

Pseudocode Beats Prose: Comparing Instruction Formats for LLM Rule Compliance Across Multiple Structured-Output Domains

Bulat Yapparov
aictrl.dev
United Kingdom
bulat@aictrl.dev

ABSTRACT

LLM-based coding agents increasingly rely on *skill files*—structured instruction documents that specify style rules, constraints, and conventions for generated artifacts. Although skill files are widely adopted (e.g., Claude Code SKILL.md, Cursor rules), no study has compared how their *format* affects compliance. We present a controlled experiment comparing three conditions—no skill (baseline), Markdown prose, and Python pseudocode—across four structured-output domains (Chart, Dockerfile, SQL, and Terraform), four models from two families (Claude and GLM), and three task complexities. In 629 scored runs evaluated against 12–15 automated binary rules per domain, we find: (1) skill files reduce failure rates by $3.7\times$ versus the baseline (33.7% to 9.2%; Cliff’s $\delta = 0.779$, *large*); (2) pseudocode format further reduces failure rates from 10.7% to 7.6%, a 29% relative reduction versus Markdown ($p = 0.001$, Cliff’s $\delta = 0.166$); (3) the pseudocode advantage is strongest on Claude Opus 4.6 (5.0% vs. 9.0% failure rate, a 44% relative reduction), while GLM-5 shows no significant format preference (6.8% vs. 5.9%); and (4) pseudocode tightens the failure-rate distribution (variance ratio 1.59; Levene’s $F = 10.90$, $p = 0.001$), increasing the probability of meeting a 10% production-quality threshold by up to 22 percentage points. We release all data, skills, evaluators, and analysis scripts at <https://github.com/aictrl-dev/skill-md-research>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Large language model (LLM) agents that generate code, configuration, and structured artifacts are now widely deployed in development workflows [12]. To steer these agents, practitioners write *skill files*: instruction documents specifying style rules, structural constraints, and domain conventions. Claude Code uses SKILL.md files; Cursor uses `.cursor/rules`; Windsurf uses `.windsurfrules`. SkillsBench [7] found that curated skill files raise agent pass rates by 16.2 percentage points, but examined only skill *presence* versus absence, not skill *format*.

Today, most skill files are written as Markdown prose—natural language with headings, bullet lists, and code examples. An alternative is to express the same rules as Python pseudocode: dataclasses for schemas, enums for valid values, and typed function signatures with validation logic. Pseudocode prompting has shown 7–16 F1 point gains on NLP classification tasks [10], but its effect on structured-output generation in realistic agentic domains is unstudied.

Meanwhile, He et al. [5] found that prompt format (Markdown, JSON, YAML, plain text) can cause up to 40% performance variation, and that the optimal format differs across model families (IoU < 0.2). This raises a practical question: *does it matter how we write skill files?*

We address this question with a controlled factorial experiment:

- **3 conditions:** no skill (baseline), Markdown prose, Python pseudocode—encoding the same rules in each format.
- **4 domains:** Vega-Lite chart generation, Dockerfile generation, dbt-style SQL pipelines, and Terraform infrastructure-as-code—covering different output modalities (JSON, Dockerfile, SQL, HCL).
- **4 models** from 2 families: Claude Haiku 4.5 and Opus 4.6 (Anthropic); GLM-4.7 and GLM-5 (ZhipuAI).
- **3 task complexities** per domain (simple, medium, complex), with up to 5 repetitions per cell.

This yields 629 evaluated runs, each scored against 12–15 domain-specific binary rules by automated evaluators.

Contributions. (1) The first empirical comparison of instruction *format* for LLM skill files, extending prior work on skill *presence* [7] and pseudocode on NLP tasks [10]. (2) A multi-domain evaluation across four structured-output domains and two model families, testing generalization. (3) Evidence that pseudocode reduces output *variability*, not just the mean, increasing the probability of meeting quality thresholds. (4) Open release of all skill files, evaluators, data, and analysis scripts.¹

2 RELATED WORK

Prompt Format Effects. He et al. [5] compared plain text, Markdown, JSON, and YAML across six benchmarks, finding up to 40% variation on code translation for GPT-3.5-turbo and more robustness for GPT-4, but no single universally optimal format. Sclar et al. [13] quantified sensitivity to spurious formatting changes in few-shot settings, reporting up to 76 accuracy points difference on LLaMA-2-13B. Errica et al. [4] proposed sensitivity and consistency metrics for prompt rephrasings. Ngweta et al. [11] introduced Mixture of Formats to improve robustness. Liu et al. [8] jointly optimized prompt content and format. None of these studies included pseudocode as a format or tested on agentic structured-output tasks.

¹<https://github.com/aictrl-dev/skill-md-research>

Pseudocode Prompting. Mishra et al. [10] created pseudocode prompts for 132 NLP tasks from Super-NaturalInstructions, finding 7–16 F1 point improvements on classification and 12–38% ROUGE-L gains using BLOOM and CodeGen. Ablations showed that code comments, docstrings, and structural cues all contributed. Kumar et al. [6] extended this to training-time augmentation with pseudocode. Chae et al. [1] used pseudocode as an intermediate reasoning representation. These works tested traditional NLP tasks, not agentic structured-output generation.

