, and consensus-gated variants (Zhao et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2026; Stein et al., 2026). A concurrent line asks how the *quality* of the signal, rather than the optimizer, governs the loop: weak rubric verifiers yield proxy gains that fail a cross-family panel

(Mahmoud et al., 2026), systematic RLVR verifier error can collapse training (Egashira et al., 2026), and at test time verifier precision bounds rejection-sampling gain (Lu et al., 2025). We establish the offline, training-time case, holding the optimizer fixed so that a matched filter swap identifies the verifier’s precision as the causal variable.

How much precision is enough. Two concurrent lines put a number on verifier reliability from the online side. Plesner et al. (2026) find RLVR within 2pp of a clean baseline at label noise up to 15%, and Cai et al. (2025) model an unreliable verifier as a reward channel with asymmetric error rates. But a scalar rate cannot say which direction of error to spend a budget on: the noise in Plesner et al. (2026) is symmetric and resampled each epoch, and they name the missing piece themselves—their precision-over-recall conclusion needs “a systematic controlled study varying FPR and FNR independently, including fixed noise”. That study is what §8 reports, offline and on policy. On the online side the sharpest prediction is Rad et al.’s (2026) bandit analysis of GRPO under noisy verification, in which the drift on incorrect reasoning modes is governed by the Youden index alone. Our two corrupted arms sit at that same index yet do not *train* alike (§8). Gureja et al. (2025) report the complementary regime of model-generated tests, where relaxing an all-tests-pass criterion recovers valuable training data that a rigid one discards.

Amplification versus reach. A distinct question is whether self-training acquires capability beyond the base or only expresses what the base already has. On a free-verifier synthetic domain, Strozzi (2026) report the latter and make the distinction decidable through a pass@ K crossover; Qi et al. (2026) find a persistent gap between self-generated and oracle supervision in closed-loop self-evolution. Both bear on the *capability* the loop ends with; ours is about the *curriculum* it trains on. What we add is the precision axis both setups hold fixed: their verifiers are exact.

Capacity versus verifier precision. Self-improvement has a capacity prerequisite (Song et al., 2025), but there the model verifies its own outputs, coupling capacity to verifier precision. An external, deterministic verifier decouples them: we vary precision at fixed capacity (§7) and capacity at a fixed verifier (§9).

Gameable judges and verifiable game generation. Automatic judges and benchmarks are known to be cheatable (Amodei et al., 2016; Zheng et al., 2025; Zhong et al., 2025; Thaman, 2026; Mahmoud et al., 2026; Helff et al., 2026), and a growing line studies code/game generation against executable checks instead (Chi et al., 2026; Sun et al., 2026; Jiang et al., 2026; Zhang et al., 2025; Jia et al., 2026). We use GameCraft-Bench (Luo et al., 2026) to ask how a judge-free execution filter shapes *what post-training transfers*.

3 Setup: the GameCraft-Bench task

GameCraft-Bench (Luo et al., 2026) poses end-to-end game synthesis: given a short design brief, a model must emit a complete, runnable Godot 4 (Linetsky et al., 2014) project. A valid output contains, at minimum, a `project.godot` engine configuration, one or more `.tscn` scene files, the `.gd` scripts that implement behavior, and a `demo_outputs/` trace of recorded input events that exercises the game. The benchmark’s official metric, OVERALL, is produced by a GPT-5.5 visual judge that renders the running game and scores it on multiple qualitative axes.

Why from-scratch projects are hard. Correctness is *conjunctive* across heterogeneous components (engine config $\wedge$ scene graph $\wedge$ scripts $\wedge$ resources): the engine refuses to run if a scene references a script that fails to parse, if a resource path is malformed, or if an autoload errors at startup. A snippet that almost works still resembles its target; a project that almost coheres does not run at all.

Families and the held-out split. The benchmark groups its 140 tasks into 15 game families (platformer, strategy, roguelike, simulation, ...). We split the families three ways to measure *cross-family* rather than in-distribution generalization: 10 for training (111 gold projects), four held out, which the model never trains on (horror, rhythm, puzzle, shooter; 25 tasks), and one (4 tasks) excluded from both. The self-distillation harvest likewise draws only from training-family briefs (Appendix C).

4 Which signal to train against

We call a filter *gameable* if a cheap transformation of the artifact raises its score while leaving task-relevant executable behavior unchanged. The

benchmark’s visual judge is gameable: even *randomly chosen* CC0 sprites lift its art score, though it scores a fixed frame consistently ($\sigma < 0.01$; Appendix A).

A verification ladder. We order the available signals by how much they certify (Appendix Fig. 4) and train against the strongest rung that is still a fixed engine predicate with no tunable score. BUILD, the rung below STRICT-LAUNCH, only opens the project headless and quits; parse errors are not fatal. Read as verifiers, the rungs differ in *precision*: BUILD accepts 887 of the 888 candidates the supervised model generates on the training families; only 73 of those (8.2%) also pass STRICT-LAUNCH. We test the consequence of a weaker rung in §7.

5 Method: launch-gated iterative self-distillation

The procedure is rejection-sampling self-distillation (Zelikman et al., 2022; Gulcehre et al., 2023; Yuan et al., 2023) with one deliberate choice: the acceptance filter is the deterministic STRICT-LAUNCH gate of the verification ladder of §4, applied only to training-family briefs. Matched controls isolate that signal; Appendix Algorithm 1 states one round.

Rounds. Round 0 produces the supervised model M_0 (SFT), trained on the 111 gold training-family projects; we write RFT- t for the model after t rounds of this rejection-filtered training. Each subsequent round generates candidates with the previous model, harvests its clean self-generated set (the *fuel*), appends it to the *gold* pool, which remains the anchor, and retrains a fresh LoRA from the base. The fuel grows every round (67 clean projects from M_0 , 123 from M_1 , 186 from M_2).

Generation and training. Each round retrains a fresh LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) on Qwen3-14B (Qwen Team, 2025) and harvests $K_h = 8$ candidates per brief with vLLM (Kwon et al., 2023); the full configuration is in Appendix C. For harvesting, STRICT-LAUNCH is paired with a fixed three-file minimum, held constant in every control below.

