

The Workspace Is the Self-Improving Agent

Satoshi Nakajima
The Singularity Society
satoshi.nakajima@gmail.com

June 15, 2026

Abstract

A common framing for file-backed LLM assistants is *the workspace is the database*: the file system stores data and the model is an interface that reads and writes it. We argue this framing understates what is actually on disk. In MulmoClaude, an open-source agent application, the workspace holds not only *data* (notes, records, generated artifacts) but *code*: persona definitions, tool wiring, application schemas, procedural skills, and recurring automations, almost all written in domain-specific languages the model interprets. Once the artifact the agent maintains includes its own *behavior*, the sharper statement is **the workspace is the agent**, and an agent that authors its own workspace is *self-improving*—not because its weights change, but because it accretes and refines a personal suite of applications in its own substrate. We make this concrete with three contributions: (i) an account of the workspace-as-agent architecture, in which identity, capability, behavior, and memory are all inspectable, forkable (`cp -r`), and versionable (`git`) files; (ii) a *self-improvement loop*—recognize, crystallize, tune, retire—by which the agent promotes a recurring need into a durable application; and (iii) an economic reframing, *software for an audience of one*, in which the marginal cost of bespoke software collapses, code becomes a disposable intermediate representation, and the burden of correctness relocates from a vendor’s QA to the trust between one user and one model. We report a longitudinal single-user deployment in which a personalized application suite (24 schema-defined applications, 3 external feeds, and 9 bespoke views) accreted over roughly two months, and we are explicit about the limitations: self-improvement requires self-pruning, execution is not replayable, a self-modifying file-based agent widens its own attack surface, and our evidence is a single author-operated deployment.

Keywords: LLM agents; self-improving agents; agent memory; end-user software engineering; applications as data; personal software; agent security.

1 Introduction

A productive design philosophy for file-backed LLM assistants is *the workspace is the database; files are the source of truth; the model is the intelligent interface*. It positions the file system as storage and the model as the component that reads and writes it. The framing is correct but incomplete, because it describes only half of what lives in a mature agent workspace.

Consider what is actually on disk in MulmoClaude, an open-source agent application built on the Claude Agent SDK. Alongside the obvious *data*—notes, records, generated artifacts—are

© 2026 Satoshi Nakajima. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

persona definitions that fix the agent’s behavior, a tool-and-server manifest that fixes its capabilities, application schemas that define entire data-backed apps, procedural skill files the agent reads to operate those apps, and automation definitions that fix when it acts proactively. These are not data; they are *program*, almost all written in domain-specific languages (DSLs) that the model interprets at run time. The model is therefore not merely an interface onto stored data; it is the **runtime that interprets a multi-DSL program persisted as files**. Strip the running process away and the agent does not vanish—it sits, complete and inspectable, on disk.

That observation motivates a sharper claim: **the workspace is the agent**. And because the artifact the agent maintains now includes its own behavior and capabilities, an agent that edits its workspace is editing itself. We call this *self-improvement*, and we mean something precise by it (§6): not that the model’s weights change—they are fixed—but that the agent accretes and refines a *personal suite of applications* in its own substrate, becoming more capable in a direction shaped by one particular user.

This paper develops the architecture, the loop that drives it, and its economic consequence. The detailed mechanism of the application layer—the Collection DSL, its validator, and the host/model reliability split—is the subject of a companion paper [6]; here we treat a collection as a given building block and focus on what it means when the whole agent is files and the agent authors them.

Contributions.

1. **Workspace-as-agent.** We show that an agent’s identity, capabilities, behavior, and memory can all be plain files, making the agent inspectable, forkable (`cp -r`), and versionable (`git`) for free (§3, §9).
2. **The self-improvement loop.** We describe a recognize $\rightarrow$ crystallize $\rightarrow$ tune $\rightarrow$ retire loop that promotes a recurring need into a durable, self-authored application, yielding personalization through accreted applications (§6).
3. **Software for an audience of one.** We argue the marginal cost of bespoke software collapses in this setting, that code becomes a disposable intermediate representation, and that the cost of correctness relocates rather than disappears (§7).
4. **A longitudinal case study** of a single real workspace (§8), and **an honest account of the limitations**: self-pruning, non-replayability, the security of a self-modifying agent, and the single-user scope of our evidence (§10).