Agent Skills. SkillsBench [7] benchmarked 86 tasks across 11 domains with 7,308 trajectories, finding curated skills raise pass rates by 16.2pp, but self-generated skills provide no benefit. Xu and Yan [15] formalized agent skills as composable packages. Neither compared skill *formats*. Our work extends SkillsBench by asking whether *how* the skill is written matters, not just *whether* one is provided.

Code as Prompt. Madaan et al. [9] showed that language models of code are few-shot commonsense learners, and Singh et al. [14] used code-like specifications for robotic task planning. These suggest that LLMs trained on code may respond better to code-formatted instructions—a hypothesis our pseudocode condition tests.

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Questions

- RQ1 (Skill Efficacy)** Does having a skill file improve rule compliance over a no-skill baseline?
- RQ2 (Format Effect)** Does pseudocode format outperform Markdown prose for rule compliance?
- RQ3 (Generalization)** Does the format effect generalize across domains and model families?
- RQ4 (Efficiency)** How do skill files affect token consumption and per-run cost?
- RQ5 (Reliability)** Does pseudocode format reduce output *variability*, yielding tighter failure-rate distributions?

3.2 Independent Variable: Instruction Format

We test three conditions (Table 1). The Markdown and pseudocode skills encode *identical* semantic content—the same rules, thresholds, and examples—differing only in surface format. Both skill conditions prepend the skill document to the task prompt; the no-skill condition includes only the task data and a generic instruction.

The pseudocode format uses Python-like dataclasses to define schemas (`@dataclass` with typed fields), enums to constrain valid values (`class Color(Enum)`), and validation functions (`def violations() -> list[str]`) that return a list of rule violations. The Markdown format expresses the same rules as prose with tables, code examples in fenced blocks, and checklists.

Table 1: Instruction conditions. Line counts are averaged across the four domains.

| Condition | Format | Lines | Description |
|------------|--------|-------|-------------------------------|
| No skill | None | 0 | Task data + generic prompt |
| Markdown | Prose | 211 | Headings, tables, bullets |
| Pseudocode | Python | 274 | Dataclasses, enums, typed fns |

Table 2: Evaluation domains with rule counts and task descriptions.

| Domain | Output | Rules | Tasks (simple / medium / comp) |
|------------|----------------|-------|-------------------------------------|
| Chart | Vega-Lite JSON | 15 | GDP bars / AI trends / Cloud reven |
| Dockerfile | Dockerfile | 13 | Java dashboard / Analytics / Rust M |
| SQL (dbt) | SQL models | 12 | Revenue report / Subscriptions / Re |
| Terraform | HCL config | 13 | S3 bucket / VPC+EC2 / ECS Farga |

Table 3: Models used in the experiment.

| Model | Family | Tier | Interface |
|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|
| Claude Haiku 4.5 | Anthropic | Economy | Claude Code CLI |
| Claude Opus 4.6 | Anthropic | Frontier | Claude Code CLI |
| GLM-4.7 | ZhipuAI | Mid-tier | OpenCode CLI |
| GLM-5 | ZhipuAI | Frontier | OpenCode CLI |

3.3 Domains and Tasks

We evaluate across four structured-output domains (Table 2), selected for diversity in output modality and the availability of deterministic automated evaluation.

Each domain has three tasks at increasing complexity. Chart tasks range from a simple bar chart to a multi-series line chart with annotations. Dockerfile tasks range from a single-stage Java application to a multi-target Rust monorepo build. SQL tasks range from a revenue aggregation with six models to a return-rate analysis requiring deduplication and window functions. Terraform tasks range from an S3 bucket to a full ECS Fargate deployment with ALB, RDS, and IAM.

3.4 Models

We test four models from two families spanning multiple capability tiers (Table 3), enabling cross-family and cross-tier comparisons following the finding by He et al. [5] that format preferences often do not transfer across model families.

All models were invoked with default temperature settings to reflect ecologically valid conditions. The three original domains (Dockerfile, SQL, Terraform) have 5 repetitions per cell yielding 4 models \times 3 conditions \times 3 tasks \times 5 reps = 180 runs each. Chart uses 3 repetitions (81 runs after excluding GLM-4.7, which was not tested in that domain). In total, we have 629 scored runs across four models and four domains.