Evaluation protocol. The primary metric is the per-candidate clean-launch rate, with all comparisons paired by task and tested by cluster-permutation within each task ($N = 25$); coverage@ K (a task is covered if any of its candi-

Table 1: Results on the four held-out families (25 tasks). The per-candidate clean-launch rate (over four decoding seeds) carries a Wilson 95% CI describing each arm’s own candidate pool; all between-arm comparisons use the paired task-level tests of §5. The 3-seed column reports arms retrained under three training seeds (mean $\pm$ s.d.).

model	per-candidate %	3-seed	cov.@32 %
SFT	8.8 _[7.0,10.9]	—	84
RFT-r1	13.6 _[11.4,16.2]	13.3 $\pm$ 0.7	88
RFT-r2	30.9 _[27.8,34.2]	26.4 $\pm$ 1.6	100
RFT-r3	42.2_[38.9,45.7]	43.7$\pm$1.5	100
CTRL (gold-dup)	5.6 _[4.2,7.4]	—	84
BUILD-gated	8.6 _[6.9,10.8]	—	84
GEN-SWAP	22.4 _[19.6,25.4]	—	100
gold ceiling	100	—	100

dates launches cleanly) is reported with the unbiased estimator $1 - \binom{n-c}{K} / \binom{n}{K}$ (Chen et al., 2021) at $K = 32$ (n candidates pooled per task, c of them clean). We write $+a/-b$ for the numbers of held-out tasks an arm improves and worsens. Per-configuration budgets and coverage estimators are in Appendix Table 5.

6 Results

Compounding to the gold ceiling. Table 1 gives the main result (per-round trajectory in Appendix Fig. 8). Under the STRICT-LAUNCH gate, three rounds of self-distillation lift the per-candidate clean-launch rate on the four held-out families from 8.8% to 42.2%. Task-level coverage at the full 32-candidate budget rises from 84% to 100%, the gold-reference ceiling, with no crossover within the sampled budget (Appendix Fig. 7). Coverage saturates by round 2, so the round-over-round compounding is carried by the per-candidate rate rather than by coverage. On the four tasks the supervised model never solves within its full 32-candidate pool, it needs 25–35 $\times$ as many draws to match a single distilled draw (Appendix D).

Significance at every round. The improvements survive paired, task-level testing (cluster-permutation, $N = 25$): round 1 over SFT gains +4.9pp (95% CI [+1.9, +8.1], $p = 0.0017$); round 3 gains +33.5pp (95% CI [+27.9, +39.6], $p < 10^{-4}$) on every one of the 25 tasks ($\geq +4/32$ clean candidates each).

Robustness and per-family coverage. Under three independent training seeds the round-wise

rates (Table 1, 3-seed column) are monotone in every seed and end above the single-run trajectory. Every family reaches full coverage by round 3 (Appendix Table 4).

The gains are functional. The gains are not confined to the axis the gate reads. An execution-grounding signal that steps the headless Scene-Tree shows the number of held-out tasks with a grounded clean candidate (score ≥ 0.50 ; Appendix B) rising monotonically, $10 \rightarrow 12 \rightarrow 14 \rightarrow 15$ of 25 (Appendix Fig. 6). A blind brief-compliance judge, never a training signal, counts projects that both launch and implement their brief: $5.0 \rightarrow 7.4 \rightarrow 12.4 \rightarrow 14.4$ per 100 candidates (both signals and their controls in Appendix B).

7 Mechanism: verifier precision is the causal variable

Three matched controls at a fixed fuel budget locate the gain.

Exact duplication regresses (Appendix Fig. 3). CTRL adds 67 exact duplicates of gold training projects, matched per task to round 1’s fuel. It regresses below SFT: 5.6% per-candidate against 8.8% (+7/−13, $p = 0.018$). It buys no coverage: at $K = 32$ CTRL sits at SFT’s 84% (Table 1). The 67 copies fall on the 48 of 111 training tasks round 1 already covers, doubling their weight. Self-distilled round 1 at the *same* budget beats CTRL +16/−5, $p < 10^{-4}$, in every leave-one-family-out fold ($p \leq 0.017$).

Each round’s fuel is better, not just larger. Holding budget and coverage fixed, drawing round 1’s count of fuel from a later generator (GEN-SWAP) isolates fuel *quality*: +8.8pp over round 1 itself (22.4 against 13.6), +20/−3, $p < 10^{-4}$, nearly twice round 1’s gain over SFT, so the loop compounds.

A matched filter swap erases the gain. The BUILD-gated control reruns round 1’s loop with the data source fixed and only the filter changed: STRICT-LAUNCH swapped for the lenient BUILD rung (§4). Because BUILD accepts nearly every candidate while STRICT-LAUNCH accepts few, the count-matched BUILD fuel is 81% STRICT-LAUNCH-broken (54/67). Trained on it, the model reaches only 8.6% per-candidate clean-launch on the held-out families: indistinguishable from SFT (8.8%, paired $p = 1.0$) and far below round 1’s

13.6% (+5/−16, $p=0.0012$). Changing only the verifier’s precision—nothing about the optimizer, the budget, or the task distribution—erases the entire first-round gain: what transfers depends on the acceptance signal. The supervised model’s candidates break exactly where the gate looks: 815 of 888 fail STRICT-LAUNCH, every one on a parse error (Appendix B).

Volume is not the binding constraint. Cutting round 1’s fuel from 67 projects to 8 still lifts per-candidate clean-launch to 11.3% (+2.5pp [+0.4, +4.8] vs. SFT; −2.3pp [−5.3, +0.3] vs. full fuel).

Precision buys coverage. Across rounds the self-distilled fuel covers 48, then 77, then 101 of the 111 training tasks (9 → 10 → 10 families) with almost no duplication, whereas the exact-duplication control re-covers the same 48 tasks and regresses (Appendix Fig. 3). High precision thus buys coverage rather than costing it, inverting the usual trade-off (Kynkäänniemi et al., 2019): a binary launch gate certifies only that the project runs, so rounds harvest novel working variants. The same widening appears at 8B, where the fuel reaches 31 → 51 → 75 of the 111 training tasks (Appendix C).

8 Pricing the fuel: a semantic gate in competitive programming

The precision axis above is established with an *execution* gate. We test it under a second *class* of verifier, one that checks correctness rather than execution: APPS introductory competitive-programming problems (Hendrycks et al., 2021), where a candidate is accepted only if it passes *all* hidden unit tests. Unlike the binary launch signal, a unit-test suite admits a *graded* verdict, so we can ask not only whether a precise gate beats a lenient one but whether the *most* precise gate is best.

Setup. We lightly supervise Qwen3-4B on 300 APPS-introductory solutions (one epoch), giving an APPS model, again M_0 , that solves 20.4% of 470 held-out problems at pass@1. From M_0 we harvest $K_h=8$ candidates on each of 1500 training problems and score every candidate on the unit-test ladder; 527 problems yield an all-pass candidate. We then build three *count-matched* fuel sets (1300 candidates each, gold held fixed) differing only in the gate that admitted them: STRICT (all tests pass), PARTIAL (at least half the tests pass, but not all), and LENIENT (syntax-valid, but not all tests pass).