2 Background and Related Work

Self-improving and memory-augmented agents. Several systems let an agent extend itself over time. Voyager [13] accretes a reusable skill library of generated code; Generative Agents [10] maintain a memory stream they periodically reflect over; Reflexion [11] and Self-Refine [4] improve a task trajectory through verbal self-feedback; STaR [15] bootstraps reasoning by fine-tuning on self-generated rationales. These differ from our setting along two axes. First, *substrate*: the accreted artifact is, variously, learned weights, a code skill-library, or a memory log, whereas ours is a set of *declarative DSL documents*—schemas, roles, automations—that are inspectable, diff-able, and validated before they run. Second, *object of improvement*: prior work largely improves task-solving *performance*, whereas the loop here improves the agent’s *application surface*—the durable apps it offers a specific user.

Location	What it is	Sense
config/roles/	persona / system-prompt definitions	code (behavior DSL)
config/mcp.json	tool-and-server wiring	code (capability DSL)
collection schema.json	data model + UI + computation + workflow	code (application DSL)
collection SKILL.md	how to operate a collection	code (procedural DSL)
data/scheduler/	recurring automations	code (trigger DSL)
data/wiki/	densely cross-linked knowledge	data + graph
conversations/memory.md	accreted facts	data
artifacts/	generated outputs	data

Table 1: What is actually in an agent workspace. The upper rows are program—the agent’s behavior, capabilities, and applications—persisted as files in DSLs the model interprets. The model is the runtime over this multi-DSL program.

Autonomous agent loops and frameworks. AutoGPT [12] and BabyAGI [7] popularized autonomous plan-act-reflect loops; multi-agent frameworks such as AutoGen [14] structure collaborating agents with configuration files. These accrete *task plans* or wire *agent topologies*; our concern is the accretion of durable, user-facing *applications* into the agent’s own substrate, which persist and are reused long after any single task.

Self-maintained knowledge. The direct ancestor of this design is the idea of letting the model build and maintain its own knowledge base—a growing, interlinked wiki—rather than a flat memory file [2]. MulmoClaude ships exactly such a self-maintained wiki. This paper extends the principle from self-maintained *data* to self-maintained *code*: the same workspace also holds the schemas, skills, and roles the agent authors and refines.

Event-log-primary agents. A complementary architecture makes an append-only event log the primary artifact to obtain deterministic replay and cheap forking [8]. We deliberately choose a different primary artifact—the workspace of files—trading byte-for-byte run replay (the model step is nondeterministic) for an agent that can be read, forked, and evolved as plain configuration; §10 returns to this trade.

End-user software engineering and the audience of one. End-user programming has long sought to let non-programmers build software, from the spreadsheet onward [3, 9]; the spreadsheet was, in effect, the first widely used *software for an audience of one*. The persistent price in that tradition is that the user must work inside a constrained authoring surface and perform the assembly. The shift we describe (§7) keeps the constrained, validated surface but moves authorship to the agent, and connects this to a software-economics argument about the collapse of bespoke build cost.

3 The Workspace Is the Agent

The claim is literal. Table 1 inventories a MulmoClaude workspace by whether each location holds *data* or *code*. Only the bottom rows are “the database.” Everything above is program: it specifies what the agent is, what it can do, how it behaves, and when it acts.

The agent’s identity is `config/roles/`; its capability set is `config/mcp.json` plus its skills; its applications are its collections; its proactive behavior is its automations; its long-term knowledge

is its wiki and memory. None of this is a learned blob separate from the files: the agent *is* the files, of which data is one part.

Lineage: from self-maintained memory to self-improvement. The design descends from the self-maintained knowledge base [2]: let the model curate its own artifact rather than be handed one. A wiki is self-maintained *data*; a collection extends that to self-maintained *structured* data; the observation here is that the workspace also holds self-maintained *code*—schemas, skills, roles, automations. The moment the maintained artifact includes the agent’s own behavior, “self-maintaining” becomes “self-improving” (§6). This kind of improvement *compounds*: each application the agent crystallizes makes the next interaction faster and more reliable, and the workspace grows into a personal capability surface no general model update reproduces.