3.5 Evaluation Pipeline

Each domain has a dedicated automated evaluator (Python script) that:

Table 4: Rule categories by domain. Each rule yields a binary pass/fail per run. SQL rules 1–10 produce per-file pass rates across all model files.

| Domain | N | Rule Categories |
|------------|----|--|
| Chart | 15 | Color palette, accent colors, accessibility (no red+green), title, source citation, font, data labels, y-axis origin, spines, grid, units, annotations, legend vs. direct labels, dimensions |
| Dockerfile | 13 | Base image tags, security (USER, secrets), structure (multi-stage, WORKDIR), cache (deps-first), layers (combined RUN), apt practices, HEALTHCHECK, EXPOSE, LABEL, exec form CMD, no ADD |
| SQL (dbt) | 12 | Keywords uppercase, one clause/line, table aliases, column aliases, no SELECT *, comment headers, LEFT JOIN only, COALESCE unknown, ROW_NUMBER dedup, one CTE/file, Jinja ref(), layer naming |
| Terraform | 13 | snake_case naming, variable description/-type, outputs, tags, variable grouping, file structure, no hardcoded IDs, provider pinned, backend configured, sensitive marked, data sources, locals block |

- (1) **Extracts** the structured output from raw LLM response text (handling multiple response formats: JSONL, fenced code blocks, plain text).
- (2) **Validates** structural integrity (e.g., at least one **FROM** instruction for Dockerfile, at least one **resource** block for Terraform).
- (3) **Checks** 12–15 binary rules specific to the domain (Table 4).

The primary metric is **failure rate**:

$$\text{failure_rate} = 1 - \frac{\text{rules_passed}}{\text{rules_scored}}$$

where **rules_scored** excludes conditional rules that are not applicable to a given task (e.g., the Terraform *sensitive* rule is only scored when the task contains secret values). We adopt failure rate as our primary metric rather than pass rate because, in the context of agentic automation, failure rate directly represents the human-in-the-loop intervention cost. A reduction from 10% to 1% failure represents a 10-fold improvement in automation reliability, a delta that is more clearly captured by failure-rate ratios than by absolute gains in pass-rate percentage points.

3.6 Statistical Methods

We use non-parametric tests throughout, as rule compliance scores are bounded and often ceiling-compressed.

- **Mann-Whitney U** (one-tailed for directional hypotheses RQ1–RQ2; two-tailed for RQ3 cross-family comparisons).

Table 5: RQ1: Skill files vs. no-skill baseline (629 runs pooled).

| Condition | N | Mean FR | Cliff’s δ | p |
|--------------|-----|---------|------------------|---------|
| No skill | 210 | 33.7% | 0.779 (large) | < 0.001 |
| Skill (both) | 419 | 9.2% | | |

Table 6: RQ1 per domain: failure rate by condition.

| Domain | No skill | Markdown | Pseudocode |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| Chart | 20.9% | 5.7% | 2.8% |
| Dockerfile | 18.7% | 4.2% | 4.2% |
| SQL (dbt) | 50.1% | 16.9% | 10.5% |
| Terraform | 39.0% | 13.7% | 10.5% |
| Pooled | 33.7% | 10.7% | 7.6% |

- **Cliff’s delta** [2] for effect size, using standard thresholds: $|\delta| < 0.147$ negligible, < 0.33 small, < 0.474 medium, ≥ 0.474 large.
- **Bootstrap 95% confidence intervals** (10,000 resamples, percentile method, seed 42) [3] for mean failure rates by model \times condition.
- **Levene’s test** (median variant) for equality of variances between conditions (RQ5). We report the variance ratio $\sigma_{MD}^2/\sigma_{PC}^2$ and 90% highest-density intervals (HDI) of the raw failure-rate distributions.

We report results per domain and pooled across all four domains. For pooled analyses, failure rates are computed per run (normalized to each domain’s rule count) and then aggregated.

4 RESULTS

4.1 RQ1: Skill Files Reduce Failure Rates

Pooling both skill conditions (Markdown and pseudocode) against the no-skill baseline across all four domains and four models, skill files produce a **large** reduction in failure rate (Table 5).

The effect is consistent across all four domains (Table 6 and Figure 1). SQL shows the highest baseline failure rate (50.1%), while Dockerfile shows the strongest relative improvement (18.7% \rightarrow 4.2%).

4.2 RQ2: Pseudocode Outperforms Markdown

Comparing the two skill formats directly, pseudocode reduces pooled failure rate from 10.7% (Markdown) to 7.6% (pseudocode), a 29% relative reduction. This is a statistically significant difference ($p = 0.001$, one-tailed), with a small effect size (Cliff’s $\delta = 0.166$).

Per-domain results (Table 7) show that the effect is strongest in SQL ($\delta = 0.495$, large). Chart shows a small effect ($\delta = 0.318$, $p = 0.015$) and Terraform shows a small effect ($\delta = 0.150$, $p = 0.048$). Dockerfile shows a negligible effect ($\delta =$




Figure 1: Failure rate by condition and domain with 95% bootstrap CIs. Skill files consistently reduce failure rates across all four domains, with pseudocode (dark blue) achieving the lowest rates.

Table 7: RQ2: Pseudocode vs. Markdown per domain. Positive δ favors pseudocode. $*p < 0.05$.

| Domain | MD FR | PC FR | δ | Mag. | p |
|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------|--------------|
| Chart* | 5.7% | 2.8% | 0.318 | small | 0.015 |
| Dockerfile | 4.2% | 4.2% | 0.015 | negl. | 0.437 |
| SQL (dbt)* | 16.9% | 10.5% | 0.495 | large | < 0.001 |
| Terraform* | 13.7% | 10.5% | 0.150 | small | 0.048 |
| Pooled* | 10.7% | 7.6% | 0.166 | | 0.001 |

0.015), where both formats achieve near-ceiling compliance (<4.2% failure rate). A per-rule breakdown (Appendix C) reveals that the SQL advantage concentrates in two correlated rules where Markdown-guided models use a `SELECT *` shortcut in staging CTEs, while pseudocode models avoid it. In Terraform, the advantage comes from variable descriptions, types, and outputs—rules that map directly to pseudocode dataclass fields.

