RLM Algorithm: Implementation vs. Paper Comparison

Comparison of our `rlm-loop` implementation against the original MIT CSAIL paper (arXiv:2512.24601).

Our Algorithm (as implemented)

```
User Query + Context (file/dir/string)


1. Materialize context → plain Python str
2. Optionally build "context sample" (--no-context-sample disables)
3. Create depth-tracked llm_query(snippet, task) closure (max_depth=3)
4. Initialize REPLEnv with namespace: CONTEXT, FILES, llm_query, FINAL,
   SHOW_VARS, pre-imported modules


5. Send to LLM: system prompt (full/compact) + user query [+ context sample]


   RLM Loop (max_iterations, timeout, token budget)

    6. Check timeout / token budget guards
    7. LLM responds with markdown
    8. Extract ```python blocks (regex)
    9. If no code blocks:
         - Check for "FINAL" in text → done
         - Else prompt LLM to write code
   10. Execute each code block sequentially
         in persistent REPL namespace
   11. If FINAL() called → done
   12. Feed captured print() output back
         as user message: "Output:\n..."
   13. Continue loop




Return RLMResult(answer, stats, history)
```

Key files: `rlm/rlm.py` (orchestrator), `rlm/repl.py` (REPL environment), `rlm/prompts.py` (system prompts), `rlm/backends.py` (LLM backends)

Paper's Algorithm

```
User Query + Context


1. Store context as CONTEXT variable in Python REPL
2. Provide llm_query(snippet, task) for sub-RLM calls
3. Root LM receives ONLY the query (context is not inline)


4. Send to LLM: system prompt + query (no context sample)


   Code-Observe-Reason Loop

  5. LLM generates Python code
  6. Execute in REPL sandbox
  7. Observe output (truncated)
  8. LLM decides next action:
       - More code (inspect/search/chunk)
       - llm_query() for semantic analysis
       - FINAL(answer) when confident
  9. Continue loop




Return final answer
```

Side-by-Side Comparison

Aspect	Paper	Our Implementation	Delta
Initial context exposure	Root LM sees only the query; CONTEXT is opaque until code runs	Context sample included by default; `--no-context-sample` disables it	**Aligned** — can now match paper's opaque-context design via flag
`llm_query` signature	`llm_query(snippet, task)` — two args	`llm_query(snippet, task)` — two args	**Match**

Aspect	Paper	Our Implementation	Delta
Recursive depth	Depth-1 only (root → sub-RLM, no deeper)	Configurable `max_depth=3` (supports multi-level recursion)	We're ahead of the paper here
Sub-RLM model	Smaller/cheaper model for sub-calls (e.g., GPT-5-mini when root is GPT-5)	`--sub-rlm-model` param exists but defaults to same model as `--model`	Paper's design is more cost-efficient
System prompt for sub-calls	Not detailed	Minimal task-focused system prompt (text analysis role)	Aligned — sub-calls now receive focused guidance
Termination	`FINAL()` + max iterations + timeouts	`FINAL()` + max iterations + `--timeout` + `--max-token-budget`	**Match**
Default model	Not applicable (paper uses specific models per experiment)	`--model` is required (no defaults)	**Aligned** — user must choose explicitly
Code extraction	Not specified in detail	Regex: ``` ```python\n(.*?)``` ``` — only explicitly tagged Python blocks	Reasonable; ignores non-Python fenced blocks
Sandbox isolation	Rootless container (security delegated to runtime)	Safe builtins whitelist (no `__import__`, `open`, `exec`) + container delegation	We add in-process restrictions on top of container isolation
Output truncation	Mentioned (first ~10K chars)	10,000 char cap per execution	Match

Aspect	Paper	Our Implementation	Delta
Multi-file support	Not discussed	`FILES` dict + `CompositeContext` for directories	Extension beyond the paper
Context loading	Context as string	Memory-mapped files via `LazyContext`, `CompositeContext` for multi-file	Engineering refinement beyond the paper
Async execution	Identified as future work	Stubs exist (`acompletion`) but delegate to sync	Neither implements true async
Native post-training	RLM-Qwen3-8B (28.3% improvement over base)	Prompt-only, no fine-tuning	Paper has a training component we don't
Cost tracking	Discussed (comparable median, high variance tail)	`RLMStats` tracks tokens, iterations, sub-RLM calls; `--max-token-budget` enforces limits	**Aligned** — cost enforcement now available
Verification strategy	Some models perform redundant verification sub-calls	`--verify` flag enables explicit verification sub-call on the final answer	Paper observes this as emergent behavior; we formalize it as opt-in

---

LLM Roles

The RLM pattern uses two distinct LLM tiers with different responsibilities:

Role Comparison

Aspect	Root LM	Sub-RLM
Depth	0	1+ (up to `max_depth`)
System prompt	Full strategy prompt (~120 lines) or compact (~25 lines)	Minimal task-focused prompt