We retrain M_0 on each set under the same recipe; we evaluate pass@1 and coverage@8 over eight training seeds on the 470 held-out problems (three decoding seeds each), paired per problem.

Transfer rises sharply with gate strictness (Appendix Table 6). STRICT-gated self-distillation raises held-out pass@1 from 20.4% to 25.5% (+5.15pp [+4.14, +6.20], $p = 0.0002$) and coverage@8 from 41.5% to 44.8% (+3.32pp [+1.61, +5.06], $p = 0.0002$) on the same 470 problems as Fig. 1. The controls separate by gate strictness rather than by volume: LENIENT leaves pass@1 untouched (−0.10pp) while cutting coverage@8 by 3.16pp ($p = 0.0004$); PARTIAL moves pass@1 by +2.11pp ($p = 0.0002$); and STRICT beats PARTIAL in a direct paired test (+3.04pp, $p = 0.0002$). At equal candidate count this repeats the conclusion of Godot’s filter swap (§7), now under a semantic verifier and against a graded ladder. The ordering is stable across eight independent training seeds that vary LoRA initialization and data order: STRICT beats every other arm in every training seed. At a fixed task mix the ordering holds: on the 173 *training* problems that all three gates cover, STRICT still beats PARTIAL (+3.3pp, $p = 0.016$); on the 96 *held-out* problems that M_0 never solves, STRICT gains +3.4pp ($p = 0.0002$, cross-fitted on held-out decoding seeds). The ordering does not hinge on the controls excluding all-pass candidates: against a gate rebuilt to admit any candidate passing at least half the tests, all-pass included, STRICT still leads by +0.98pp [+0.49, +1.46] ($p = 0.0004$) in all eight seeds.

A linear conversion rate. The ladder above varies which rule admits a candidate. To isolate precision itself with a *constructed* clean arm (frozen per-problem histogram; not Appendix Table 6’s harvested STRICT), we hold the task set, gold pool, and candidate count fixed and vary only π , the fraction of the 1300 fuel candidates that actually pass all tests. Injected false positives displace clean candidates on the problems the clean arm already covers. We measure this ladder over 23 training seeds and 470 held-out problems (150 as elsewhere, plus 320 further APPS problems), under the crossed seed×task bootstrap defined in Appendix C. Transfer then tracks precision at a constant rate (Fig. 1): the arms gain +7.39, +6.32, +5.37, +3.59, and +1.89pp over M_0 at $\pi = 1.0, 0.875, 0.75, 0.5$, and 0.25, monotone across all five. Measured against




Figure 1: **Linear conversion of clean fuel into transfer.** Held-out gain over M_0 (pp) against fuel precision π , the fraction of the admitted candidates that pass all tests. The APPS arms are *controlled*: π is set by construction at fixed task set, gold pool, and candidate count (1300). Dashed: the linear rate $\pi \Delta(1)$, where $\Delta(1)$ is the gain from clean fuel. Lower panel: residuals from that rate. Bars are 95% crossed seed $\times$ task bootstrap CIs over 23 training seeds and 470 problems.

the linear rate $\pi \Delta(1)$, the residuals at $\pi = 0.875, 0.75, 0.5$, and 0.25 are $-0.14, -0.17, -0.10$, and $+0.04$ pp, each with its own 95% CI covering zero and contained in ± 0.55 pp: halving the admitted correctness returns $+3.59$ pp where the rate predicts $+3.69$. Precision therefore *prices* the fuel it admits: a batch of precision π buys about π of what clean fuel buys. The price is steep. Every rung sits below clean fuel: the gap $\Delta(1) - \Delta(\pi)$ has its interval clear of zero, from 1.07 pp $[0.84, 1.30]$ at $\pi = 0.875$ up to 5.50 pp $[4.76, 6.29]$ at $\pi = 0.25$.

The rate also holds out of sample. The 320 problems are disjoint from the 150 used elsewhere and entered only after the 150-problem analysis was fixed, so they are a held-out replication rather than a larger sample. On that increment alone the five arms gain $+7.77, +6.66, +5.63, +3.82$, and $+2.05$ pp, strictly monotone with every interval clear of zero, and the four residual intervals again all contain zero, within ± 0.72 pp. The rate is not confined to constructed ladders. Two gates built by thresholding the unit-test fraction, admitting at $\geq 25\%$ and at $\geq 50\%$ with all-pass included, realize $\pi = 0.44$ and 0.58 ; over eight training seeds their gains land on $\pi \Delta(1)$ within 0.10 pp.

Only false positives are paid for (Appendix Fig. 5). The ladder above moves precision by injecting false positives; a gate can also err the

other way. From a frozen $K_h = 48$ harvest we build a second ladder that fixes the admitted count and varies the *direction* of the error: CLEAN (all-pass), FP25 (a quarter of the slots replaced by same-problem, syntax-valid, non-all-pass completions), FN25/FN50/FN75 (one quarter, one half, and three quarters of every problem’s true positives masked), and MIX (a 25% error budget split evenly between the two directions). All six arms carry an identical per-problem slot histogram at a common count-matched quota of 944 rows, over eight training seeds, so they differ only in which kind of error the verifier makes.

Removing three quarters of every problem’s true positives moves the held-out rate by -0.03 pp (95% CI $[-0.74, +0.63]$), against -1.58 pp $[-2.23, -0.95]$ for a quarter of false positives; no false-negative rung is distinguishable from CLEAN, while every false-negative rung beats FP25 directly ($+1.43, +1.74, +1.55$ pp; every interval clear of zero).

The MIX arm makes the accounting explicit. Splitting the error budget evenly moves the rate by -0.87 pp $[-1.56, -0.18]$, while its false-positive half alone predicts -0.79 pp: the two agree within 0.08 pp. At a fixed admitted count, then, the damage is almost entirely a function of the false-positive rate, and a gate’s recall is very nearly free, because it costs no *problem* coverage: the false-negative arms keep each problem’s slot count by construction. A larger harvest budget buys the other thing: problems the loop did not cover before (§10).

Precision is the active variable, not a stand-in for how much correct data clears the gate: at a fixed admitted count *and* a fixed number of updates, replacing a quarter of the true positives with copies of the survivors costs nothing measurable, while replacing them with false positives costs 2.57 pp $[1.75, 3.50]$ in all eight seeds (Appendix C).