4.3 RQ3: Generalization Across Models and Families

Cross-domain consistency. All four domains show a positive pseudocode effect (Chart, Dockerfile, SQL, and Terraform). The mean Cliff’s delta across domains is +0.209 (small positive). The binomial test for direction consistency (4/4 positive) yields $p = 0.12$.

Cross-family analysis. Table 8 and Figure 2 show the pseudocode effect separated by model family. For Claude models, the effect is statistically significant in SQL ($\delta = 0.982$, large) and Chart ($\delta = 0.472$, medium, $p = 0.005$), with Terraform trending positive ($\delta = 0.252$, $p = 0.053$), but not significant in Dockerfile. For GLM models, the effect is not statistically significant in any individual domain.

Frontier model analysis. The pseudocode advantage is most pronounced on Claude’s frontier model (Table 9 and Figure 3). Claude Opus 4.6 shows a pooled failure rate of 5.0%

Table 8: RQ3: Cliff’s delta (pseudocode vs. Markdown) by family and domain. Two-tailed tests. $*p < 0.05$.

| Family | Domain | δ | p | Mag. |
|--------|------------|----------|---------|--------|
| Claude | Chart* | 0.472 | 0.005 | medium |
| | Dockerfile | 0.100 | 0.435 | negl. |
| | SQL* | 0.982 | < 0.001 | large |
| | Terraform | 0.252 | 0.053 | small |
| GLM | Chart | 0.099 | 0.750 | negl. |
| | Dockerfile | -0.053 | 0.673 | negl. |
| | SQL | 0.093 | 0.532 | negl. |
| | Terraform | 0.033 | 0.798 | negl. |




Figure 2: Failure rate (%) by model and condition. Darker green indicates lower failure rates. White lines separate Claude (top) and GLM (bottom) families.

Table 9: Failure rates for frontier models: Markdown vs. pseudocode.

| Model | MD FR | PC FR | Δ | Rel. ↓ |
|-----------------|-------|-------|----------|--------|
| Claude Opus 4.6 | 9.0% | 5.0% | +3.9pp | -44% |
| GLM-5 | 5.9% | 6.8% | -0.9pp | +15% |

(pseudocode) vs. 9.0% (Markdown), a 44% relative reduction. GLM-5 shows 6.8% vs. 5.9%, with pseudocode slightly *underperforming* Markdown (+15% relative).

4.4 RQ4: Token Efficiency

Skill files increase both input and output token consumption. Pseudocode prompts are 30.8% longer than no-skill prompts (5,597 vs. 4,279 mean input tokens), while Markdown adds 21.5% (5,198 tokens). Both formats also produce *longer* outputs: +46.2% for pseudocode and +40.3% for Markdown relative to the no-skill baseline (1,621 and 1,556 vs. 1,109 mean output tokens). Models generate more structured, multi-section output when guided by a skill file.

Comparing the two skill formats directly, pseudocode prompts are only 8% longer than Markdown and produce




Figure 3: Pseudocode advantage per model (Markdown FR – Pseudocode FR) with 95% bootstrap CIs. Three of four models favor pseudocode, with Opus 4.6 showing the largest advantage; GLM-5’s CI crosses zero.

Table 10: RQ5: 90% HDI width of the failure-rate distribution and $P(\text{FR} < 10\%)$ per model. HDI narrowing indicates tighter distributions under pseudocode.

| Model | HDI _{MD} | HDI _{PC} | Narrowing | $\Delta P(\text{FR} < 10\%)$ |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| Haiku 4.5 | 38.5% | 31.2% | +7.3pp (19%) | +22.2pp |
| Opus 4.6 | 17.3% | 10.7% | +6.6pp (38%) | +20.9pp |
| GLM-4.7 | 30.8% | 29.3% | +1.4pp (5%) | +8.9pp |
| GLM-5 | 15.4% | 15.4% | +0.0pp (0%) | −1.8pp |

4% more output tokens. For Claude models (where cost data is available), the mean cost per run is \$0.061 (pseudocode) vs. \$0.054 (Markdown) vs. \$0.045 (no-skill). The pseudocode–Markdown cost premium of \$0.007 per run buys a 29% relative reduction in failure rate (RQ2), a favorable tradeoff for production workloads where rework cost from non-compliant output far exceeds the token premium.

4.5 RQ5: Pseudocode Reduces Output Variability

Beyond lowering mean failure rates (RQ2), pseudocode also *tightens* the failure-rate distribution. We assess this with three complementary measures: variance ratio via Levene’s test, 90% highest-density interval (HDI) widths, and the probability of meeting a 10% production-quality threshold.