4 A Collection Is an Application

The load-bearing building block is the *collection*: a single `schema.json` plus record files that, together with the model as runtime, behaves like a traditional application. It has a data model (typed fields), relationships (cross-collection references), computation (spreadsheet-like derived fields), a user interface (host-rendered field types plus optional bespoke HTML views), workflows (declarative actions that hand off to a seeded chat), and host-driven recurrence—with *zero* application-specific host code. The companion paper [6] develops this mechanism and the validator that makes a structurally incoherent schema fail to load; for this paper the relevant point is only that a collection is a genuine application, not a memory note. It differs from a note in three ways: *structure* (a schema pins the shape; a note is re-parsed lossily), *durable behavior* (a collection behaves the same tomorrow; a prompt-of-the-moment does not), and *a UI for free*. That makes a collection the top rung of a ladder—conversation, then `memory.md`, then a collection, then a collection with workflows and UI—and recognizing when a recurring need has stabilized enough to climb it is where self-improvement begins.

5 The Boundaries That Dissolve

A traditional application is built by developers, shipped across a deployment boundary, and run by users. The workspace model erases all three.

The builder is the agent, not a human composer. This is the line that separates the architecture from no-code platforms. In Airtable, Notion, or Retool—even with recent AI-assisted authoring—the human still composes the app from primitives the platform supplies. Here the user expresses a need in natural language, often implicitly through repeated similar requests, and the *agent* writes the schema, authors the skill, and wires the actions. The human is the product owner, not the carpenter: the jump is from *no-code* (a human composes blocks) to *intent-driven* (an agent composes the DSL program from intent).


There is no deployment boundary. A collection is authored directly into the agent’s own substrate; building it and running it happen in the same workspace, in the same breath. There is no build, no CI, no release, no migration job. “Also track whether I have been to each restaurant” edits the schema and skill in place, and the app has evolved, live.

The app/agent boundary disappears. Because the workspace is the agent (§3) and the app is authored into the workspace, the app becomes part of the agent. There is no longer a clean line between “the agent” and “the applications the agent built.” When the agent refines a collection it built, it is modifying its own code. That is the precise sense in which this is a *self-improving agent*, and why that description fits better than “no-code platform”: the latter foregrounds a human builder and a separate product, both of which are wrong here.

The trajectory already shows it. This is not aspirational. In the studied codebase, features such as worklog, client, and invoice tracking began as hardcoded host plugins—developer-built apps behind a deployment boundary—and are being superseded by collection skills the agent can author with no host change. The locus of application creation is visibly moving from the development team to the agent.

6 The Self-Improvement Loop

“Self-improving” is loose unless we say what improves and how. It is not that the model gets generally smarter; it is that the agent accretes and refines a personal suite of applications. The loop has four steps, and the fourth is the one most easily forgotten.



1. **Recognize.** Notice that a need recurs—the user keeps asking for the same shape of thing in free-form chat. This is the signal to promote it up the maturity ladder (§4).
2. **Crystallize.** Author the application: write the schema, the skill, the actions. The loose intent becomes a durable, structured, reliable app.
3. **Tune.** As the need evolves, adjust where the reliability dial sits (companion paper [6])—move more structure into the schema where it must be deterministic, leave more to the model where it needs judgment.
4. **Retire.** When an app is superseded or abandoned, remove it. This keeps the agent’s “self” coherent rather than sprawling (§10).

Running this loop over months yields not a smarter model but an agent whose workspace has grown into a *personalized application suite shaped to one user*. Two instances that start identical diverge into very different agents, because they crystallize different apps from different lives. Self-improvement here is **personalization through accreted applications**—the agent becomes more useful to *its* owner specifically, not more capable in the abstract.

7 Software for an Audience of One

The self-improvement loop is only affordable because of an economic shift worth stating on its own terms.




Figure 1: Three agent-authored custom views from the studied deployment (two collection views and one feed view). Each is software with an addressable audience of one, produced for the cost of a natural-language request; the owner never wrote or read the generated HTML.