The ordering belongs to the learning interface, not to the data (Appendix Table 3). That ranking is a statement about *offline* rejection sampling, where the gate decides which rows enter a fixed-size training set: a false positive writes a wrong trajectory into the fuel, while a false negative merely withholds one of many interchangeable right ones. An on-policy learner meets the same two errors on different terms, because the verifier is the reward rather than the filter: a false negative there does not withhold a row but penalizes a trajectory the model in fact got right. We therefore repeat the contrast

with the optimizer swapped and everything else held fixed: the same two corruption directions at a 25% dose of each, but GRPO (Shao et al., 2024) in place of rejection-SFT, over eight training seeds per arm as in the offline experiment (run configuration in Appendix C). Each dose is a confusion-matrix rate; because each arm perturbs one direction only, the two match the Youden index $J = \text{TPR} - \text{FPR}$ to within 10^{-4} , as in Rad et al. (2026).

Held at that index, the two directions do not train alike. A clean verifier leaves 48.8% of rollout groups with no learning signal at all: every member earns the same reward, so the group-relative advantage vanishes. Masking a quarter of the true positives cuts that share to 14.1%, and false positives cut it to 36.7%. Both hold in all eight training seeds. The false-negative arm therefore receives *more* gradient than the clean one in every seed, not less (Appendix Table 3), and spends it pushing away from trajectories that in fact passed: measured by the uncorrupted verifier, the policy’s own rollouts score 0.608 against the clean arm’s 0.696. Injected false positives push toward trajectories that in fact failed, and push less, because a group in which every rollout already passes offers nothing to flip. What eight seeds resolve here is the training signal, which separates in every one of them; held-out transfer points the same way ($\text{FN} - \text{FP} = -1.90\text{pp}$ [$-5.08, +0.96$] over all 150 problems).

The loop compounds under a semantic gate too. A second STRICT-gated round continues the climb: harvesting from round 1 and retraining from the base adds +2.6pp over round 1 (95% CI [$+1.4, +3.9$], $p < 10^{-4}$; +7.9pp over M_0 , on the 150-problem set), with coverage@8 rising monotonically ($42.9 \rightarrow 48.0 \rightarrow 49.3\%$). The fuel compounds too: the number of *training* problems yielding all-pass fuel grows from 527 to 660 (+25%), outpacing the gain in pass@1. The gate widens what the loop covers at a fixed harvest budget rather than polishing the part it already covers (Appendix C).

9 How far this goes: scale

The BUILD swap and the APPS precision ladder both hold the base fixed and vary the verifier. The complementary swap, varying the base at a fixed verifier, asks how far the loop travels. We rerun the full loop (supervised fine-tuning on the same 111 gold projects, then STRICT-LAUNCH-gated self-distillation) across model scale; across lineages

we hold that recipe fixed—verifier and gold task families unchanged—and ask only whether the fuel itself is Qwen-specific.

Cross-scale: three rounds compound at 8B. At 8B (Qwen3-8B+LoRA, identical recipe, five decoding seeds) the loop runs the full three rounds and compounds monotonically: per-candidate clean-launch climbs $3.5 \rightarrow 6.2 \rightarrow 9.3 \rightarrow 17.0\%$, and coverage@32 (unbiased, same estimator as Table 1) rises $50.8 \rightarrow 69.1 \rightarrow 83.6 \rightarrow 99.5\%$. The per-candidate rate gains +13.5pp over the supervised model (bootstrap [$+9.9, +17.7$], $p < 10^{-4}$), with the third round alone worth +7.7pp ($[+4.3, +11.3]$, $p = 0.0004$). One round buys +2.7pp here against +4.9pp at 14B, so $1.75\times$ the parameters is worth 2.2pp of one-round gain, under the same recipe, gate, and task families (per-scale evaluation budgets in Appendix C). The gate’s advantage persists at this scale: three launch-gated rounds stand +12.3pp above one BUILD-gated round ($[+8.3, +16.6]$, $p < 10^{-4}$). The loop survives a halving of scale: at 4B one launch-gated round lifts per-candidate clean-launch from 2.00% to 4.17% (+2.17pp, bootstrap [$+0.67, +3.75$], $p = 0.016$ over six decoding seeds, and positive in all six) and coverage@48 from 56.0% to 68.0%.

Every base produces fuel once the recipe is controlled. Every base we tried, across three lineages, produces STRICT-LAUNCH-clean fuel at 2.1–9.6% per candidate on the canonical 111 training tasks (888 candidates per base, 8 per task), under a recipe matched across bases in supervised data, sequence budget, and adapter placement (Appendix Table 2); the highest fuel rate in the sweep belongs to Gemma-3-12B, above Qwen3-14B.

10 Search is a multiplier, not a substitute

Back on APPS, raising only the candidates drawn per problem to $K_h = 32$, with model, adapter, decoding, fuel selection, training, and evaluation held fixed, gains +2.44pp ($[+0.97, +4.03]$, $p = 0.0025$). That invites the obvious economy: sample more and check less. It does not work. We cross the two knobs directly on the same frozen APPS pool (Fig. 2): gate in {STRICT, PARTIAL} crossed with K_h in {8, 32}, four count-matched arms at a common 900-row quota, eight training seeds, all built from prefixes of the same candidates, one round from M_0 (a different estimand from the +2.44pp above). Quadru-




Figure 2: **Search is a multiplier, not a substitute.** Held-out pass@1 for the four count-matched APPS arms, as means over eight training seeds on 150 held-out problems; thin lines are the individual seeds. Every contrast is paired by seed.

pling the harvest is worth +1.62pp [+0.72, +2.60] of held-out pass@1 behind the STRICT gate, in all eight seeds, and is indistinguishable from zero behind PARTIAL (+0.31pp [-0.47, +1.17]); the paired STRICT-minus-PARTIAL premium is +1.31pp [+0.85, +1.83] (all eight seeds positive). The STRICT gate at the *low* budget still beats the PARTIAL gate at four times the budget, by +1.78pp [+0.65, +2.94] ($p = 0.0026$, in all eight seeds). And the gate’s own advantage widens as the budget grows, from +2.09pp [+1.05, +3.15] at $K_h = 8$ to +3.40pp [+2.17, +4.67] at $K_h = 32$: what a larger budget returns is set by the gate that reads what it buys.

The three axes, priced in one currency. We price the axes in what the loop spends: verifier invocations and generated tokens. Sharpening the gate is free in that currency, since STRICT and PARTIAL each cost one unit-test run, and STRICT-LAUNCH and BUILD each cost one engine invocation; quadrupling the harvest costs $4\times$ the generation and $4\times$ the verification; going from 8B to 14B costs $1.75\times$ as much compute per token. The one cost precision does carry is yield: at a fixed admitted count a stricter gate needs $1/\text{yield}$ times the generation, and STRICT-LAUNCH admits 73 of 888 candidates where BUILD admits 887. That cost falls as the loop runs, since the generator’s own clean rate rises $4.6 \rightarrow 9.8 \rightarrow 17.5\%$ across rounds at 8B (Appendix C). Within each domain the returns then run inversely to price. On APPS the free axis returns the +2.09pp above against the $4\times$ axis’s +1.62pp. On Godot the free axis returns 5.0pp of one-round gain against 2.2pp for the $1.75\times$ axis (§7, §9). In

our setting, precision is the cheapest of the three axes and the one that returns the most.