Pooled variance. Pooling across all models and domains, Markdown runs have a sample variance of 0.0093 compared to 0.0059 for pseudocode—a ratio of 1.59. Levene’s test confirms unequal variances ($F = 10.90$, $p = 0.001$).

Per-model HDI narrowing. Table 10 shows the 90% HDI width of the raw failure-rate distribution per model. Pseudocode produces a narrower HDI for three of four models, with the largest narrowing on Opus 4.6 (17.3% \rightarrow 10.7%, a 38% reduction).




Figure 4: Failure-rate distributions by model and format (split violin). Left halves are Markdown; right halves are pseudocode. The dashed line marks the 10% production-quality threshold. Pseudocode distributions are tighter and more concentrated below the threshold.

Production-quality threshold. The probability of a run achieving $<10\%$ failure rate increases under pseudocode for three of four models (Figure 4). The increase is largest for Haiku 4.5 (+22.2pp) and Opus 4.6 (+20.9pp). Pseudocode not only lowers the mean but concentrates runs in the low-defect region.

5 DISCUSSION

Why pseudocode works. We hypothesize that pseudocode’s advantage stems from two mechanisms. First, *type constraints act as explicit contracts*: a dataclass field `sensitive: bool = True` is less ambiguous than the prose “mark sensitive variables with the sensitive flag.” The LLM’s code pre-training makes it more likely to satisfy typed specifications. Second, *validation functions signal expected checks*: a `violations()` method that returns a list of failure conditions provides the model with an explicit checklist in a format it processes natively during code generation.

Skill-induced complexity. The per-rule breakdown (Appendix C) reveals that skills can *hurt* compliance on individual rules. In SQL, both skill formats instruct multi-layer dbt pipelines with staging models. Most models take a shortcut—writing `SELECT * FROM source` in staging CTEs—that simultaneously violates two rules (clause-per-line and no-SELECT *). Without the skill, models write monolithic queries that avoid this pattern entirely. The skill’s structural guidance creates more surface area for violations, even though it explicitly forbids `SELECT *`. This highlights a design tension: richer architectural guidance may introduce failure modes that simpler instructions avoid.

Ceiling effects in Dockerfile. The Dockerfile domain shows no significant pseudocode advantage, likely because both formats achieve near-ceiling compliance ($\leq 4.2\%$ failure rate). The rules themselves may be simple enough that any reminder suffices. The SQL, Chart, and Terraform domains, with higher failure rates and more nuanced rules (e.g., “COALESCE

nullable dimensions to ‘(unknown)’”, “muted color palette”), provide more room for format to matter.

Cross-family divergence. The pseudocode effect is statistically significant for Claude models in SQL ($\delta = 0.982$, large) and Chart ($\delta = 0.472$, medium), and trends positive in Terraform, but is not significant for GLM models individually (Table 8). This aligns with He et al.’s finding that format preferences do not transfer across model families [5]. The two frontier models (Opus 4.6 and GLM-5) show different patterns: Opus strongly favors pseudocode, while GLM-5 slightly favors Markdown. Format preferences are model-family-dependent, though the *direction* favors pseudocode in three of four models.

Reliability beyond the mean. RQ5 reveals that pseudocode’s benefit extends beyond mean reduction to *variance reduction* for most models. The pooled variance ratio of 1.59 (Levene’s $p = 0.001$) means Markdown runs have 59% more spread. Pseudocode narrows the HDI for three of four models, with the largest effect on Haiku 4.5 (HDI width 38.5% \rightarrow 31.2%) and Opus 4.6 (17.3% \rightarrow 10.7%). Practically, this manifests as a higher probability of meeting a production-quality threshold (<10% failure rate): Haiku 4.5 gains +22.2pp and Opus 4.6 gains +20.9pp under pseudocode. For teams deploying LLM agents at scale, reduced variance translates to fewer outlier failures and more predictable behavior.

Practical recommendations. For practitioners writing skill files:

- (1) **Any skill file helps.** The $3.7\times$ failure rate reduction from the baseline (RQ1) dwarfs the format effect.
- (2) **Pseudocode offers a small additional advantage** in domains with complex, nuanced rules. For domains where skills already achieve near-perfect compliance (e.g., Dockerfile), format matters less.
- (3) **The pseudocode advantage is model-dependent.** Some frontier models (Opus 4.6) benefit strongly, while others (GLM-5) show no preference or even slight reversal.
- (4) **Semantic content matters more than format.** The gap between any-skill and no-skill is $8\times$ larger than the gap between pseudocode and Markdown (24.6pp vs. 3.1pp).

Comparison to prior work. Mishra et al. [10] found 7–16 F1 point gains from pseudocode on NLP tasks using BLOOM and CodeGen. Our work extends this to structured-output generation using modern frontier models (2025–2026 vintage) and finds a smaller but consistent advantage. The smaller effect size is expected: our Markdown baseline is already a well-structured skill file (not plain text), making the comparison stricter. SkillsBench [7] found a 16.2pp skill presence effect; our 24.6pp pooled effect (33.7% \rightarrow 9.2%) is comparable in magnitude, despite measuring compliance rather than pass rate.

