

Behavioral Skill Reconstruction: Reconstructing Hidden Functionality from LLM Agent Skills

Peichun Hua Haoxuan Xu Mengyuan Li

peichunhua04@gmail.com {xuhaoxua, mli49061}@usc.edu

University of Southern California

Abstract

Closed source agent skills may encode proprietary instructions, scripts, constants, and data. Providers may offer their capabilities as services while keeping the underlying packages hidden. Prior work focuses on prompt injection attacks that directly disclose these artifacts, and existing defenses accordingly aim to prevent such leakage. However, preventing file disclosure does not prevent users from recovering the functionality those files implement. This raises a fundamental question: *can a user reconstruct a skill’s functionality through ordinary use while its files remain hidden?*

We study behavioral skill reconstruction (BSR), in which an attacker uses valid task requests and observed responses to build a functional clone of a hidden skill. We introduce SKILL-CLONE, a black-box attack that clones a target skill by forming an interface hypothesis from its public advertisement, issuing structured benign probes, synthesizing an executable replica, and iteratively repairing it through differential validation against the victim skill. Across 30 skills spanning rules, tables, procedures, and algorithms, SKILLCLONE achieves exact or partial recovery on held-out inputs for several targets. Iterative requerying closes gaps missed by single-round reconstruction. Because SKILLCLONE uses only legitimate interactions, disclosure-focused defenses provide limited coverage, and less detailed skill descriptions offer limited protection. These results show that file secrecy alone does not ensure functional secrecy. Defenses must also limit cumulative information leakage from ordinary use.

1 Introduction

LLM agents increasingly rely on external *skills*, which package instructions, scripts, reference data, and tool logic that an agent loads on demand (Anthropic, 2025). Skills add specialized capabilities without retraining the underlying model and can

substantially improve task performance (Li et al., 2026). The emerging ecosystem includes both public and proprietary skills. Public registries host 90,368 skills from 9,485 publishers, with 24.3 million cumulative installs (Cho et al., 2026), while paid marketplaces list more than 2,000 skills and report over \$100,000 in creator earnings (Wang et al., 2026). Private and enterprise skills may further encode valuable rules, data, procedures, and code. Providers may therefore wish to offer these capabilities as services while keeping the underlying packages confidential.

The value of these skills creates an incentive to recover their capabilities without paying for or independently developing them. Existing research has primarily studied direct disclosure, where prompt injection, jailbreak, or prompt stealing induces an agent to reveal hidden instructions or files (Zhang et al., 2024; Sha and Zhang, 2024; Agarwal et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2026). Related studies examine cross-modal injection, unsafe runtime behavior, and composition-based exploitation (Lan and Xiao, 2026; Xie et al., 2026; Hossain et al., 2026). Corresponding defenses detect extraction intent, isolate protected instructions, or filter outputs containing sensitive content (Hua et al., 2026; Li et al., 2025; Cao et al., 2025; Jiang et al., 2025). This attack and defense setting treats skill confidentiality primarily as artifact secrecy: a skill is considered protected if its underlying files are not disclosed.

Artifact secrecy, however, may not imply functional secrecy. A skill offered as a service must reveal aspects of its behavior through ordinary task responses. Repeated interactions can expose table entries, decision thresholds, composition rules, and procedural conventions while the underlying package remains hidden. This raises our central research question: *Can an attacker reconstruct a skill’s hidden functionality through ordinary task use while its artifacts remain concealed?*

We study this threat as **behavioral skill recon-**

struction (BSR). In BSR, an attacker submits valid task requests, observes the responses, and builds a functional clone of a hidden skill. The attacker neither accesses the skill package nor asks the agent to reveal it, but interacts with the skill-enabled agent through its intended service interface.

We introduce SKILLCLONE, a black box attack for behavioral skill reconstruction. SKILLCLONE begins with the public skill *description*, which allows an agent to route relevant tasks to it. The attack converts cues in the descriptive advertisement into a typed interface hypothesis, issues structured benign probes, parses the responses, and synthesizes an executable clone. It then generates validation inputs, identifies disagreements between the clone and the victim, and issues additional probes to repair the inferred implementation. This closed-loop process uses only victim responses and does not require access to the hidden skill or the evaluation oracle. We define *model-relative marginal functionality* to isolate the skill’s contribution from capabilities the underlying model already provides. A component is *IP-positive* and eligible for reconstruction scoring only when the skill-enabled victim applies it reliably, but the same model cannot reproduce it from the public description alone.

We evaluate SKILLCLONE on 30 skills from SkillsBench (Li et al., 2026), SkillRet (Cho et al., 2026), and a public registry crawl. The suite covers rules, tables, procedures, and algorithms. In deployed-agent experiments, SKILLCLONE recovers 16 of 21 mined skills above floor on the strongest victim and produces exact clones for several deterministic procedures. Controlled in-context experiments separate functional leakage from routing and framework failures and show that iterative victim-guided requerying closes coverage gaps that defeat single-round reconstruction. We further find that defenses designed for direct disclosure provide limited protection. A disclosure-oriented filter detects all four explicit disclosure probes in our evaluation, while its input detector flags 6.7% of SKILLCLONE’s task-valid probes. Reducing the detail of public skill descriptions also yields inconsistent protection. These results show that protecting skill files from disclosure is insufficient to preserve functional secrecy. Defenses must also limit the information accumulated through legitimate task interactions.

Our contributions are:

1. We formulate behavioral skill reconstruction

as a distinct threat to closed source agent skills and define model-relative marginal functionality for measuring recovery beyond the base model’s existing capabilities.

2. We introduce SKILLCLONE, an iterative black box attack that uses public skill advertisements, structured benign probes, executable synthesis, and victim-guided differential validation to reconstruct functionality.
3. We evaluate SKILLCLONE on 30 skills spanning rules, tables, procedures, and algorithms, identify six major reconstruction bottlenecks, and measure two defense interventions.

2 Background

Agent Skills. A *skill* is a reusable, file-system-based package that an agent loads during task execution to handle a class of tasks without retraining the model (Anthropic, 2025; Li et al., 2026). It combines a natural-language instruction file with optional scripts, templates, reference files, and worked examples; an agent harness makes these resources actionable at inference time. Skills continue a line of work on reusable agent capabilities, including executable libraries learned from experience (Wang et al., 2023), reusable workflows induced from trajectories (Wang et al., 2024b), and portable capability packages (Xu and Yan, 2026). Large public registries make both skill reuse and skill retrieval practical research problems (Cho et al., 2026; Liu et al., 2026a).

We model a skill as $s = (a_s, b_s)$. The *advertisement* a_s is the public name and description used for routing (Cho et al., 2026); the *body* b_s contains the full instructions and any bundled scripts, data, or resources. Under progressive disclosure (Anthropic, 2025), an agent initially sees a_s , loads b_s when selected, and opens auxiliary files as needed. Mounting s on model m yields an agent $A_{m,s}$ whose observable behavior depends on the hidden body. The advertisement supports routing, and ordinary answers expose the body’s functional consequences, which SKILLCLONE leverages.

Model and function extraction. A classical line reconstructs a victim model from black-box prediction queries. Tramèr et al. (2016) showed that prediction APIs leak their models and extracted them using equation-solving and path-finding attacks; Papernot et al. (2017) trained a local surrogate on queried labels to transfer adversarial examples; Jagielski et al. (2020) recovered network

weights and hyperparameters with high accuracy and fidelity; and [Krishna et al. \(2020\)](#) showed that production machine-learning pipelines expose their models to adversaries with legitimate pipeline access. More recently, [Carlini et al. \(2024\)](#) recovered structural components of a production language model, and a parallel line extracts verbatim training data ([Carlini et al., 2021](#)) and infers training-set membership ([Shokri et al., 2017](#)); surrogate training itself builds on knowledge distillation ([Hinton et al., 2015](#)). SKILLCLONE inherits the black-box query primitive, the active-learning view of probe selection, and the surrogate-versus-victim agreement metric, but targets the marginal functionality contributed by one mounted skill, recoverable by a normal user of a skill-enabled agent.