11 Conclusion

The verifier is the curriculum. Under a deterministic, judge-free launch gate, rejection-sampling self-distillation *compounds* to the gold-reference coverage ceiling on held-out families. Precision sets how high the loop climbs, at a rate one can measure: a lenient filter erases the gain (§7), and under a semantic gate admitted correctness converts into held-out gain at an approximately constant rate, so fuel of precision π retains about π of what clean fuel buys (§8).

Every base we tried, across three lineages, supplies fuel (§9); on the four tasks the supervised model never solves within budget, the distilled advantage is a $25\text{--}35\times$ sampling-efficiency gain (Appendix D). The gate needs no domain-specific retuning: the same all-or-nothing rule applies to a launch check and to a unit-test check. Where a verifiable predicate exists for the artifact, precision is what to buy first.

Limitations

Our main compounding loop is studied on a single engine ($N = 25$ held-out tasks); the precision axis replicates in a second domain under a semantic gate (APPS, §8). At $N = 25$, only single-round differences well above the per-task variability are resolvable, and because that variability is between tasks, drawing more candidates per task does not reduce it; the APPS comparisons, at 150–470 problems, are not so constrained. We therefore report Godot effects as rates with intervals, always with the evaluation budget at which each clean-launch rate was measured. Execution grounding is a lower bound on functionality, covering runtime survival and observable state change rather than brief compliance, which we measure separately with a blind judge.

Ethical Considerations

This work uses public code- and game-generation benchmarks (GameCraft-Bench, APPS) and publicly available models, involves no human-subjects data, and relies on deterministic execution checks rather than human annotation. Compute is reported in Appendix C; the artifacts we will release use only resources whose licenses permit research use and redistribution.

References

- Dario Amodei, Chris Olah, Jacob Steinhardt, Paul Christiano, John Schulman, and Dan Mané. 2016. [Concrete problems in AI safety](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.06565*.
- Xin-Qiang Cai, Wei Wang, Feng Liu, Tongliang Liu, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2025. [Reinforcement learning with verifiable yet noisy rewards under imperfect verifiers](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.00915*.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, et al. 2021. [Evaluating large language models trained on code](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03374*.
- Wayne Chi, Yixiong Fang, Arnav Yayavaram, Siddharth Yayavaram, Seth Karten, QiuHong Anna Wei, Runkun Chen, Alexander Wang, Valerie Chen, Ameet Talwalkar, and Chris Donahue. 2026. [GameDevBench: Evaluating agentic capabilities through game development](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Kazuki Egashira, Mark Vero, Jasper Dekoninck, Florian E. Dorner, Robin Staab, and Martin T. Vechev. 2026. [Delay, plateau, or collapse: Evaluating the impact of systematic verification error on RLVR](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.02909*.
- Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Ksenia Konyushkova, Lotte Weerts, Abhishek Sharma, Aditya Siddhant, Alex Ahern, Miaosen Wang, Chenjie Gu, Wolfgang Macherey, Arnaud Doucet, Orhan Firat, and Nando de Freitas. 2023. [Reinforced self-training \(ReST\) for language modeling](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08998*.
- Srishti Gureja, Elena Tommasone, Jingyi He, Sara Hooker, Matthias Gallé, and Marzieh Fadaee. 2025. [Verification limits code LLM training](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.20837*.
- Lukas Helff, Quentin Delfosse, David Steinmann, Ruben Härle, Hikaru Shindo, Patrick Schramowski, Wolfgang Stammer, Kristian Kersting, and Felix Friedrich. 2026. [LLMs gaming verifiers: RLVR can lead to reward hacking](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.15149*.
- Dan Hendrycks, Steven Basart, Saurav Kadavath, Mantas Mazeika, Akul Arora, Ethan Guo, Collin Burns, Samir Puranik, Horace He, Dawn Song, and Jacob Steinhardt. 2021. [Measuring coding challenge competence with APPS](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS) Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- Arian Hosseini, Xingdi Yuan, Nikolay Malkin, Aaron Courville, Alessandro Sordoni, and Rishabh Agarwal. 2024. [V-STaR: Training verifiers for self-taught reasoners](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.06457*.
- Edward J. Hu, Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Chaobo Jia, Ruipeng Wan, Ting Sun, Weihao Tan, Borui Wan, Yuxuan Tong, Guangming Sheng, and Hong Xu. 2026. [GameGen-Verifier: Parallel keypoint-based verification for LLM-generated games via runtime state injection](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.07442*.
- Yilei Jiang, Jinyuan Hu, Qianyin Xiao, Yaozhi Zheng, Ruize Ma, Kaituo Feng, Jiaming Han, Tianshuo Peng, Kaixuan Fan, Manyuan Zhang, and Xiangyu Yue. 2026. [OpenGame: Open agentic coding for games](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.18394*.
- Woosuk Kwon, Zhuohan Li, Siyuan Zhuang, Ying Sheng, Lianmin Zheng, Cody Hao Yu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Hao Zhang, and Ion Stoica. 2023. [Efficient memory management for large language model serving with PagedAttention](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*.
- Tuomas Kynkäänniemi, Tero Karras, Samuli Laine, Jaakko Lehtinen, and Timo Aila. 2019. [Improved precision and recall metric for assessing generative models](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Juan Linietsky, Ariel Manzur, and Godot Engine contributors. 2014. Godot engine. <https://godotengine.org>.
- Jack Lu, Ryan Teehan, Jinran Jin, and Mengye Ren. 2025. [When does verification pay off? a closer look at LLMs as solution verifiers](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2512.02304*.
- Tongxu Luo, Rongsheng Wang, Jiayi Bi, Chenming Xu, Zhengyang Tang, Jianlong Chen, Juhao Liang, Ke Ji, Shuqi Guo, Yuhao Du, Fan Bu, Wenyu Du, Xiaotong Zhang, Kyle Li, Shaobo Wang, Linfeng Zhang, Yuxuan Liu, Xin Lai, Chenxin Li, and 6 others. 2026. [GameCraft-Bench: Can agents build playable games end-to-end in a real game engine?](#) *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.17861*.
- Anas Mahmoud, MohammadHossein Rezaei, Zihao Wang, Anisha Gunjal, Bing Liu, and Yunzhong He. 2026. [Reward hacking in rubric-based reinforcement learning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.12474*.
- Andreas Plesner, Francisco Guzmán, and Anish Athalye. 2026. [An imperfect verifier is good enough: Learning with noisy rewards](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.07666*.
- Zhenting Qi, Susanna Maria Baby, Stefanie Anna Baby, Kan Yuan, Andrew Tomkins, Tu Vu, Da-Cheng Juan, and Cyrus Rashtchian. 2026. [On the generalization gap in self-evolving language model reasoning](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.01075*.
- Qwen Team. 2025. [Qwen3 technical report](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.09388*.