6 THREATS TO VALIDITY

Internal validity. Automated evaluators may produce false positives or false negatives. We mitigated this by documenting edge cases in per-domain rubrics and iterating evaluator logic on pilot runs before the main experiment. Evaluators were finalized before data collection. The same author wrote both Markdown and pseudocode skills, which could introduce systematic bias; we verified semantic equivalence through independent rule-by-rule comparison (Section 3.2).

Construct validity. Rule compliance is a proxy for output quality, not a direct measure. A Dockerfile that passes all 13 rules may still be functionally incorrect (e.g., wrong base image for the application). We include outcome checks (correct port, runtime match) for Dockerfile and Terraform, but these are secondary metrics.

External validity. We test four domains, all producing text-based structured output. Results may not generalize to interactive agent tasks, multi-turn conversations, or visual output. We test two model families; other families (GPT, Llama, Gemini) may respond differently. The three tasks per domain provide limited coverage of each domain’s full complexity space. Not all models are tested in all domains (Chart lacks GLM-4.7).

Reliability. The three original domains (Dockerfile, SQL, Terraform) have 5 repetitions per cell; Chart uses 3 repetitions. Fewer repetitions reduce statistical power for per-domain analyses. Some cells in the original domains have 4 or 6 repetitions due to calibration runs, which we include in the analysis. One Terraform run (Opus, Markdown, task 3, rep 5) was excluded because the CLI infrastructure repeatedly blocked the model’s file-write attempts, producing an incomplete output unrelated to model capability; the remaining four repetitions of that cell scored consistently (12/13 rules).

7 CONCLUSION

We presented the first controlled comparison of instruction format for LLM skill files. Across 629 runs spanning four structured-output domains and four models from two families, we find that (1) skill files provide a large and consistent compliance improvement over no-skill baselines, (2) pseudocode format offers a statistically significant additional advantage over Markdown prose ($p = 0.001$), though the effect size is small and varies by model family, and (3) pseudocode reduces output variability (variance ratio 1.59, $p = 0.001$), increasing the probability of meeting production-quality thresholds by up to 22 percentage points.

The practical implication is clear: writing skill files in pseudocode rather than Markdown is a low-cost intervention that reduces output defects by an additional 29% (10.7% \rightarrow 7.6% failure rate) while also tightening the distribution for most models, with no downside beyond slightly longer input prompts. The format advantage is model-dependent: Claude Opus 4.6 benefits substantially (–44% relative reduction), while GLM-5 shows no format preference. For practitioners

authoring skill files for LLM agents, we recommend starting with any well-structured skill file (the largest effect), and considering pseudocode format for domains with complex constraints where both lower failure rates and predictable behavior matter.

Future work should extend this comparison to interactive agentic tasks with tool use, additional models (e.g., GPT, Llama), more domains (e.g., Kubernetes manifests, CI/CD pipelines), and user studies measuring skill file authoring effort.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hyunjoo Chae et al. 2024. Language Models as Compilers: Simulating Pseudocode Execution Improves Algorithmic Reasoning in Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. 22471–22502.
- [2] Norman Cliff. 1993. Dominance Statistics: Ordinal Analyses to Answer Ordinal Questions. *Psychological Bulletin* 114, 3 (1993), 494–509.
- [3] Bradley Efron and Robert J. Tibshirani. 1994. *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- [4] Federico Errica, Davide Sanvito, Giuseppe Siracusano, and Roberto Bifulco. 2025. What Did I Do Wrong? Quantifying LLMs’ Sensitivity and Consistency to Prompt Engineering. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (NAACL)*. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-long.73/>
- [5] Jia He, Mukund Rungta, David Koleczek, Arshdeep Sekhon, Franklin X Wang, and Sadid Hasan. 2024. Does Prompt Formatting Have Any Impact on LLM Performance? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.10541* (2024).
- [6] Prince Kumar, Rudra Murthy, Riyaz Bhat, and Danish Contractor. 2025. Training with Pseudo-Code for Instruction Following. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.18011* (2025).
- [7] Xiangyi Li et al. 2026. SkillsBench: Benchmarking How Well Agent Skills Work Across Diverse Tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12670* (2026).
- [8] Yuanze Liu et al. 2025. Beyond Prompt Content: Enhancing LLM Performance via Content-Format Integrated Prompt Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.04295* (2025).
- [9] Aman Madaan, Shuyan Zhou, Uri Alon, Yiming Yang, and Graham Neubig. 2022. Language Models of Code are Few-Shot Commonsense Learners. In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*.
- [10] Mayank Mishra, Prince Kumar, Riyaz Bhat, Rudra Murthy, Danish Contractor, and Srikanth Tamilselvam. 2023. Prompting with Pseudo-Code Instructions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 15178–15197. <https://aclanthology.org/2023.emnlp-main.939/>
- [11] Lilian Ngweta, Kiran Kate, Jason Tsay, and Yara Rizk. 2025. Towards LLMs Robustness to Changes in Prompt Format Styles. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Student Research Workshop*. <https://aclanthology.org/2025.naacl-srw.51/>
- [12] Aske Plaat et al. 2025. Agentic Large Language Models, a Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.23037* (2025).
- [13] Melanie Sclar, Yejin Choi, Yulia Tsvetkov, and Alane Suhr. 2024. Quantifying Language Models’ Sensitivity to Spurious Features in Prompt Design. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- [14] Ishika Singh, Vats Blukis, Arsalan Mousavian, Ankit Goyal, Danfei Xu, Jonathan Tremblay, Dieter Fox, Jesse Thomason, and Animesh Garg. 2023. ProgPrompt: Program Generation for Situated Robot Task Planning using Large Language Models. *Autonomous Robots* 47 (2023), 999–1012.
- [15] Renjun Xu and Yang Yan. 2026. Agent Skills for Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.12430* (2026).