Prompt and instruction disclosure. A second line steals the hidden text that conditions a model. System prompts and in-context instructions can be reconstructed through adversarial queries ([Zhang et al., 2024](#); [Sha and Zhang, 2024](#); [Agarwal et al., 2024](#)); instruction-hijacking techniques such as “ignore previous prompt” ([Perez and Ribeiro, 2022](#)) and universal adversarial suffixes ([Zou et al., 2023](#)) manipulate the same hidden text; indirect prompt injection ([Greshake et al., 2023](#)) delivers it through tool and document content; and black-box skill stealing induces an agent to print its `SKILL.md` ([Wang et al., 2026](#)). These attacks succeed only when the hidden string is disclosed. SKILLCLONE forbids disclosure: the adversary’s objective is the function the text implements, observed through ordinary answers, so disclosure-shaped filters (Section 6) leave it unaffected.

Agent and skill security. Skills extend tool-use agents ([Yao et al., 2023](#); [Schick et al., 2023](#); [Qin et al., 2024](#); [Wang et al., 2025](#)) and form a distinct attack surface. An empirical study of agent skills in the wild catalogues security vulnerabilities across public registries at scale ([Liu et al., 2026b](#)); skill mutation attacks ([Kim et al., 2026](#)) and vetting benchmarks ([Hossain et al., 2026](#)) address malicious skill content, while runtime sandboxing ([Lan and Xiao, 2026](#)) and composition auditing ([Xie et al., 2026](#)) constrain what a loaded skill can do, and lifecycle governance tracks skills from collection to retirement ([Liu et al., 2026a](#)). Agent-side leakage also flows through tool interfaces: memory retrieval can be hijacked to exfiltrate private records ([Cui et al., 2026b](#)), and multi-agent orchestration harnesses can be distilled through black-box inter-

action ([Cui et al., 2026a](#)). These works attack artifacts, agent infrastructure, or interaction protocols. SKILLCLONE instead measures the functionality itself: how much of a benign skill leaks through ordinary, task-valid use.

Concurrently, [Geng et al. \(2026\)](#) independently proposes to infer proprietary skills from behavior; notably, their SIGLEAK contrasts skill-enabled and skill-disabled execution trajectories. SKILLCLONE differs in three respects: it observes final answers only, without disabling the skill, which might not be practical in real scenarios; it synthesizes executable clones scored by exact held-out ASR against deterministic oracles, not semantic similarity; and it attributes each outcome to a binding bottleneck. We also provide an evaluation suite containing IP-positive skills from different sources, covering various types of skills, and we provide held-out test cases to infer the real functionality of the clone.

Defenses against extraction and disclosure. A defense literature targets extraction and disclosure directly: knowledge honeypots trap extraction attempts with planted decoys ([Dai and Dong, 2026](#)); PromptKeeper ([Jiang et al., 2025](#)) and system-level prompt protection ([Cao et al., 2025](#)) defend the system prompt itself; structured-query defenses ([Chen et al., 2025](#)) and dynamic rule-based isolation ([Li et al., 2025](#)) block injection channels; and adaptive shield prompting protects multimodal models from structure-based attacks ([Wang et al., 2024a](#)). Adjacent robustness work detects jailbreak attempts ([Nian et al., 2025](#); [Hua et al., 2026](#)). These defenses assume that an attack manifests as anomalous queries, injection channels, or disclosure of a protected string. SKILLCLONE’s probes are task-valid and benign by construction, and its objective is functional rather than textual: Section 6 shows that disclosure-shaped filters ([Wang et al., 2026](#)) leave its ASR unchanged. Our measurements characterize the gap these defenses leave open—cumulative behavioral reconstruction through ordinary task use.

3 Attack Methodology

We model our attack, SKILLCLONE, as a black-box system identification of the functionality contributed by a mounted skill. Figure 1 summarizes the attack loop, the victim boundary, and the evaluation process. In this section, we first define the threat model (§3.1), as well as the component-

oriented reconstruction target (§3.2). Then we present the interface hypothesis, probe policy, observation parsing, program synthesis, and differential repair modules (§3.3).

Running example. To illustrate how SKILLCLONE reconstructs hidden functionality, we use a synthetic document-triage skill. It assigns text to three priority levels (1–urgent, 2–review, and 3–normal). Its advertisement specifies content and word count as inputs, while its body encodes an urgent-keyword disjunction, a length threshold (> 500 words), and a conjunction requiring both high word count and review-related content for Priority 2. The attacker reconstructs these rules through task-valid probes.

3.1 Threat Model and Formal Objective

We adopt a black-box threat model similar to prior related work (Wang et al., 2026; Cui et al., 2026a). The attacker is a normal user of a skill-enabled agent. It knows the advertisement and public task interface σ_s and may submit *task-valid* inputs. Its observations are restricted to final messages and artifacts. The attacker cannot inspect the skill body, bundled files, hidden tool activity, chain-of-thought, or evaluator test cases. Its goal is an executable clone $\hat{f}$ that recovers the function contributed by the mounted skill.

Each query must request output that the advertised skill is intended to provide. Artifact-revelation and instruction-exfiltration queries fall outside the protocol. This restriction separates SKILLCLONE from jailbreak, prompt-injection, and prompt-extraction settings (Wang et al., 2024a; Hua et al., 2026; Li et al., 2025; Cao et al., 2025; Jiang et al., 2025). All evaluated skill bodies are public artifacts available to the evaluator, but the protocol withholds them from the attacker.

Within this threat model, we formalize the reconstruction objective as follows. For a victim model m and skill s , let $A_{m,s}$ denote the agent exposed to users. A task input $x \in \mathcal{X}$ produces an observable answer $y = A_{m,s}(x)$ consisting only of visible messages and artifacts. The attacker receives the advertisement a_s , public task interface σ_s , and query budget B , and its information after t queries is

$$H_t = \{a_s, \sigma_s, (x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_t, y_t)\}, \quad (1)$$

$$y_i = A_{m,s}(x_i).$$

The attacker’s policy chooses $x_{t+1} \sim \pi(\cdot \mid H_t)$ subject to the task-valid restriction above, and a

synthesizer maps the resulting history to an executable clone in a class $\mathcal{G}$. The evaluator alone holds the skill’s ground-truth function f_s^* and uses it to score the final clone (§4); the attacker instead optimizes agreement with further victim responses.

3.2 Component-oriented Target Model

The reconstruction target is the *model-relative marginal functionality* contributed by the hidden skill body: concrete thresholds, table entries, composition rules, and procedural conventions that distinguish the skill-enabled agent from the plain LLM model. For example, a traffic-classification advertisement may expose the task and its input fields, while the hidden body specifies the exact detection thresholds and the logic that combines them.

The public advertisement and task interface provide cues about the likely implementation structure, but leave its exact form unspecified. A pricing skill, for example, may suggest a lookup table indexed by products or service tiers, whereas a traffic classifier may suggest threshold-based rules over network features. From these cues, the attacker constructs an initial typed interface hypothesis h_0 , specifying candidate input and output types, latent factors, hidden parameters, and composition families. The subsequent probing and synthesis stages instantiate and refine this hypothesis by recovering the concrete constants, entries, and logic.

3.3 Autonomous Attack Modules

SKILLCLONE realizes behavioral reconstruction through five modules connected by their data flow. Interface hypothesis formation narrows the space of plausible implementations; probe generation and observation parsing convert task-valid interactions into typed evidence; program synthesis produces an executable clone; and differential validation uses victim–clone disagreements to guide repair.

Interface hypothesis. Given (a_s, σ_s) , the attacker constructs a typed interface hypothesis

$$h_0 = (\hat{\mathcal{X}}, \hat{\mathcal{Y}}, \hat{\mathcal{Z}}, \hat{\Theta}, \hat{\mathcal{C}}), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{Z}}$ are candidate latent factors, $\hat{\Theta}$ are candidate constants or parameters, and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}$ is a candidate composition family. Candidate factors include port counts, entropy, and conjunctions for network skills; city, product, code, or date keys for data skills; and intermediate quantities and reduction conventions for procedures. The public advertisement, task interface, and general domain knowledge bound this hypothesis space. Unadvertised




Figure 1: Overview of SKILLCLONE. Stages 1–3 turn public advertisement and interface into interface hypothesis and diverse probes. Stages 4–6 send probe inputs into the victim, parse its responses, and synthesize the clone. Differential validation compares clone and victim outputs and prioritizes disagreements for the next round.

factors outside general domain knowledge can be absent from h_0 , creating a hypothesis-quality bottleneck. In the document-priority example, the public information exposes the input fields, output labels, and relevance of keywords and length while leaving the exact keywords, threshold, and composition unknown.