Ali Rad, Khashayar Filom, Darioush Keivan, Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani, and Ehsan Kamalinejad. 2026. [Rate or fate? RLV^εR: Reinforcement learning with verifiable noisy rewards](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.04411*.

Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. 2024. [Deepseekmath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*.

Avi Singh, John D. Co-Reyes, Rishabh Agarwal, et al. 2024. [Beyond human data: Scaling self-training for problem-solving with language models](#). *Transactions on Machine Learning Research (TMLR)*.

Yuda Song, Hanlin Zhang, Carson Eisenach, Sham M. Kakade, Dean Foster, and Udaya Ghai. 2025. [Mind the gap: Examining the self-improvement capabilities of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Alex Stein, Furong Huang, and Tom Goldstein. 2026. [GATES: Self-distillation under privileged context with consensus gating](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.20574*.

Igor Lima Strozzi. 2026. [Teacher-free self-training amplifies but does not compound: A pass@k crossover on a free-verifier domain](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.07856*.

Jianwen Sun, Chuanhao Li, Zizhen Li, Yukang Feng, Fanrui Zhang, Yifei Huang, Yu Dai, and Kaipeng Zhang. 2026. [JAMER: Project-level code framework dataset and benchmark on professional game engines](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.19830*.

Kunvar Thaman. 2026. [Reward hacking benchmark: Measuring exploits in LLM agents with tool use](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.02964*.

Zheng Yuan, Hongyi Yuan, Chengpeng Li, Guanting Dong, Keming Lu, Chuanqi Tan, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. [Scaling relationship on learning mathematical reasoning with large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01825*.

Yang Yue, Zhiqi Chen, Rui Lu, Andrew Zhao, Zhaokai Wang, Shiji Song, and Gao Huang. 2025. [Does reinforcement learning really incentivize reasoning capacity in LLMs beyond the base model?](#) In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.

Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah D. Goodman. 2022. [STaR: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, volume 35, pages 15476–15488.

Ruixiang Zhang, Richard He Bai, Huangjie Zheng, Navdeep Jaitly, Ronan Collobert, and Yizhe Zhang. 2026. [Embarrassingly simple self-distillation improves code generation](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.01193*.




Figure 3: (a) Same 67-sample budget; the dashed line is the supervised model’s rate. Neither control improves on it: exact gold duplication regresses ($p = 0.018$) and the lenient BUILD filter merely matches it. Only STRICT-LAUNCH-filtered self-distillation gains ($p < 10^{-4}$ against CTRL, $p = 0.0012$ against BUILD-gated). (b) What the precise gate buys: the training tasks, of 111, whose fuel contains a clean project, with each round’s fuel size beside its point. The exact-duplication control re-covers the 48 that round 1’s fuel already reaches.

Wei Zhang, Jack Yang, Renshuai Tao, Lingzheng Chai, Shawn Guo, Jiajun Wu, Xiaoming Chen, Ganqu Cui, Ning Ding, Xander Xu, Hu Wei, and Bowen Zhou. 2025. [V-GameGym: Visual game generation for code large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.20136*.

Siyan Zhao, Zhihui Xie, Mengchen Liu, Jing Huang, Guan Pang, Feiyu Chen, and Aditya Grover. 2026. [Self-distilled reasoner: On-policy self-distillation for large language models](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.18734*.

Xiaosen Zheng, Tianyu Pang, Chao Du, Qian Liu, Jing Jiang, and Min Lin. 2025. [Cheating automatic LLM benchmarks: Null models achieve high win rates](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

Ziqian Zhong, Aditi Raghunathan, Nicholas Carlini, et al. 2025. [ImpossibleBench: Measuring LLMs’ propensity of exploiting test cases](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.20270*.

A Diagnosis: the visual judge is gameable

The probe uses an agentic game-builder (a separate setting from the from-scratch generator studied in the main text) and shares the benchmark’s exact evaluation stack: the official Godot 4.6.2 runtime,

headless replay, and the official GPT-5.5 OVERALL visual judge (the same judge used on the public leaderboard, so scores are directly comparable).

The agentic pipeline and the asset lever. The companion agent constructs a project through a sequence of build passes; the one that matters here is a *material-grounding* pass that retrieves real CC0 sprite assets and substitutes them for the solid-color placeholder rectangles the agent otherwise emits. Enabling the material-grounding pass raises the judge’s art score with the game’s code held fixed: the art score comes out $1.8\times$ what the same code earns with its original placeholders. The lever is presentation, not fit: *randomly chosen* sprites of comparable provenance raise it as much as the retrieved ones. The manipulated outputs move under a judge that is self-consistent on a fixed frame ($\sigma < 0.01$). Across generation seeds, one model’s OVERALL moves by 0.08–0.33.

B Verification signals in detail

Why the lenient rung is near-vacuous. The lenient BUILD check (open the project headless and quit, `godot --headless --quit-after`) does not treat parse, project, or scene-resource errors as fatal: the process can still exit 0. On the held-out families, supervised-model outputs that pass this check are nonetheless non-functional in concrete, diagnosable ways: scripts that fail to parse (undeclared identifiers, calls to non-existent methods) and so never load; malformed `project.godot` files (unquoted values, bare input-map identifiers) that cause the engine to open its project manager instead of the game; and broken `.tscn` external-resource references. The same engine renders the corresponding gold projects without error. Empirically this failure is parse-dominated: of the 888 candidates the supervised model generates on the training families, 815 fail STRICT-LAUNCH, and every one of those contains a GDScript or `project.godot` parse error.

STRICT-LAUNCH. A candidate passes STRICT-LAUNCH if `godot --headless --path PROJECT --quit-after 5` returns exit code 0 *and* emits no parse, load, or resource-resolution error on `stderr` (we match patterns such as `Parse Error`, `Failed to load script`, `unresolved identifiers or calls`, and `failed ext_resource lookups`). The gate separates working from broken projects: all held-out gold

projects pass STRICT-LAUNCH (the 25/25 gold ceiling), and the BUILD-passing outputs that fail it do so with concrete parse or load errors.