The collapse of bespoke build cost. Software was always built for the average of an audience, never the individual—but this was a consequence of cost, not a preference. Development was expensive and fixed while replication was free, so the rational strategy was to spread the fixed cost over as many users as possible: build for the mass. When an agent can generate a working application from a sentence of intent, the fixed cost collapses, and with it the reason to target the average. Software whose audience is a single person—historically impossible, not merely uneconomic—becomes the default for a large class of needs.

Code as a disposable intermediate representation. When code costs almost nothing to produce, it stops being the precious asset and becomes a compile target between intent and behavior. The durable artifacts are the *intent* (natural language) and the *data* (the records); the code in between—a schema, or the HTML of a custom view—is regrown when the need changes rather than maintained. Figure 1 shows three custom views from the studied workspace: each is a self-contained HTML file the agent wrote on request and the host serves sandboxed, and in each case the owner described the view in natural language and never saw the markup. A restaurant guide drawn as a transit map is software no vendor would build for a market of one—and now does not have to be.

Correctness relocates rather than disappears. Mass software is poor at fitting the individual but excellent at accumulating correctness: many users and years surface edge cases and harden the code. Software for an audience of one has no such second audience. The cost of correctness does not vanish; it relocates—from a vendor’s QA organization to the trust between one user and one model. The stakes are uneven: a wrong poster gallery is harmless, but a wrong financial or tax view is not, and only the model and the single user ever inspect it. This is the spreadsheet era’s oldest hazard—the invisible formula error in a model no one else audits—returning in a more powerful form, and it is a real limitation (§10), not a footnote.

8 Case Study: A Longitudinal Single-User Deployment

We report on one author’s production workspace, which accreted applications through ordinary use over roughly two months, with no host code written per application.

An accreted, personal application suite. The workspace contains 24 schema-defined collections holding ~ 700 records, 3 external feeds holding a further ~ 260 ingested records, and 9

agent-authored custom views (7 over collections, 2 over feeds). The applications span personal finance, reading and watch lists, a vocabulary trainer, recurring-obligation trackers, contact and engagement records, and domain-specific trackers; their record counts span nearly three orders of magnitude, from a single-record profile to hundreds of entries. Crucially, the suite *diverges sharply from any mass-market product*—a restaurant guide rendered as a transit map, a read-write podcast tracker carrying the owner’s own ratings and resume positions—which is the signature of build-for-one (§7).

The loop, observed. All four steps of §6 appear in the history. Needs were *recognized* and *crystallized* into collections; schemas were *tuned* in place (for example, a podcast feed gained user rating and notes fields after ingestion had populated it, absorbed as an additive, non-breaking change); and the *retire* step is visible as the ongoing migration from hardcoded worklog/client/invoice plugins toward collection skills that supersede them (§5).

Forking and versioning, in practice. Because the agent is its files, the whole agent—apps, memory, personality, automations—is copied by `cp -r` and versioned by `git`; every self-edit to a schema, role, or skill is a readable, revertible diff. This is the audit mechanism we rely on in place of run replay (§10).

9 Forking, Portability, and What the Workspace Buys for Free

Because the agent is its workspace, several properties that normally require engineering fall out of the file system. *Forking* an agent is `cp -r`: copying the directory copies the apps, memory, personality, and automations as one coherent unit, with no separate “export behavior” and “export data” steps, because they are the same files. *Versioning* an agent is `git`: a git-backed workspace gives configuration replay (`checkout`), branching, and self-edit lineage (`blame`)—audit and rollback for the agent’s edits to itself, with no bespoke runtime. *Portability* is trivial: nothing is stranded in a process or a database server; move the directory, move the agent. And *inspectability* is total: every part of the agent is a readable, greppable, diffable file, with no opaque learned blob that constitutes the agent apart from its workspace. These are not the headline result, but they are why the headline result is practical: an agent you can fork, version, inspect, and carry is one you can more safely let modify itself, because every modification is a visible, reversible change to files you can read.