A PROMPT TEMPLATES

All three conditions use the same task data (JSON object with task requirements). The conditions differ in the instruction prefix.

No-skill condition. The task JSON is followed by a domain-specific generic instruction (e.g., “Generate a Dockerfile. Output ONLY the Dockerfile.”).

Markdown condition. The skill file (Markdown prose with headings, tables, and checklists) is prepended to the task JSON.

Pseudocode condition. The skill file (Python pseudocode with dataclasses, enums, and validation functions) is prepended to the task JSON.

Full prompt templates and skill files are available in the repository under `papers/1-pseudocode-format/domains/{domain}/skill` and `papers/1-pseudocode-format/prompts/`.

B PER-DOMAIN RULE DETAILS

Chart / Vega-Lite (15 scored rules). (1) Muted/professional color palette, (2) Accent colors (≤ 2 highlights), (3) Accessibility (no red+green conflict), (4) Single chart type consistency, (5) Insight-driven title (≥ 25 chars), (6) Source citation, (7) Sans-serif font, (8) Data labels when ≤ 8 points, (9) Y-axis origin at zero, (10) Minimal spines, (11) Subtle grid colors, (12) Units in ≥ 2 locations, (13) Key annotations, (14) Direct labels vs. legend, (15) Chart dimensions.

Dockerfile (13 scored rules). (1) Specific image tag on every FROM, (2) Non-root USER, (3) No secrets in ENV/ARG, (4) Multi-stage build, (5) WORKDIR before COPY/RUN, (6) Dependencies before source code, (7) Combined RUN instructions (≤ 2 adjacent), (8) apt-get best practices, (9) HEALTHCHECK present, (10) EXPOSE documented, (11) LABEL metadata, (12) Exec form CMD/ENTRYPOINT, (13) No unnecessary ADD.

SQL / dbt (12 scored rules). (1) Keywords uppercase, (2) One clause per line, (3) Table aliases, (4) Column aliases with AS, (5) No SELECT *, (6) Comment header, (7) LEFT JOIN only, (8) COALESCE to ‘(unknown)’, (9) ROW_NUMBER dedup, (10) One CTE per file, (11) Jinja ref(), (12) Layer naming conventions.

Terraform (13 scored rules). (1) snake_case naming, (2) Variable descriptions, (3) Variable type constraints, (4) Outputs defined, (5) Tags on taggable resources, (6) Variable grouping, (7) File structure hints, (8) No hardcoded IDs, (9) Provider version pinned, (10) Backend configured, (11) Sensitive values marked, (12) Data sources for lookups, (13) Locals block present.

C PER-RULE PASS RATE BREAKDOWN

Tables 11–14 show pass rates for every scored rule by condition, revealing where the pseudocode advantage concentrates and where skills can *hurt* compliance.

Largest pseudocode advantages. SQL rules 2 and 5 (one clause per line, no `SELECT *`) show the largest pseudocode–Markdown gaps (+53.3pp and +52.9pp). Both rules fail together because Markdown-guided models create staging models with `SELECT * FROM source` on a single line—a shortcut that violates both rules simultaneously. Pseudocode models avoid this pattern (98.6% and 98.2% pass). In the Chart domain, rules 8 (data labels) and 12 (unit labels) show +33.3pp and +41.2pp gaps; the pseudocode validation functions explicitly check these. Terraform rules 2–4 (variable descriptions, types, outputs) show +13–15pp, consistent with pseudocode’s typed dataclass fields making these requirements harder to miss.

Largest Markdown advantages. Chart rule 2 (accent color limit) shows the largest Markdown advantage (−36.6pp). The Markdown skill uses a clear table for this rule, while the pseudocode encodes it as a validation function that may be less salient. SQL rule 9 (`ROW_NUMBER` dedup, −12.5pp) and Terraform rule 1 (naming, −10.0pp) also favor Markdown modestly.

Skill-induced complexity in SQL. Rules 2 and 5 illustrate a subtle effect: the skill instructs a multi-layer dbt pipeline with staging models, creating more opportunities for `SELECT *` violations than monolithic queries. Despite the skill explicitly forbidding `SELECT *`, most models (except GLM-5) take a shortcut in staging CTEs. This correlation is near-perfect ($r = 0.996$ between rule 2 and rule 5 scores).