Execution grounding (EXEC-GROUND). It injects an instrumentation probe into a temporary copy of the project and steps the headless Scene-Tree for up to 180 frames in passive, synthetic, and demo-replay modes, replaying up to three recorded `demo_outputs` traces per task. The score is $1[\text{runtime-error-free}] \cdot (0.35 s_{\text{state}} + 0.25 s_{\text{passive}} + 0.40 s_{\text{active}})$, thresholded at 0.50 for the grounded call. The state term reads script-exposed member variables (so single-node procedural games still register state); the passive term measures state change with no input at all; the active term subtracts that baseline so autonomous animation is not counted as interaction. On the calibration set (15 gold projects across families; 15 STRICT-LAUNCH-broken candidates plus one hand-built empty shell), gold scores a median of 0.75 (minimum 0.58) and every negative scores near zero (empty shell 0.013): the threshold at 0.50 separates the two sets with no overlap.

The brief-compliance negative control. As the negative reference for the brief-compliance measurement of §6, we wrote a single brief-agnostic project: one Node2D that drifts, one that follows the pointer, and a bank of ticking member variables. We submitted it verbatim for all 25 held-out briefs. It launches cleanly, and the blind judge rates it 0/25 against gold’s 19/25. The shell generator will be released with the code.

C Training, generation, and data

Separating precision from fuel quantity. The count-matched ladder varies precision by replacing admitted slots, so a lower-precision arm also holds fewer true positives. A four-arm ladder at the same 944-row quota and the same eight training seeds, retrained and re-evaluated end to end on a different accelerator, separates them: CLEAN; FP25 (the same persisted fuel as Fig. 5, 708 true positives and 236 false ones); C708 (those 708 alone, at 708 rows and so a quarter fewer optimizer steps); and C708R (those same 708, with 236 of them duplicated back to 944 rows). Against CLEAN: C708R +0.40pp [−0.18, +1.03], C708 −0.91pp [−1.86, +0.06], and FP25 −2.17pp [−3.02, −1.46] with all eight seeds negative, which reproduces the −1.58pp [−2.23, −0.95] of the original run on overlapping




Figure 4: **The verification ladder**, ordered by how much each signal certifies. **BUILD** is near-vacuous (it admits 887 of the supervised model’s 888 training-family candidates, of which only 73 also pass **STRICT-LAUNCH**); **STRICT-LAUNCH**, our training gate, requires a clean headless launch (exit code 0, no parse/load/resource error), deterministic and judge-free; **execution grounding** drives the running SceneTree and serves as a readout rather than a gate; the top rung, a multimodal visual judge, certifies the most but is gameable.




Figure 5: **Only one direction of verifier error is paid for.** Held-out pass@1 relative to the CLEAN arm on APPS, in percentage points, with 95% crossed seed × task bootstrap intervals, at a common count-matched quota over eight training seeds. Realized, not nominal: $1 - \pi$ is the non-all-pass share of the *admitted* rows (the axis of Fig. 1); the FNR is masked true positives over those available. FN arms mask true positives, FP25 injects false ones, MIX splits the error budget evenly.

intervals. Both paths land on that penalty: the remaining step to FP25 costs 1.27pp from C708 and 2.57pp from C708R. C708 is handicapped on updates and still ahead of FP25; C708R cannot reproduce the per-problem slot histogram exactly, since a replaced slot on a problem with no surviving sibling has nothing same-problem to duplicate.

GRPO arms of the error-direction ladder. Each run trains Qwen3-4B with LoRA for 300 optimizer steps at group size $G = 8$ on 50 problems whose pass rate under the current policy lies in $[0.25, 0.75]$. The two corrupted arms realize error rates of 24.97% and 24.98%, giving Youden indices of 0.7503 and 0.7502.

Algorithm 1: One round of launch-gated self-distillation.

input : model M_t ; training-family briefs $\mathcal{B}$;
gold pool $\mathcal{D}_t$; harvest budget K_h ;
samples per brief

for each brief $b \in \mathcal{B}$ **do**
sample K_h candidate projects
 $\{c_1, \dots, c_{K_h}\} \sim M_t(\cdot | b)$;
for each candidate c **with at least three files** **do**
materialize c to a project tree ;
if STRICT-LAUNCH(c) **then** mark c as clean;
keep up to two deduplicated clean candidates for b ;

$\mathcal{F}_t \leftarrow$ all kept clean candidates (the round’s fuel) ;
 $\mathcal{D}_{t+1} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_t \cup \mathcal{F}_t$;
 $M_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{FINE-TUNE}(\text{base}, \mathcal{D}_{t+1})$;
output : $M_{t+1}, \mathcal{F}_t$

Table 2: STRICT-LAUNCH fuel rate per candidate, under a *matched* training recipe (8 epochs), measured on the canonical 111 training tasks (888 candidates per base).

Base	STRICT-LAUNCH rate	Wilson 95% CI
Qwen3-4B	2.14%	[1.37, 3.32]
Llama-3.1-8B	2.93%	[2.01, 4.26]
Qwen3-8B	4.62%	[3.42, 6.20]
Qwen3-14B	8.22%	[6.59, 10.21]
Gemma-3-12B	9.57%	[7.81, 11.69]

Fuel expansion at 8B. The generator’s own yield of STRICT-LAUNCH-clean candidates on the training families covers $31 \rightarrow 51 \rightarrow 75$ of the 111 tasks.




Figure 6: **Two readouts the gate never optimizes.** (a) Execution grounding: tasks with at least one grounded (≥ 0.50) clean candidate, $10 \rightarrow 12 \rightarrow 14 \rightarrow 15$ of the same 25 held-out tasks; the score is validated by 15/15 grounded gold against 0/16 known-bad projects. (b) Brief compliance under a blind judge that reads only the brief and the shipped GDScript: projects per 100 candidates that both launch and implement their brief.




Figure 7: **The supervised model never closes the coverage gap within the sampled budget.** Coverage@ K under the unbiased estimator $1 - \frac{n-c}{\binom{n}{K}}$, pooling four decoding seeds into $n=32$ candidates per task, c of them clean, averaged over the 25 held-out tasks. The supervised model is still 16.0pp short of full coverage at $K=32$; round 3 has been above 97% since $K=8$.

Table 3: Training-signal diagnostics for the GRPO arms over the same eight training seeds as Fig. 5, as mean $\pm$ s.d. over those seeds; “clean reward” scores the policy’s own rollouts with the *uncorrupted* verifier.