10 Discussion and Limitations

Self-improvement requires self-pruning. If every recognized need spawns an artifact and every artifact becomes part of the agent’s “self,” then self-improvement without self-pruning produces a junk drawer: half-built collections, abandoned skills, stale automations. Traditional applications have maintainers and sunset processes; a self-built suite needs the same discipline, and nothing provides it automatically. The retire step (§6) is what keeps the agent’s self coherent rather than merely larger; an agent that only ever adds capabilities eventually degrades, because more surface means more ways to be wrong and more instructions competing for the same intent. A genuinely self-improving agent must be as willing to delete its own code as to write it.

Non-replayable execution. Because the operating step is a nondeterministic model call, a run cannot be replayed byte-for-byte, and a self-modification’s effect cannot be A/B-replayed against

the prior behavior on identical inputs—the deliberate trade against log-primary designs [8]. The mitigation is configuration-level rather than run-level: a git-backed workspace makes every self-edit auditable and revertable, which is the granularity that matters for an agent editing its own applications.

Correctness has no second audience. As argued in §7, an application with an audience of one does not accumulate correctness the way mass software does. Pushing consequential computation into host-evaluated derived fields helps, but relocates rather than removes the valid-but-wrong failure mode: a derived formula is itself a model-authored expression that the host evaluates faithfully whether or not it is the right formula. That formulas and schemas are short, inspectable, plain-text artifacts makes *review against stated intent* tractable, but the residual risk is real.

The security of a self-modifying, file-based agent. Making behavior editable as files widens the attack surface in two ways. First, content the agent ingests is untrusted: feeds bring external natural language into records the model reasons over while it may hold write-capable tokens, so indirect prompt injection [1] is a live threat that view sandboxing does not address, since it governs UI rendering rather than the model’s context. Second, the agent edits its *own* behavior—roles, skills, schemas—so a successful injection or a careless self-edit can in principle alter what the agent is, not just what it stores. The defenses are partial and must be layered: a git-backed workspace makes every self-edit reviewable and revertable; the schema validator rejects structurally incoherent self-modifications at load regardless of how they were written; and consequential or externally-triggered operations warrant confirmation. We did not observe an attack in our benign deployment, but we flag self-modification security as the architecture’s most important open problem.

Threats to validity. Our evidence is a single user, a single system, and an author-operated deployment; it demonstrates feasibility and the no-host-code property but does not establish generality, and it reports usage rather than a controlled comparison. Quantifying how often the loop is run, how much authoring effort it saves versus alternatives, and how the discipline of pruning holds up across users and longer horizons is future work.

Owning the learning loop. A firm’s strategic question in an AI-driven economy—recently framed by Nadella [5]—is whether it can *own the learning loop* that encodes its institutional knowledge, and, as the test of that ownership, whether it can swap out a generalist model without losing the “company-veteran” expertise built on top of it. The workspace-as-agent architecture passes that test by construction: the expertise lives in roles, schemas, skills, and the wiki—files the model interprets—not in weights it carries, so replacing the model leaves the accumulated knowledge intact. This is a stronger form of ownership than encoding the loop by fine-tuning a model on private traces, which re-couples the firm’s IP to a particular model; a declarative workspace keeps that IP inspectable, diff-able, forkable, and model-agnostic. The honest qualification is one of coverage: declarative files capture *explicit* knowledge—workflows, judgment-as-prose, linked notes—better than the *tacit* pattern recognition that learning on private traces can absorb. The two are complementary; the workspace is the portable substrate that survives a model swap, and any private tuning is an accelerator layered on top of it rather than the thing one owns.

From one user to the firm. MulmoClaude is, throughout this paper, a *single-user* agent, and our evidence is one personal workspace—but nothing in the architecture is intrinsically personal, and the concept generalizes directly to an organization. The same primitives scale: a team’s

learning loop becomes a shared, versioned workspace of roles, collection schemas, skills, and a cross-linked wiki, forked with `cp -r`, branched and audited with `git`, and owned independently of any model vendor. At that scale the workspace is exactly the firm’s compounding capital—institutional memory made queryable, recurring workflows crystallized into applications, and the whole of it portable across model generations. We have not evaluated the multi-user case, and its open problems are real (concurrency, access control, and the merge discipline that keeps a shared “self” coherent); but the single-user results suggest that the durable unit of ownership—whether the owner is a person or a firm—can be a workspace of files rather than a tuned model.