Aspect	Root LM	Sub-RLM
Conversation	Multi-turn (code → output → code → … → FINAL)	Single-turn (one prompt, one response)
Produces	Python code in ```` ```python ```` blocks	Plain text (summary, extraction, analysis)
Has access to	`CONTEXT`, `FILES`, `llm_query()`, `FINAL()`, `SHOW_VARS()`, pre-imported modules	Only the snippet passed by root
Model	`--model`	`--sub-rlm-model` (defaults to `--model`)

Root LM Responsibilities

The root LM writes Python code to explore the document programmatically. It never sees the full document inline (unless `--no-context-sample` is disabled). Instead, it:

1. Receives the user query (and optionally a document sample)
2. Writes exploration code to inspect structure, search for patterns, extract chunks
3. Delegates **semantic** analysis to the sub-RLM via `llm_query(snippet, task)`
4. Aggregates sub-RLM results and calls `FINAL(answer)` when confident

Sub-RLM Responsibilities

The sub-RLM processes individual text chunks. It:

1. Receives a snippet of text and a task description
2. Returns plain-text results (summaries, extractions, classifications)
3. Has no access to the REPL, `CONTEXT`, or any tools — only the snippet it was given
4. Does not generate code

Emergent Strategies from the Paper

The paper (arXiv:2512.24601) and the accompanying blog post identify five emergent strategies that models discover when given the RLM environment:

Strategy	Description	Example Code
Peeking	Inspect document structure and size	`print(CONTEXT[:1000])`, `print(len(CONTEXT))`
Grepping	Keyword/regex search to locate relevant regions	`re.findall(r'pattern', CONTEXT, re.IGNORECASE)`

Strategy	Description	Example Code
Partition+Map	Chunk the document and fan out `llm_query()` calls	Split `CONTEXT` into N chunks, call `llm_query()` on each
Summarization	Hierarchical summarization via sub-RLM calls	Summarize chunks, then summarize the summaries
Long-input/long-output	Direct extraction for structured outputs	Extract lists, tables, or formatted data from large regions

Our prompts map these emergent strategies to a prescriptive four-phase model:

Our Phase	Paper Strategies Covered
Inspect	Peeking
Search	Grepping
Chunk + Analyze	Partition+Map, Summarization
Synthesize	Long-input/long-output, final aggregation

The paper observes that models discover these strategies naturally with minimal prompting. Our prompts are more prescriptive (explicit chunk size guidance, specific function examples), which improves consistency but may constrain creative exploration.

Verification (Emergent Behavior)

The paper observes that some models perform redundant "verification" subcalls — re-checking their own intermediate results before calling `FINAL()`. This behavior is emergent and not prompted for. Our implementation offers an explicit `--verify` flag that formalizes this pattern as an opt-in post-processing step.

Remaining Divergences

1. Context Sample in Initial Prompt (our addition, now optional)

Our approach (`_build_context_sample()`): By default, sends evenly-spaced 500-char excerpts from the document in the first message. Can be disabled with `--no-context-sample` to match the paper's opaque-context design.

Paper's approach: Root LM only knows CONTEXT exists. It must write code to inspect it.

Trade-off: The default gives the LLM a head start (knows format, size, structure immediately) but adds tokens to the initial prompt. Use `--no-context-sample` for the paper's strict "context as environment" paradigm.

2. Multi-level Recursion (our extension)

Paper: Depth-1 only (root → sub-RLM, no deeper).

Ours: Configurable `max_depth=3` (supports multi-level recursion).

This is an intentional extension beyond the paper's design.

Emergent Strategy Comparison

Both the paper and our prompts describe the same four-phase strategy:

Phase	Paper	Our Prompts
Inspect	Examine context structure, size, format	If sample provided, study it; otherwise `print(CONTEXT[:1000])`
Search	Regex/keyword filtering to narrow focus	"Start BROAD: `re.findall(pattern, CONTEXT)` with `re.IGNORECASE`"
Chunk	Uniform or semantic partitioning	"Extract sections: `CONTEXT[start:end]` (aim for 1000-5000 chars)"
Synthesize	Aggregate sub-RLM results + FINAL()	"Combine and call `FINAL(answer)`"

Our prompts also include guidance on when to use `llm_query()` (semantic tasks) vs Python directly (structural tasks). The paper observes these strategies as emergent behavior that models discover with minimal prompting; our prompts are more prescriptive to improve consistency.

Future Refinement Candidates

Actionable items identified by this comparison:

- **Default to a cheaper model for sub-RLM calls** — leverage `--sub-rlm-model` param with a smaller default

- **Evaluate prompt prescriptiveness** — test whether our detailed prompts help or constrain the LLM compared to the paper's minimal approach
- **Native post-training** — the paper fine-tuned RLM-Qwen3-8B (28.3% improvement over base); we rely on prompt-only guidance
- **True async execution** — replace sync-delegating `acompletion` stubs with genuine async REPL execution