	CLEAN	FP25	FN25
degenerate groups	0.488 $\pm$.023	0.367 $\pm$.062	0.141 $\pm$.037
gradient norm	0.293 $\pm$.027	0.318 $\pm$.034	0.405 $\pm$.057
clean reward	0.696 $\pm$.036	0.629 $\pm$.049	0.608 $\pm$.028

Data and split. The family partition is given in §3. We verified zero held-out leakage into any round’s fuel: every harvested brief carries a training-family label and matches no held-out brief. Per round, the harvest keeps, among candidates with at least three files, the STRICT-LAUNCH-clean ones, deduplicated, capped at two per task: of M_0 ’s 73 STRICT-LAUNCH-clean candidates this yields




Figure 8: **Three rounds compound.** The per-candidate clean-launch rate on the four held-out families climbs $8.8 \rightarrow 13.6 \rightarrow 30.9 \rightarrow 42.2\%$ with Wilson intervals. Task-level coverage is not co-plotted; at the full 32-candidate budget it runs $84 \rightarrow 88 \rightarrow 100 \rightarrow 100\%$, saturating at round 2. This series is the single-run trajectory the matched controls are compared against; the three-seed means are in Table 1.

67 fuel projects, then 123 from M_1 and 186 from M_2 ; these cover 48, 77, and 101 of the 111 training tasks across the three rounds, reaching all 10 training families by round 2. Code, the harvested fuel, and one adapter per reported arm will be released upon publication.

Training. On Qwen3-14B we train for 8 epochs; hyper-parameters follow. All training and inference ran on a single 96 GB GPU; a full three-round loop (generation, filtering, and retraining) took on the order of tens of GPU-hours.

Generation. vLLM 0.11.2 serves the LoRA adapter unmerged at `bfloat16`. We draw $K_h = 8$ candidates for each training-family brief. Prompts are rendered with each base model’s own chat template (`apply_chat_template`, `add_generation_prompt=True`,

enable_thinking=False), so each base is queried in its native format. Decoding on Godot uses Qwen3 non-thinking sampling: temperature 0.7, top- p 0.8, top- k 20, repetition penalty 1.05, and a 24,576-token generation cap. The cap is set above the longest gold reference (19,192 tokens).

LoRA and optimization. Adapters use $r = 16$, $\alpha = 32$, dropout 0.05, no bias, task type CAUSAL-LM. Target modules are resolved from `named_modules` at run time, matching the `{q,k,v,o,gate,up,down}_proj` projections; if a base carries a vision tower, its projections are excluded and only language-model projections are adapted. Optimization is AdamW with a cosine schedule and a 3% warmup ratio, learning rate 10^{-4} , batch size 1 with gradient accumulation 8, sequence length 24,576, and scaled dot-product attention, all in `bfloat16`. The prompt is masked out of the loss (labels set to -100 over the prompt span). On APPS we reuse the same settings at the smaller scale: $r = 16$, $\alpha = 32$, learning rate 10^{-4} , sequence length 1536; held-out generation uses temperature 0.8 and top- p 0.95.

Evaluation and statistics. The 14B arms are evaluated with 8 candidates per held-out task across four decoding seeds (800 candidates per model, pooled to $K = 32$ for coverage); the 8B and 4B replications use five and six decoding seeds, respectively. The primary metric is the per-candidate clean-launch rate; comparisons between models are paired by task and tested with a cluster-permutation test that permutes candidate labels within each task ($N = 25$ tasks, 50,000 draws), with task-level bootstrap confidence intervals on effect sizes (50,000 resamples). The APPS ladders instead use a crossed seed $\times$ task bootstrap: training seeds and held-out problems are resampled independently with replacement and the effect is recomputed over the crossed resamples (10,000 draws), with percentile intervals. Because candidates drawn for the same task are strongly correlated (intraclass correlation 0.63), every comparison clusters on the task rather than on the candidate. Wilson intervals are reported per arm as a description of its candidate pool and are not used for between-arm inference. Table 5 lists the evaluation budget and coverage estimator for every configuration.

Table 4: Per-family coverage@16 at a single two-decoding-seed budget, in task counts. Round 3 reaches full coverage in every family, while the exact-duplication control (CTRL) regresses in three of the four families.

family	SFT	r1	r2	r3	CTRL
horror	5/5	5/5	5/5	5/5	4/5
puzzle	5/8	5/8	7/8	8/8	2/8
rhythm	2/5	4/5	4/5	5/5	4/5
shooter	6/7	5/7	6/7	7/7	3/7

Table 5: Evaluation protocol per configuration. Draws pool all decoding seeds (8 candidates per task per seed; APPS rows are labeled by held-out size). Table 4 instead uses one fixed seed pair, in task counts.

configuration	seeds	draws	coverage
Godot 14B	4	800	coverage@32, unbiased
Godot 8B	5	1000	coverage@32, unbiased
Godot 4B	6	1200	coverage@48, unbiased
APPS 4B /150	3	3600	coverage@8, task counts
APPS 4B /470	3	11280	coverage@8, task counts
Fig. 7 (14B)	4	800	unbiased, $K \leq 32$

Table 6: APPS-introductory, Qwen3-4B. From a lightly supervised M_0 (20.4%), only the STRICT (all-tests-pass) gate produces decisive transfer; the count-matched PARTIAL ($\geq 50\%$ but not all tests) control moves the rate less; LENIENT (syntax-valid only) leaves pass@1 untouched while cutting coverage@8. Paired bootstrap over 470 held-out problems, eight training seeds; rates in %, Δ in percentage points, p for the comparison with M_0 . * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$.

Fuel gate	pass@1	Δ	coverage@8	Δ
M_0 (gold SFT)	20.4	—	41.5	—
STRICT	25.5	+5.15**	44.8	+3.32**
PARTIAL	22.5	+2.11**	41.0	−0.46
LENIENT	20.3	−0.10	38.3	−3.16**

D Efficiency, not reach: what a zero at $K = 32$ means

Four of the 25 held-out tasks produced no clean project anywhere in the supervised model’s full 32-candidate pool, while the distilled model (RFT-r3) produced one on all four. We drew 512 fresh candidates per task from the same frozen supervised adapter, under the same gate and decoding configuration. All four yielded clean projects: 15, 23, 3, and 5 successes out of 512, against 17, 25, 6, and 8 out of 32 for the distilled model. To reach, with m supervised draws, the chance that a single distilled draw is clean $(1 - (1 - q)^m = q_{\text{RFT}}$, where q and q_{RFT} are the per-draw clean rates of the

supervised and distilled models), the supervised model needs 25–35 draws, so under a multi-file executable gate the separation is one of sampling efficiency, placing this setting in the regime [Yue et al. \(2025\)](#) report for RLVR in the language domain. The reading survives a larger budget: at 8B, *one* launch-gated round covers 19/25 at $K = 40$, against 14/25 for the supervised model and 15/25 for one BUILD-gated round.