Probe policy. The attacker uses a fixed, domain-general operator library to distinguish its current hypotheses. *Isolation* varies one factor while holding the rest neutral; *dose-response* sweeps its magnitude; *boundary search* localizes a threshold; *composition* distinguishes additive, max/min, priority, floor, and Boolean rules; *counterfactual* and *confound* probes separate overlapping factors; and *enumeration* covers lookup keys. The operator library is a heuristic experimental-design policy. The autonomous attacker chooses and instantiates operators from the public information and observed history.

Running example. In our example, the attacker may adopt the following strategies:

Isolation. The attacker hypothesizes that certain keywords trigger urgent priority. It submits “server outage” with a neutral 300-word body; the victim returns Priority 1. It then submits “server reboot,” also at 300 words; the victim again returns Priority 1. Holding word count constant while varying the keyword shows that both phrases activate the urgent rule, suggesting a keyword list.

Boundary search. The attacker suspects a word-count threshold for the review tier. It submits “budget review” at exactly 500 words; the victim returns Priority 3. It then submits the same text at 501

words; the victim returns Priority 2. The attacker infers a strict threshold at >500 words.

Composition. To test whether length alone suffices, the attacker submits “quarterly report” with 600 words and neutral content; the victim returns Priority 3. Priority 2 requires long text *and* review-related content, a conjunction rule.

Observation parsing. Real agents return prose and artifacts. The attacker requests “only the answer,” parses each visible response into a typed observation, and treats the parsed victim output as the label for subsequent synthesis and repair.

Program synthesis. The synthesizer $\hat{f}_t = S(H_t) \in \mathcal{G}$ turns the history into executable code using a constrained schema appropriate to the hypothesized interface: threshold classifier, table lookup, rule engine, state machine, or numeric procedure. The resulting artifact is a standalone executable surrogate of the function contributed by the skill. Held-out execution exposes unsupported specifications. The synthesizer infers private constants and data from the query history.

Running example. In our example, the attacker has collected observations such as (“server outage”, 300 words) $\rightarrow$ Priority 1, (“budget review”, 500 words) $\rightarrow$ Priority 3, and (“quarterly report”, 600 words) $\rightarrow$ Priority 3. Together with the 501-word “budget review” observation above, the synthesizer infers: (1) two keywords trigger Priority 1 regardless of length; (2) Priority 2 requires > 500 words AND review-related content; (3) everything else defaults to Priority 3. It then writes a Python function with conditional branches encoding these rules

such that its correctness can be checked mechanically in the evaluation.

Differential verification and repair. The evaluator oracle remains hidden, so the attacker scores candidates by victim agreement. It generates fresh task-valid inputs and runs both the synthesized clone $\hat{f}_t$ and $A_{m,s}$, re-queries disagreements, and synthesizes a repaired clone.

Running example. For example, if the document clone initially uses words ≥ 500 , “budget approval” at exactly 500 words produces a disagreement: the clone returns Priority 2 and the victim returns Priority 3. At 501 words, both return Priority 2. These observations identify the strict >500 comparison, and the attacker repairs the clone accordingly. The attacker returns the candidate $\hat{f}_{t^*}$ with the highest victim agreement on its validation set, where

$$t^* = \arg \max_t \text{Agree}(\hat{f}_t, A_{m,s}; V), \quad (3)$$

where V is generated by the attacker and is disjoint from the evaluator test data.

3.4 Reconstruction Loop

Putting the modules together, one round updates the interface hypothesis from H_t , instantiates a discriminating probe, parses the victim response, synthesizes $\hat{f}_{t+1}$, and validates it against fresh victim outputs. The loop repeats until budget B is exhausted and returns the round with the highest victim agreement. This modular design enables ablations that replace one module at a time and measure the resulting change in ASR. §5.1 defines these interventions and reports the corresponding failure mechanisms for each type of skills.

4 Experimental Setup

We first construct the skill suite and determine eligible skill–victim cells (§4.1), then build component-level held-out evaluators and scoring (§4.2), and finally specify the SKILLCLONE protocol (§4.3).

4.1 Eligibility and Suite Construction

Our suite is designed to support exact and attributable measurement of behavioral reconstruction. This imposes two eligibility requirements: 1) deterministic functionality with auditable ground truth, so that recovery can be scored by held-out functional equivalence; 2) the skill body must provide a measurable functional benefit for at least

one victim: the victim must reliably perform some functionality with the body that it cannot without the skill body.

Candidate pools and execution settings. We draw candidates from SkillsBench (Li et al., 2026), SkillRet (Cho et al., 2026), and a public registry crawl. Within each candidate cohort, eligibility screening and the subsequent SKILLCLONE evaluation use the same execution setting. SkillsBench candidates retain the benchmark’s deployed OpenHands setting because these packages are curated for agent execution. Mined candidates are screened and evaluated by directly loading the skill body in context. This controlled setting isolates the SKILLCLONE mechanism from agent-stack delivery and parsing failures. Appendix D further reports full-agent functionality screens and complete SKILLCLONE evaluation runs for the mined skills.

Victim models. We evaluate DeepSeek-Flash, DeepSeek-Pro, GLM-5.1 (Zhipu AI, 2026), Kimi-K2.6 (Team et al., 2026), and GPT-5.6-Luna as victims. These models define the skill–victim cells considered in the second screening stage and in the subsequent cross-model evaluation.

Two-stage screening. The first stage retains targets with deterministic logic and auditable ground truth; mined candidates additionally require a compatible license. In the second stage, we run each surviving candidate with and without the body on the same task-valid inputs for each victim. A component is *marginal* when $A_{m,s}$ applies it reliably and $A_{m,\emptyset}$ fails to do so; a skill–victim cell is IP-positive when it contains at least one such component. Operationally, we require $\text{fid}(A_{m,s}) \geq 0.6$ and $\text{fid}(A_{m,s}) - \text{fid}(A_{m,\emptyset}) \geq 0.25$, where fid is agreement with the oracle.

A skill enters the suite when at least one victim yields an IP-positive cell, whereas reconstruction for a particular victim is evaluated only on that victim’s eligible cells. This procedure yields a 30-skill suite with 9 code-execution or procedure-heavy SkillsBench skills, 11 SkillRet data/rule skills, and 10 data/rule skills from the registry crawl. Appendix B documents the sources, license filter, selection criteria, and per-victim counts.

4.2 Held-out Evaluator and Scoring

For each retained target, we complete the evaluator used for held-out scoring. The evaluator includes a deterministic self-oracle f_s^* reimplemented from

the body, a typed input/output schema, and a seeded input generator. It decomposes the skill into functional components $c \in C_s$ and constructs discriminating inputs $D(c)$ on which correct and incorrect implementations diverge. These inputs exercise hidden constants, thresholds, table rows, special cases, composition rules, and procedure conventions. The component set and discriminating inputs remain evaluator-only.

Probe, attacker-generated validation, and evaluator test inputs are drawn from disjoint generator ranges. Mined-skill clones are scored on $n=150$ evaluator-only test inputs, and SkillsBench clones are scored on $n=800$. The test distribution emphasizes discriminating inputs so that held-out agreement measures recovery of the hidden components rather than agreement on uninformative examples. Appendix B gives the per-skill oracle, component definitions, and split construction.

The primary score is attack success rate:

$$\text{ASR}(\hat{f}) = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim \mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}} [\mathbf{1}\{\hat{f}(x) = f_s^*(x)\}]. \quad (4)$$

The deployable clone is selected by victim agreement on attacker-generated validation inputs, while reported ASR is computed against f_s^* on evaluator-held-out inputs.

4.3 SKILLCLONE Experimental Protocol

Attacker model. DeepSeek-V4-Flash Preview (DeepSeek-AI, 2026) serves as the primary attacker throughout our experiments. We use DeepSeek-Pro only in the attacker-model ablation.