11 Conclusion

Traditional software assumes that engineers write programs and users operate them. The architecture described here assumes something different: users express intent, the agent writes the programs—into itself—and the resulting applications are part of the agent. The collection schema is the program, the DSLs in the workspace are the source code, the model is the runtime, and the workspace is the agent. Because the programs live inside the agent, writing them is the agent improving itself, which is why, of the available names, *self-improving agent* fits better than *no-code platform*. The same move that makes this possible—near-zero-cost bespoke software, authored from intent—turns software from a product shipped to a market into an artifact grown for an individual, and shifts the discipline from maintaining precious code to verifying disposable code and curating the durable intent and data behind it.

Availability

MulmoClaude is open source, including the roles, collection schemas, skills, and automations that constitute the workspace-as-agent described here, and the self-maintained wiki: <https://github.com/recepton/mulmoclaude>.

References

- [1] Kai Greshake, Sahar Abdelnabi, Shailesh Mishra, Christoph Endres, Thorsten Holz, and Mario Fritz. Not what you’ve signed up for: Compromising real-world LLM-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security (AISec)*, 2023. doi: 10.1145/3605764.3623985. arXiv:2302.12173.
- [2] Andrej Karpathy. LLM knowledge bases. <https://gist.github.com/karpathy/442a6bf555914893e9891c11519de94f>, 2025.
- [3] Andrew J. Ko, Robin Abraham, Laura Beckwith, Alan Blackwell, Margaret Burnett, Martin Erwig, Christopher Scaffidi, Joseph Lawrance, Henry Lieberman, Brad Myers, Mary Beth Rosson, Gregg Rothermel, Mary Shaw, and Susan Wiedenbeck. The state of the art in end-user software engineering. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 43(3):1–44, 2011. doi: 10.1145/1922649.1922658.
- [4] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegreffe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhumoye, Yiming Yang, Shashank Gupta, Bodhisattwa Prasad Majumder, Katherine Hermann, Sean Welleck, Amir Yazdanbakhsh, and

- Peter Clark. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. arXiv:2303.17651.
- [5] Satya Nadella. A frontier without an ecosystem is not stable. Post on X, <https://x.com/satyanadella/status/2066182223213293753>, 2026.
 - [6] Satoshi Nakajima. DSLs as harnesses for reliable LLM agents. Companion paper, Mulmo-Claude project, 2026. arXiv id to be added once posted.
 - [7] Yohei Nakajima. BabyAGI. <https://github.com/yoheinakajima/babyagi>, 2023.
 - [8] Yohei Nakajima. The log is the agent: Event-sourced reactive graphs for auditable, forkable agentic systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.21997*, 2026.
 - [9] Bonnie A. Nardi. *A Small Matter of Programming: Perspectives on End User Computing*. MIT Press, 1993.
 - [10] Joon Sung Park, Joseph C. O’Brien, Carrie J. Cai, Meredith Ringel Morris, Percy Liang, and Michael S. Bernstein. Generative agents: Interactive simulacra of human behavior. In *ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST)*, 2023. arXiv:2304.03442.
 - [11] Noah Shinn, Federico Cassano, Edward Berman, Ashwin Gopinath, Karthik Narasimhan, and Shunyu Yao. Reflexion: Language agents with verbal reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2023. arXiv:2303.11366.
 - [12] Significant Gravitas. Auto-GPT: An autonomous GPT-4 experiment. <https://github.com/Significant-Gravitas/AutoGPT>, 2023.
 - [13] Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.16291*, 2023.
 - [14] Qingyun Wu, Gagan Bansal, Jieyu Zhang, Yiran Wu, Beibin Li, Erkang Zhu, Li Jiang, Xiaoyun Zhang, Shaokun Zhang, Jiale Liu, Ahmed H. Awadallah, Ryen W. White, Doug Burger, and Chi Wang. AutoGen: Enabling next-gen llm applications via multi-agent conversation framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.08155*, 2023.
 - [15] Eric Zelikman, Yuhuai Wu, Jesse Mu, and Noah D. Goodman. STaR: Bootstrapping reasoning with reasoning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2022. arXiv:2203.14465.