Table 11: Chart: per-rule pass rate (%) by condition.

| # | Rule | None | MD | PC | PC–MD |
|----|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Muted palette | 5.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2 | Accent ≤ 2 | 100.0 | 95.8 | 59.3 | −36.6 |
| 3 | Color accessibility | 94.1 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | Single chart type | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 5 | Insight title | 77.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 6 | Source citation | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 7 | Sans-serif font | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 8 | Data labels | 3.7 | 66.7 | 100.0 | +33.3 |
| 9 | Y-axis origin zero | 100.0 | 95.5 | 100.0 | +4.5 |
| 10 | Minimal spines | — | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | Subtle grid | — | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 12 | Units in ≥ 2 loc | 100.0 | 58.8 | 100.0 | +41.2 |
| 13 | Key annotations | 100.0 | 88.9 | 100.0 | +11.1 |
| 14 | Direct labels | 85.2 | 95.5 | 100.0 | +4.5 |
| 15 | Chart dimensions | — | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

D REPRODUCTION

All materials are available at <https://github.com/aictrl-dev/skill-md-research>:

- `papers/1-pseudocode-format/domains/{domain}/skills/`
— Matched skill file pairs
- `papers/1-pseudocode-format/domains/{domain}/test-data/` • `papers/1-pseudocode-format/domains/{domain}/evaluate_*.p`
— Task JSON files — Automated evaluators

Table 12: Dockerfile: per-rule pass rate (%) by condition.

| # | Rule | None | MD | PC | PC–MD |
|----|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Specific tag | 92.1 | 100.0 | 98.4 | −1.6 |
| 2 | Non-root USER | 66.7 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | No secrets | 98.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | Multi-stage | 88.9 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 5 | WORKDIR first | 82.5 | 96.8 | 93.7 | −3.2 |
| 6 | Deps before source | 60.3 | 57.1 | 63.5 | +6.3 |
| 7 | Combined RUN | 88.9 | 92.1 | 90.5 | −1.6 |
| 8 | apt-get practices | 98.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 9 | HEALTHCHECK | 69.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 10 | EXPOSE | 96.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | LABEL metadata | 19.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 12 | Exec form CMD | 96.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 13 | No ADD | 98.4 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |

Table 13: SQL (dbt): per-rule pass rate (%) by condition. Rules 2 and 5 are correlated because `SELECT * FROM source` violates both.

| # | Rule | None | MD | PC | PC–MD |
|----|-------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Keywords uppercase | 90.8 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 2 | Clause per line | 94.6 | 45.3 | 98.6 | +53.3 |
| 3 | Table aliases | 67.6 | 99.5 | 99.4 | −0.2 |
| 4 | Column aliases (AS) | 87.4 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 0.0 |
| 5 | No <code>SELECT *</code> | 95.4 | 45.3 | 98.2 | +52.9 |
| 6 | Comment header | 24.6 | 98.8 | 90.5 | −8.3 |
| 7 | LEFT JOIN only | 36.7 | 97.8 | 98.3 | +0.6 |
| 8 | COALESCE unknown | 0.0 | 44.4 | 40.3 | −4.0 |
| 9 | <code>ROW_NUMBER</code> dedup | 31.7 | 72.1 | 59.6 | −12.5 |
| 10 | One CTE per file | 70.3 | 99.1 | 99.5 | +0.5 |
| 11 | Jinja <code>ref()</code> | 0.0 | 98.3 | 95.0 | −3.3 |
| 12 | Layer naming | 0.0 | 98.3 | 96.7 | −1.7 |

Table 14: Terraform: per-rule pass rate (%) by condition.

| # | Rule | None | MD | PC | PC–MD |
|----|--------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | <code>snake_case</code> naming | 33.3 | 94.9 | 83.3 | −11.6 |
| 2 | Variable descriptions | 61.7 | 76.3 | 90.0 | +13.7 |
| 3 | Variable types | 76.7 | 76.3 | 90.0 | +13.7 |
| 4 | Outputs defined | 56.7 | 78.0 | 91.7 | +13.7 |
| 5 | Tags on resources | 68.3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 6 | Lifecycle ignore | 95.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 7 | Variable separation | 95.0 | 98.3 | 100.0 | +1.7 |
| 8 | File structure | 95.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 9 | No hardcoded IDs | 43.3 | 30.5 | 23.3 | −7.2 |
| 10 | Provider pinned | 70.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | Backend configured | 0.0 | 88.1 | 100.0 | +11.9 |
| 12 | Sensitive marked | 88.3 | 91.5 | 95.0 | +3.5 |
| 13 | Data sources | 90.0 | 98.3 | 91.7 | −6.6 |
| 14 | Locals block | 15.0 | 89.8 | 98.3 | +8.5 |

- `papers/1-pseudocode-format/domains/{domain}/results/scores`
 - Raw scored data
- `papers/1-pseudocode-format/paper/compute_stats.py`
 - Cross-domain statistics
- `papers/1-pseudocode-format/scripts/generate_figures.py`
 - Figure generation
- `papers/1-pseudocode-format/scripts/variability_analysis.py`
 - Reusable variability analysis (HDI, Levene, threshold rates, violin plots)