Query budget. Controlled mined-skill runs use 52 victim probes to build the clone and 30 further victim queries to select among candidates, for 82 victim queries per skill. SkillsBench attacks use $K=24$ victim probes. The paired acquisition-policy ablation gives both arms the same acquisition budget and victim outputs; Appendix D reports its separate shared-panel accounting. At these budgets, DeepSeek attacks cost approximately 0.9 ¢ with Flash and 1.3 ¢ with Pro.

Model and synthesis settings. Victims run at temperature 0 where the API permits; Kimi-K2.6 uses its fixed vendor setting (Moonshot AI, 2026). The synthesizer produces three candidates at temperatures $\{0, 0.5, 0.9\}$ and retains the one with highest victim-validation agreement. Appendix D reports parsing within the full agent stack. Appendix C.5 reports victim-temperature robustness.

5 Results

We evaluate whether SKILLCLONE reconstructs hidden functionality and what limits recovery (§5.1), how closed-loop refinement and adaptive probe selection affect reconstruction (§5.2), and how results vary across victim models (§5.3).

5.1 Reconstruction Effectiveness

Reconstruction by component type. Table 1 groups the 30-skill suite by dominant hidden functionality and reports all-victim median ASR and fraction above floor; Appendix C provides per-skill and per-model results.

Bottleneck diagnostics. For each skill, we investigate the process and provide diagnostics for failures: ground-truth labels in place of victim responses test *victim fidelity*; hand-designed boundary sweeps test *probe specificity*; an unbounded query budget tests *coverage*; a supplied latent factor tests *hypothesis quality*; a named algorithm or visible working (Appendix C.4) tests *synthesis*; and a supplied formula identity tests *recall*.

Victim fidelity affects every component type because victim responses are the attacker’s only labels. While the IP screen removes cells without a reliable teaching signal, eligible cells can still contain incorrect labels that corrupt reconstruction. For `r2r`, the victim miscomputes the Jacobian entries that contain the hidden constants, so the attacker learns from incorrect labels and the clone scores 0% ASR. With evaluator-oracle labels, the same reconstruction reaches 100% ASR, identifying victim fidelity as the bottleneck.

Threshold and decision rules have a 71% median, with three of four skills above floor. Coarse autonomous probes distinguish the categorical constraints in `security-env-standards` yet miss `dapt`’s exact entropy and packet-rate cutoffs, leaving it at its 50% balanced-class floor. Hand-designed boundary sweeps lift `dapt` to 96–100%, identifying probe specificity as the bottleneck.

Lookup tables have a higher 84% median, with all six skills above floor. The attacker enumerates the few dozen tiers in `klingai-pricing`, whereas 24 probes reveal too little of the 230-entry `codebook`, leaving ASR at 0%. A probe-budget sweep confirms that coverage-bound skills benefit from more probes (Appendix C.6).

Rule composition has the highest median (88%). We found that `civ6` plateaus at 60% because the

Component type	<i>n</i>	Representatives (all-victim median ASR)	Median ASR	%>floor	Primary bottleneck
Threshold / decision rules	4	security-env-standards (91%), dapt (50%), lead-scoring (29%)	71%	3/4	probe specificity
Lookup tables / data	6	klimgai-pricing (100%), labunit (77%)	84%	6/6	coverage
Rule composition	6	team-composition (100%), bellog (73%)	88%	6/6	hypothesis quality
Procedures / algorithms	8	drone (100%), working-day (100%)	75%	4/8	synthesis
Numeric formulas	6	protein-qc (33%), token-cost (91%), labor-rate (94%)	57%	4/6	recall

Table 1: Extraction ASR by dominant component type, pooled across all five victim models. Representative skills report the per-skill median ASR across victims. Pooled medians and %>floor combine controlled mined-skill and deployed SkillsBench settings under the cross-victim protocol.

hypothesis generator misses an unadvertised confound; supplying that factor resolves the gap, identifying hypothesis quality as the bottleneck.

Procedures and algorithms are bimodal, with a 75% median and four of eight above floor. The synthesizer exactly recovers the sequential logic in *drone*, *working-day*, and *reflow*, while *cache* and *osm-topology* require state-machine or modular-arithmetic synthesis. We show that an explicit recipe extraction step lifts *osm-topology* to 100% (Appendix C.4).

Numeric formulas have the lowest median (57%). *labor-rate* and *knowledge-worker-salaries* reach 81–94%, while *powerlifting* remains near 0% because the attacker recalls Wilks in place of DOTS despite perfect probes and victim fidelity; supplying the formula identity fully resolves the gap.

Clone structure. Successful clones achieve 74–100% ASR at 35–59% token precision against the skill body: the recovered function is implemented through distinct program structures, not textual reproduction. Appendix C.7 provides the full breakdown.

5.2 Effects of Closed-loop Refinement

We also show that the closed-loop refinement has large effects. Within the 16 skills whose mean lift exceeds 5 pp, refinement adds +29 pp (Pro), +24 pp (GLM), +34 pp (Kimi), and +25 pp (Luna). Eight reach at least 90% ASR on one victim, and three reach 100% on all four victims. Refinement mostly repairs coverage gaps; synthesis-bound *osm-topology* and fidelity-limited *isocom* and *midi-protocol-lookup* show little lift. Appendix C.3 reports the full breakdown.

An equal-budget comparison (Appendix C.6) isolates the effect of *adaptive probe selection* for Flash, Pro, and Luna. It improves 6/21 skills for Flash and Pro and 5/21 for Luna, with mean gains of +9.57 pp, +6.00 pp, and +7.18 pp, respectively, among improved skills.

5.3 Cross-model Variations

Figure 2 repeats controlled reconstruction across five victims and groups all skills by type. *stars-we-prefer* and *delegation* exceed their floors by 85 and 62 points, respectively, for every victim. Other outcomes vary sharply: for example, *protein-qc* gains 99 points with DeepSeek Pro and 5 with Kimi; *labor-rate* gains 89–95 points with DeepSeek Flash, Pro, and Kimi and 24 with Luna. *osm-topology* stays below floor for all four eligible victims, exposing a synthesis bottleneck *shared* across model families.

Functional reconstruction transfers across model families: every victim achieves recovery above its per-skill majority-class floor in several component classes, and several skills are recovered for all five victims. Recovery magnitude remains model-dependent, as shown by the large victim gaps on *protein-qc* and *labor-rate*. Bottlenecks also persist across families: *osm-topology* remains below floor for every victim because each clone fails at the same modular-arithmetic synthesis step. Thus, victim choice changes the degree of exposure, while shared reconstruction mechanisms determine several successes and failures. Appendix D separately compares controlled eligibility with full-agent realization. GPT-5.6-Luna uses the skills effectively in OpenHands, recovering 16 of 21 mined skills above floor, with 71.8% unconditional mean ASR and 90.1% conditional ASR on



Figure 2: Cross-victim reconstruction results. Skills grouped as threshold (T), lookup (L), rules (R), procedure (P), and numeric-formula (N), with codes mapped in Appendix C. Cells report ASR minus per-skill floor; gray $\times$ cells lack measurable marginal functionality, and open diamonds mark synthesis-bound outcomes.

Probe set	N	Input detected	Output blocked	Either
Disclosure Probes	4	4	3	4
SKILLCLONE (Ours)	252	17	0	17

Table 2: Performance of disclosure-shaped filters (DeepSeek Pro victim). The input detector flags the query text; the output filter blocks responses whose lexical overlap with the skill body exceeds 0.5.

its 16 Full+ skills. This result shows that SKILLCLONE succeeds through a realistic agent stack when the victim applies the skill reliably.

6 Defense Evaluation

We evaluate two interventions drawn from prior literature (Wang et al., 2026) and measure their effect on functional reconstruction.

Disclosure-shaped filters. We reimplement the input intent detector (an LLM classifier that flags extraction queries) and output filter (a lexical-overlap threshold with skill-body). We run both detectors over the probes and responses generated during our attacks, together with four disclosure probes from Wang et al. (2026) as a comparison.

Table 2 reports the outcome. All disclosure probes are caught by at least one filter. The input detector flags 17 of 252 task-valid SKILLCLONE probes (6.7%), and the output filter flags none because the responses carry little lexical overlap with the skill body. Text-oriented signals, therefore, miss the cumulative functional information that SKILLCLONE extracts across benign interactions.

