

TestJack: Should you trust the results in coding benchmarks?

Agentic Coding Benchmarks Auditing via Evaluator Evolution

PRIMARY

Publisher	arXiv
Published	2026-10-07
Retrieved	2026-10-10
Cite key	arxiv2026testjack
URL	https://arxiv.org/abs/2610.10619

Assessment. Primary: the work's own abstract record. Affiliations are NOT printed on the abs page and the HTML rendering (arxiv.org/html/2610.10619v1) returned HTTP 429 to the fetch proxy with an instruction not to retry, so no institution is attributed anywhere in this edition. All published figures come from the abstract; no per-benchmark or per-model breakdown is claimed. Identifier verified against the story before use: title and YYYYMM both match a 7 October 2026 submission.

Claims drawn from this source. CLAIM-2026-10-10-01, CLAIM-2026-10-10-02, CLAIM-2026-10-10-03, CLAIM-2026-10-10-04

arXiv:2610.10619 [cs.SE, cs.AI]. v1 posted Wed, 7 Oct 2026 07:58:04 UTC (389 KB).
Authors: Shuangjie Yao, Hao Wang, Koushik Sen, Simin Chen, Baishakhi Ray, Dawn Song. No institutional affiliation is printed on the abs record.

Abstract, as extracted: most coding benchmarks judge a solution correct if it passes a fixed set of unit tests. Those tests often miss required behaviour, so agents can pass them while failing the task, and benchmark scores may therefore reflect adaptation to the evaluator rather than problem-solving skill. The authors introduce TestJack, which generates tests for each trial that target requirements the patch might violate, keeps only tests the ground-truth patch passes, and produces replayable evidence for each confirmed failure. A lighter variant audits a sample of trials and reuses the tests across trials for the same task. Across six frontier model backends and five benchmarks, about 34.4% of trials judged correct violate task requirements, and the overall resolution rate drops from 50.6% to 33.2%.

Arithmetic check performed in this run: $50.6 \times (1 - 0.344) = 33.19$, so the 34.4% figure and the 17.4-point drop are one measurement expressed two ways, not two independent findings. This is stated in the post rather than left for a reader to assume.

Retrieval note: arxiv.org/html/2610.10619v1 returned HTTP 429 from the fetch proxy with an explicit instruction not to retry. The PDF was therefore not attempted. No number beyond the three above is used.