Advertisement minimization. We test whether removing reconstruction cues from the public advertisement reduces extraction. An LLM rewrites each of the 21 mined skills’ descriptions at two

Ad condition	Top-1 recall	Median Δ ASR	Protected	Harmed
Original	99.5%	—	—	—
Task-only	96.2%	0.0 pp	3/21	4/21
Vague	96.2%	0.0 pp	2/21	3/21

Table 3: Advertisement minimization: routing and extraction under rewritten descriptions. Top-1 recall measures closed-catalog skill selection. Protected (harmed): ≥ 20 pp ASR decrease (increase).

levels. *Task-only* retains the domain and legitimate-use trigger while deleting mechanism names, constants, thresholds, table keys, and composition rules; *vague* retains only the broad task family. We also verify that the rewritten advertisements still support routing (selecting the correct skill from the catalog). Table 3 shows that both rewrites preserve the routing recall but yield a median ASR change of 0 pp. Removing cues can either mislead hypothesis formation or induce broader probes: `neo4j-schema` drops from 89% to 10% without schema keys, whereas `token-cost-tracking` rises from 4% to 54% because coarser descriptions produce broader probes that better regularize the clone.

7 Conclusion

This work proposes SKILLCLONE, which identifies functional reconstruction as a confidentiality risk for agent skills. SKILLCLONE turns task-valid black-box interactions into executable clones and iteratively refines them using disagreement signals. Across 30 skills, SKILLCLONE recovers 16 of 21 mined skills above floor on the strongest victim, and controlled interventions trace the residual failures to hypothesis formation, probe specificity, coverage, victim fidelity, recall, or synthesis. Prior

defenses against disclosure provide limited protection, and skill confidentiality must account for cumulative functional leakage through task use.

Limitations

Evaluation scope. Held-out exact equivalence evaluates deterministic rules, thresholds, tables, formulas, and procedures. Creative, interactive, and judgment-heavy skills require semantic or distributional imitation metrics, downstream-task effects, pairwise preference tests, or human evaluation that separates skill behavior from the base model and controls evaluator bias.

Model and service coverage. The evaluation covers DeepSeek Flash and Pro, GLM-5.1, Kimi-K2.6, and GPT-5.6-Luna, with substantial variation across skill-victim cells. The temperature sweep covers eight IP-positive deterministic skills over the tested API settings. All skill bodies are public artifacts; however, proprietary services and paid marketplaces remain outside the study.

Threat and defense scope. The attacker queries one skill-enabled agent and observes visible messages and artifacts. As we study a new and emerging threat, no customized defense is available for now. Our defense evaluation covers disclosure filtering and advertisement rewriting proposed in previous work on skill stealing. A broader evaluation would add cross-session identity controls, cumulative query monitoring, output coarsening, and private routing representations, etc.

References

- Divyansh Agarwal, Alexander Fabbri, Ben Risher, Philippe Laban, Shafiq Joty, and Chien-Sheng Wu. 2024. [Prompt leakage effect and mitigation strategies for multi-turn LLM applications](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Industry Track*, pages 1255–1275, Miami, Florida, US. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Anthropic. 2025. Equipping agents for the real world with agent skills. Anthropic Engineering Blog. <https://www.anthropic.com/engineering/equipping-agents-for-the-real-world-with-agent-skills>, accessed 2026-06.
- Bochuan Cao, Changjiang Li, Yuanpu Cao, Yameng Ge, Ting Wang, and Jinghui Chen. 2025. [You can't steal nothing: Mitigating prompt leakages in llms via system vectors](#). In *Proceedings of the 2025 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, CCS 2025, Taipei, Taiwan, October 13-17, 2025*, pages 4423–4437. ACM.
- Nicholas Carlini, Daniel Paleka, Krishnamurthy Dj Dvijotham, Thomas Steinke, Jonathan Hayase, A. Feder Cooper, Katherine Lee, Matthew Jagielski, Milad Nasr, Arthur Conmy, Eric Wallace, David Rolnick, and Florian Tramèr. 2024. [Stealing part of a production language model](#). In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2024, Vienna, Austria, July 21-27, 2024*, volume 235 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5680–5705. PMLR / OpenReview.net.
- Nicholas Carlini, Florian Tramèr, Eric Wallace, Matthew Jagielski, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Katherine Lee, Adam Roberts, Tom B. Brown, Dawn Song, Úlfar Erlingsson, Alina Oprea, and Colin Raffel. 2021. [Extracting training data from large language models](#). In *30th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2021, August 11-13, 2021*, pages 2633–2650. USENIX Association.
- Sizhe Chen, Julien Piet, Chawin Sitawarin, and David A. Wagner. 2025. [Struq: Defending against prompt injection with structured queries](#). In *34th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2025, Seattle, WA, USA, August 13-15, 2025*, pages 2383–2400. USENIX Association.
- Hongcheol Cho, Ryangkyung Kang, and Youngeun Kim. 2026. SkillRet: A large-scale benchmark for skill retrieval in LLM agents. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.05726*.
- Yu Cui, Wuli Yang, Yirui Shi, Junhao Xia, Hui Jiang, Lei Gao, and Chenfu Bao. 2026a. [Agent harness distillation: Inference-time harness extraction and exploitation in autonomous multi-agent systems](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2607.28147.
- Yu Cui, Ruiqing Yue, Hang Fu, Sicheng Pan, Zhuoyu Sun, Baohan Huang, Haibin Zhang, Cong Zuo, and Licheng Wang. 2026b. [Spore: Efficient and training-free privacy extraction attack on llms via inference-time hybrid probing](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2604.23711.
- Yuyang Dai and Yushun Dong. 2026. Let them steal: Trapping large language model extraction attacks with knowledge honeypot. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.15810*.
- DeepSeek-AI. 2026. Deepseek-v4: Towards highly efficient million-token context intelligence.
- DeepSeek-AI. 2026. The temperature parameter — deepseek api documentation. https://api-docs.deepseek.com/quick_start/parameter_settings. Recommends temperature 0 for coding/math/structured data; default 1.0. Accessed: 2026-06-30.
- Jianing Geng, Ruiqi He, Zekun Fei, Biao Yi, Xuansheng Wu, Ruijie Wang, Zheli Liu, Xia Hu, and Qingkai

- Zeng. 2026. [Agent skills matter: Inferring proprietary skills from execution trajectories](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2607.25560.
- Kai Greshake, Sahar Abdelnabi, Shailesh Mishra, Christoph Endres, Thorsten Holz, and Mario Fritz. 2023. 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)*, pages 79–90. ArXiv:2302.12173.
- Geoffrey E. Hinton, Oriol Vinyals, and Jeffrey Dean. 2015. [Distilling the knowledge in a neural network](#). *CoRR*, arXiv:1503.02531.
- Ismail Hossain, Sai Puppala, Md Jahangir Alam, Tanzim Ahad, and Sajedul Talukder. 2026. SkillVetBench: LLM-as-judge for multi-dimensional security risk evaluation in open-source LLM agent skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.15899*.
- Peichun Hua, Hao Li, Shanghao Shi, Zhiyuan Yu, and Ning Zhang. 2026. [Rethinking jailbreak detection of large vision language models with representational contrastive scoring](#). In *Proceedings of the 64th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 21748–21785, San Diego, California, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- International Powerlifting Federation. 2020. IPF (GL) coefficients 2020. https://www.powerlifting.sport/fileadmin/ipf/data/ipf-formula/IPF_GL_Coefficients-2020.pdf. Accessed: 2026-08-03.
- Matthew Jagielski, Nicholas Carlini, David Berthelot, Alex Kurakin, and Nicolas Papernot. 2020. [High accuracy and high fidelity extraction of neural networks](#). In *29th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2020, August 12-14, 2020*, pages 1345–1362. USENIX Association.
- Zhifeng Jiang, Zhihua Jin, and Guoliang He. 2025. [PromptKeeper: Safeguarding system prompts for LLMs](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2025*, pages 2712–2728, Suzhou, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Youngduk Kim, Minkyoo Song, and Seungwon Shin. 2026. SkillMutator: Benchmarking and defending language-and-code cross-modal attacks on LLM agent skills. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.14154*.
- Kalpesh Krishna, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Ankur P. Parikh, Nicolas Papernot, and Mohit Iyyer. 2020. [Thieves on sesame street! model extraction of bert-based apis](#). In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net.
- Tu Lan and Chaowei Xiao. 2026. Runtime skill audit: Targeted runtime probing for agent skill security. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.11671*.
- Hao Li, Xiaogeng Liu, Hung-Chun Chiu, Dianqi Li, Ning Zhang, and Chaowei Xiao. 2025. [DRIFT: dynamic rule-based defense with injection isolation for securing LLM agents](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 38: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2025, NeurIPS 2025, San Diego, CA, USA, December 2-7, 2025 / Mexico City, Mexico, November 30 - December 5, 2025*.
- Xiangyi Li, Wenbo Chen, Yimin Liu, Shenghan Zheng, Xiaokun Chen, Yifeng He, Yubo Li, Bingran You, Haotian Shen, Jiankai Sun, Shuyi Wang, Qunhong Zeng, Di Wang, Xuandong Zhao, Yuanli Wang, Roey Ben Chaim, Zonglin Di, Yipeng Gao, Junwei He, and 21 others. 2026. [Skillsbench: Benchmarking how well agent skills work across diverse tasks](#). *CoRR*, abs/2602.12670.
- Hongyi Liu, Haoyan Yang, Tao Jiang, Bo Tang, Feiyu Xiong, Yuyu Luo, and Zhiyu Li. 2026a. SkillsVote: Lifecycle governance of agent skills from collection, recommendation to evolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2605.18401*.
- Yi Liu, Weizhe Wang, Ruitao Feng, Yao Zhang, Guangquan Xu, Gelei Deng, Yuekang Li, and Leo Zhang. 2026b. Agent skills in the wild: An empirical study of security vulnerabilities at scale. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2601.10338*.
- C. Maiwald and T. Mayer. 2018. Review of method proposals to calculate best lifter scores (relative scores) in IPF powerlifting competitions. https://www.asia-powerlifting.com/fileadmin/ipf/data/ipf-formula/IPF_Evaluation_Report_V3_2018-10-29_anonymized.pdf. Review submitted to the International Powerlifting Federation; Accessed: 2026-08-03.
- Moonshot AI. 2026. Using thinking models — kimi platform documentation. <https://platform.kimi.ai/docs/guide/use-kimi-k2-thinking-model>. Accessed: 2026-06-29.
- Yi Nian, Shenzhe Zhu, Yuehan Qin, Li Li, Ziyi Wang, Chaowei Xiao, and Yue Zhao. 2025. [Jaildam: Jailbreak detection with adaptive memory for vision-language model](#). *ArXiv preprint*, abs/2504.03770.
- Nicolas Papernot, Patrick D. McDaniel, Ian J. Goodfellow, Somesh Jha, Z. Berkay Celik, and Ananthram Swami. 2017. [Practical black-box attacks against machine learning](#). In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security, AsiaCCS 2017, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, April 2-6, 2017*, pages 506–519. ACM.
- Fábio Perez and Ian Ribeiro. 2022. Ignore previous prompt: Attack techniques for language models. *NeurIPS 2022 ML Safety Workshop*. arXiv:2211.09527.
- Powerlift Pro. Understanding the DOTS score in powerlifting: A comprehensive guide. <https://powerliftpro.app/understanding-the-dot>

[s-score-in-powerlifting-a-comprehensive-guide/](#). Accessed: 2026-08-03.

- Yujia Qin, Shihao Liang, Yining Ye, Kunlun Zhu, Lan Yan, Yaxi Lu, Yankai Lin, Xin Cong, Xiangru Tang, Bill Qian, Sihan Zhao, Lauren Hong, Runchu Tian, Ruobing Xie, Jie Zhou, Mark Gerstein, Dahai Li, Zhiyuan Liu, and Maosong Sun. 2024. [Toolllm: Facilitating large language models to master 16000+ real-world apis](#). In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2024, Vienna, Austria, May 7-11, 2024*. OpenReview.net.
- Timo Schick, Jane Dwivedi-Yu, Roberto Dessì, Roberta Raileanu, Maria Lomeli, Eric Hambro, Luke Zettlemoyer, Nicola Cancedda, and Thomas Scialom. 2023. [Toolformer: Language models can teach themselves to use tools](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*.
- Zeyang Sha and Yang Zhang. 2024. [Prompt stealing attacks against large language models](#). *CoRR*, abs/2402.12959.
- Reza Shokri, Marco Stronati, Congzheng Song, and Vitaly Shmatikov. 2017. [Membership inference attacks against machine learning models](#). In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2017, San Jose, CA, USA, May 22-26, 2017*, pages 3–18. IEEE Computer Society.
- Kimi Team, Yifan Bai, Yiping Bao, Y. Charles, Cheng Chen, Guanduo Chen, Haiting Chen, Huarong Chen, Jiahao Chen, Ningxin Chen, Ruijue Chen, Yanru Chen, Yuankun Chen, Yutian Chen, Zhuofu Chen, Jialei Cui, Hao Ding, Mengnan Dong, Angang Du, and 181 others. 2026. [Kimi k2: Open agentic intelligence](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2507.20534.
- Florian Tramèr, Fan Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K. Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. 2016. [Stealing machine learning models via prediction apis](#). In *25th USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 16, Austin, TX, USA, August 10-12, 2016*, pages 601–618. USENIX Association.
- PAUL M Vanderburgh and ALAN M Batterham. 1999. Validation of the wilks powerlifting formula. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, 31(12):1869.
- Guanzhi Wang, Yuqi Xie, Yunfan Jiang, Ajay Mandlekar, Chaowei Xiao, Yuke Zhu, Linxi Fan, and Anima Anandkumar. 2023. [Voyager: An open-ended embodied agent with large language models](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2305.16291.
- Xingyao Wang, Boxuan Li, Yufan Song, Frank F. Xu, Xiangru Tang, Mingchen Zhuge, Jiayi Pan, Yueqi Song, Bowen Li, Jaskirat Singh, Hoang H. Tran, Fuqiang Li, Ren Ma, Mingzhang Zheng, Bill Qian, Daniel Shao, Niklas Muennighoff, Yizhe Zhang, Binyuan Hui, and 5 others. 2025. [Openhands: An open platform for AI software developers as generalist agents](#). In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2025, Singapore, April 24-28, 2025*. OpenReview.net.
- Yu Wang, Xiaogeng Liu, Yu Li, Muhao Chen, and Chaowei Xiao. 2024a. Adashield: Safeguarding multimodal large language models from structure-based attack via adaptive shield prompting. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 77–94. Springer.
- Zihan Wang, Rui Zhang, Yu Liu, Chi Liu, Qingchuan Zhao, Hongwei Li, and Guowen Xu. 2026. Black-box skill stealing attack from proprietary LLM agents: An empirical study. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2604.21829*.
- Zora Zhiruo Wang, Jiayuan Mao, Daniel Fried, and Graham Neubig. 2024b. [Agent workflow memory](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2409.07429.
- Yi Xie, Jiawei Du, Yu Cheng, Jiuan Zhou, and Zhaoxia Yin. 2026. Benign in isolation, harmful in composition: Security risks in agent skill ecosystems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2606.15242*.
- Renjun Xu and Yang Yan. 2026. [Agent skills for large language models: Architecture, acquisition, security, and the path forward](#). *Preprint*, arXiv:2602.12430.
- Juncheng Yang, Yazhuo Zhang, Ziyue Qiu, Yao Yue, and Rashmi Vinayak. 2023. [FIFO queues are all you need for cache eviction](#). In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP 2023, Koblenz, Germany, October 23-26, 2023*, pages 130–149. ACM.
- Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik R. Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. 2023. [React: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models](#). In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net.
- Yiming Zhang, Nicholas Carlini, and Daphne Ippolito. 2024. Effective prompt extraction from language models. In *First Conference on Language Modeling (COLM)*. ArXiv:2307.06865.
- Zhipu AI. 2026. GLM-5.1. Model card / API documentation. <https://docs.bigmodel.cn/cn/guide/models/text/glm-5.1>, accessed 2026-06.
- Andy Zou, Zifan Wang, Nicholas Carlini, Milad Nasr, J. Zico Kolter, and Matt Fredrikson. 2023. Universal and transferable adversarial attacks on aligned language models. ArXiv:2307.15043.

A Skill Types and Binding Mechanisms by Example

Table 1 groups skills by *component type* and names the *binding mechanism* that caps each type. This

appendix grounds both columns by stating the task, concealed component, and mechanism governing recovery. The advertisement exposes the task framing (e.g. “detect malicious traffic”, “compute a district bonus”); the body supplies the constants, tables, and conventions below. Table 4 summarizes the six binding mechanisms with one exemplar each, followed by per-skill analyses.

A.1 Fully Extractable: Deterministic Procedures and Small Tables

drone (trajectory procedure; 100% ASR). The skill turns a waypoint list into a smooth quadrotor trajectory. The hidden IP is a clamped cubic-spline planner—zero velocity enforced at each waypoint, with fixed per-axis acceleration limits. Ordinary trajectory requests fully exercise the procedure, so the synthesizer reconstructs it exactly.

reflow (procedure conventions; 100% ASR). Reflow soldering attaches components by passing a circuit board through an oven with a controlled temperature profile; the solder is fully molten only above the *liquidus* temperature. From thermocouple time–temperature traces the skill reports peak temperature, maximum ramp rate, and time above liquidus. The public typed interface specifies the $[100, 150]^{\circ}\text{C}$ preheat band, which we treat as public input information. The hidden conventions use linear interpolation at liquidus crossings and define the run-level peak as the *minimum* of per-thermocouple maxima, with ties broken by the lowest sensor ID. Crafted traces isolate these conventions, and the clone matches the victim exactly.

A.2 Partially Bound: Hypothesis, Probe Specificity, and Public Data

dapt (threshold rule; probe specificity). The skill flags malicious traffic from packet features. The IP is a conjunctive threshold rule: a port scan requires port entropy > 6.0 bits *and* SYN-only ratio > 0.7 *and* > 100 unique ports; a DoS requires peak/average packet-rate > 20 ; C2 (command-and-control) beaconing requires inter-arrival-time CV < 0.5 . Hand-designed boundary sweeps localize every cutoff (96–100% ASR). The autonomous attacker’s coarse probes miss the exact constants and leave ASR at the 50% balanced-class floor, identifying probe quality as the bottleneck.

civ6 (rule table + confound; hypothesis quality). The skill totals Civilization VI district adjacency bonuses. Beyond a per-district bonus table

($+2/+1/+0.5$ terms per neighbor type), the IP includes a latent *confound*: an adjacent Government Plaza adds $+1$ to specialty districts, a factor the advertisement never names. The attacker recovers the explicit table but frequently omits this unadvertised factor, so ASR plateaus near 60%.

labunit (lookup/conversion data; public data). The skill harmonizes clinical lab values to standard units using a table of ~ 60 analytes (the substances a lab test measures) with valid ranges and conversion factors, applied by a range-triggered rule that keeps the conversion landing in range. Enumerating analytes recovers most of the table (77% ASR); standard clinical knowledge supplies some of the recovered conversions.

A.3 Hard-bound: Victim fidelity, Coverage, Synthesis, and Recall

r2r (numeric linearization; victim fidelity). Roll-to-roll (R2R) manufacturing moves a flexible material web between rollers, as in printed-electronics or film production; the skill linearizes the web’s tension–velocity dynamics into a discrete state-space (A, B) for model-predictive control; the hidden functionality depends on Jacobian entries fixed by plant constants (modulus–area product EA , roller radius R , inertia J , web length L). The deployed victim applies this correctly only 12/24 times, so the attacker learns from incorrect labels and the clone scores 0% on the constant-bearing entries. Replacing the victim responses with evaluator-oracle labels raises ASR to 100%, establishing victim fidelity as the recovery bottleneck.

codebook (private table; coverage). The skill normalizes free-text failure reasons to standard manufacturing codes via per-product codebooks (230 code→label entries: $72+80+78$) plus a weighted-matching procedure. A 24-probe budget surfaces only 3 of the 230 entries, leaving ASR at 0%; held-out inputs span 127 codes the clone never saw, so even a perfect oracle caps recovery at the $\sim 2\%$ of held-out mass carried by those three codes. Probe coverage sets the recovery ceiling.

cache and osm-topology (stateful/derived procedure; synthesis). *cache* replays a KV-cache trace under the S3-FIFO policy (Yang et al., 2023): small/main/ghost FIFO queues, a saturating frequency counter (0–3), second-chance admission, and longest-prefix hit semantics. Even when

Mechanism	Exemplar	Diagnostic (what we vary)	Signature (what it shows)
Hypothesis quality	<code>civ6</code>	Supply the missing latent factor (the Government-Plaza confound) to the hypothesis.	ASR is stuck near 60% until the unadvertised factor is added; with the confound supplied, reconstruction reaches 100%.
Probe fidelity	<code>speci-dapt</code>	Replace the attacker’s coarse self-designed probes with hand-designed boundary sweeps.	ASR jumps from the 50% floor to 96–100% once the exact thresholds are localized.
Coverage	<code>codebook</code>	Raise the probe budget, and compute a perfect-oracle upper bound.	ASR stays at 0% even with a perfect oracle: the 24 probes surface only 3 of the 230 private entries, and held-out inputs span 127 codes the clone never saw. The table is too large to enumerate.
Synthesis	<code>cache, osm</code>	Hand the synthesizer the named algorithm, or run recipe extraction.	Clones stay below floor even when the victim answers every probe correctly: <code>cache</code> 13% (floor 18%) and <code>osm</code> 28–35% (floor 38%); supplying the algorithm or extracting the recipe lifts <code>osm</code> to 100%.
Recall	<code>powerlifting</code>	Supply the correct public formula (DOTS) directly.	ASR is $\sim 0\%$ with perfect probes and a faithful victim (24/24): only the formula’s identity is missing, and supplying DOTS resolves the gap.
Oracle fidelity	<code>r2r</code>	Measure the deployed victim’s probe fidelity directly.	The victim is right on only 12/24 probes, so noisy labels cap the clone at 0%; evaluator-oracle labels raise ASR to 100%.

Table 4: The six recurring mechanisms that cap held-out ASR (§5), each with an exemplar skill, the diagnostic that isolates it, and its signature. Each mechanism is pinned by intervening on one part of the attack loop—the victim oracle, the probe budget or design, or the synthesizer—and checking whether ASR moves.

the victim executes it correctly, the synthesizer cannot reconstruct the multi-queue state machine from input–output pairs, leaving ASR at 13%, below its 18% floor. `osm-topology` (OpenStreetMap) is the same failure in miniature: a modular hue→ternary-color assignment (each feature colored one of three classes) whose exact arithmetic the clone fails to express, holding closed-loop ASR at 28–35%, below its 38% floor.

powerlifting (public formula; recall). The skill computes a normalized competition score from a lifter’s sex, bodyweight, and total, so lifters of different bodyweights can be compared on a single scale. Powerlifting federations standardize this comparison with a formula that multiplies the total by a coefficient fitted as a polynomial in bodyweight. The canonical formula, Wilks (Vanderburgh and Batterham, 1999), was the international standard for roughly two decades until the IPF replaced it with its own points (now IPF GL) (Maiwald and Mayer, 2018; International Powerlifting Federation, 2020), which compare lifters only within a sex; DOTS (Dynamic Objective Team

Scoring) was introduced in 2019 by the German IPF affiliate BVDK to compare lifters across sexes on a single team and is now used by US federations including the USAPL and USPA (Powerlift Pro). The skill body specifies DOTS: $\text{total} \times \text{a sex-specific quartic coefficient } 500/\text{poly}_4(\text{BW})$, with bodyweight clamped to $[40, 210]$ kg (men) and $[40, 150]$ kg (women). The coefficients are *public*; the only hidden bit is the *choice* of DOTS among published alternatives (Wilks, IPF GL, Glossbrenner), and the advertisement names no formula. The attack therefore reduces to recalling the right formula—guess wrong and ASR is $\sim 0\%$ even with perfect probes and a faithful victim: the attacker recalls the best-known formula, Wilks, and never proposes DOTS, because observations fix a function’s outputs, not its identity; Wilks and DOTS agree to $\sim 1\%$ at mid-range bodyweights (60–125 kg), so a Wilks clone clears agreement-based validation, while at the extremes (5–6% apart at 40 and 200 kg) the data can only discriminate hypotheses the attacker has already proposed. Supplying the identity (“DOTS”) reduces the attack to recalling a named

Victim model	Code / 9	Mined / 21	Total / 30
DeepSeek-Pro	9	20	29
DeepSeek-Flash	9	14	23
Kimi-K2.6	9	13	22
GLM-5.1	9	12	21
GPT-5.6-Luna	2	13	15

Table 5: Cells with measurable model-relative marginal functionality in the curated 30-skill suite. The 9 SkillsBench targets are confirmed through the full-agent pipeline; the 21 mined targets use the controlled body-versus-advertisement comparison. Counts define the cells entering controlled extraction analysis.

public formula, resolving the gap completely.

B Benchmark Construction Details

This appendix expands the curation funnel and test construction summarized in §4.

B.1 Mining and Licensing

The 9 code-execution skills come from SkillsBench (Li et al., 2026), which curates skills that bundle scripts and deterministic verifiers. The 21 mined data/rule skills come from two crawls: the SkillRet corpus of 17,810 public skills curated from 22,795 marketplace listings (Cho et al., 2026), and a broader registry crawl spanning hundreds of source repositories. We retain MIT/Apache-or-equivalent licensed packages and deduplicate by source URL, repository, and skill name. The deterministic-ground-truth and marginal-functionality filters produce the purpose-selected evaluation suite characterized in Limitations.

B.2 Selection Requirements

Observable marginal functionality. A target must be IP-positive for at least one victim model: the model applies the body reliably and cannot reproduce the behavior from the advertisement alone. For data/rule skills, the controlled comparison requires $\text{fid}(A_{m,s}) \geq 0.6$ and a body-minus-advertisement margin of at least 0.25. The paired full-agent comparison asks the same question after skill selection, file access, tool use, and execution are delegated to OpenHands.

Exact ground truth. A target must expose a deterministic function that we can call or reimplement to label arbitrary held-out inputs. This criterion selects skills compatible with exact-equivalence measurement; Limitations describes the resulting evaluation scope.

B.3 Oracles, Discriminating inputs, and Splits

For each surviving skill we author an adapter that exposes a deterministic self-oracle f_s^* reimplemented from the private body. The oracle captures the *functional core* of the body—the deterministic computation that maps typed inputs to outputs—and excludes the public advertisement, instructional framing, worked examples, and formatting. It serves as the reconstruction ground truth. The adapter also provides a typed input/output schema and an input generator emphasizing *discriminating* inputs $D(c)$ on which correct and incorrect implementations diverge. Two skills receive an explicit rebalance, footnoted in Table 1 and detailed in Appendix A: `dapt` uses a class-balanced held-out set with a 50% malicious rate and 50% trivial floor, compared with an 89% deployment base rate; `r2r` scores the Jacobian entries encoding private plant constants, giving all-zero and identity clones a 0% floor. Probe, validation, and test inputs are mutually disjoint. Mined-skill clones use $n=150$ held-out test inputs, and SkillsBench clones use $n=800$. The mined controlled protocol uses 52 acquisition probes and 30 validation queries; SkillsBench attacks use $K=24$ victim probes.

C Additional Results

These analyses support the attack-process interpretation in §5. They provide secondary budget, refinement, and temperature diagnostics and are detailed here to keep the main evidence ladder focused on end-to-end recovery and attack components.

API reasoning settings. We use the API defaults at experiment time unless specified. DeepSeek-V4-Flash (Preview) and Pro (DeepSeek-AI, 2026) inherit `thinking=enabled` and `reasoning_effort=high`. GLM-5.1 (Zhipu AI, 2026) uses `thinking=disabled`. GPT-5.6-Luna receives the OpenAI reasoning endpoint’s default effort, and Kimi-K2.6 (Team et al., 2026; Moonshot AI, 2026) uses its vendor-pinned thinking mode.

C.1 Controlled Cross-model Results

Table 7 provides the controlled matrix summarized in §5. Direct body placement makes each cell a conditional measure of reconstruction after successful skill delivery. All 21 targets are complete under the finalized protocol.

Table 6 maps the compact skill codes in Figure 2 to their full names.

Code	Skill
T1	lead-scoring
T2	check-secrets
T3	security-environment-standards
T4	rbac-validator
L1	internal-reference
L2	demo-design-tokens
L3	stars-we-prefer
L4	browser-history-acset
L5	neo4j-schema
L6	isocom
L7	klimgai-pricing
L8	midi-protocol-lookup
R1	bellog-structure
R2	delegation
P1	token-cost-tracking
P2	osm-topology
P3	working-day
N1	labor-rate
N2	knowledge-worker-salaries
N3	protein-qc-score
N4	team-composition

Table 6: Codebook for Figure 2. Prefixes T/L/R/P/N denote threshold, lookup, rule-composition, procedure, and numeric-formula components.

C.2 Attacker Model

Table 8 compares the primary Flash attacker against the stronger DeepSeek-Pro attacker under the fully autonomous SKILLCLONE protocol (LLM-designed probes, LLM clone induction) on the five code-execution skills. The victim is DeepSeek-Pro throughout.

Pro improves selectively over Flash. It leads by 45.6 pp on labunit and 30.8 pp on reflow; the two attackers remain within 5 pp on civ6 and dapt. Both receive identical probes, and Pro more reliably compiles correct clones from the observations, locating the gap in synthesis. Average cost is \$0.0089 per Flash attack and \$0.0134 per Pro attack. Flash serves as the primary attacker because it is cheaper, competitive on simpler targets, and exposes synthesis bottlenecks that Pro partially masks.

C.3 Closed-loop Refinement

Tables 9–13 report per-skill closed-loop lift by component type across four victim models (Flash attacker). Each round adds 10 disagreement queries ($k_0=12$, 4 rounds), and the best round is selected by victim-only validation agreement. Group averages are reported in each table; skills without measurable marginal functionality for a given victim are excluded from that victim’s column (see Table 5). The closed loop adds +29 pp (Pro), +24 pp (GLM), +34 pp (Kimi), and +25 pp (Luna) on average across the 16 skills with mean lift >5 pp.

Skill	floor	controlled closed-loop ASR (%)				
		F	P	G	K	L
stars-we-prefer	15	100	100	100	100	100
team-composition	1	100	100	–	100	100
token-cost-tracking	1	100	91	–	91	–
working-day	1	–	100	100	–	–
delegation	38	100	100	100	100	100
rbac-validator	66	96	99	91	–	–
security-env-standards	50	–	87	–	91	100
neo4j-schema	81	–	92	–	–	92
klimgai-pricing	14	81	100	100	100	34
check-secrets	65	–	11	–	–	–
bellog-structure	11	88	83	73	73	73
knowledge-worker-salaries	9	86	81	81	72	86
internal-reference	27	69	68	69	75	75
isocom	11	–	–	100	–	–
demo-design-tokens	6	58	46	59	–	42
midi-protocol-lookup	9	50	50	–	–	–
labor-rate	5	100	94	–	100	29
osm-topology	38	28	35	35	–	28
lead-scoring	17	–	29	31	21	–
protein-qc-score	1	33	100	–	6	56
browser-history-acset	31	–	31	–	31	–

Table 7: Controlled closed-loop ASR (% , $n=150$) on the 21 mined data/rule skills with a Flash attacker. F/P/G/K/L denote victim models (Flash, Pro, GLM-5.1, Kimi-K2.6, GPT-5.6-Luna); “–” marks cells without measurable marginal functionality in the controlled setting. Italic values are synthesis-bound. The matrix measures reconstruction conditional on successful skill delivery.

Skill	Type	DeepSeek-Pro attacker	DeepSeek-Flash attacker
dapt	threshold	50.0%	50.0%
civ6	rule	55.1%	59.2%
labunit	data	78.4%	32.8%
reflow	procedure	100.0%	69.2%
cache	stateful	0.0%	n/a [†]

Table 8: Held-out ASR (%) by attacker model under the fully autonomous SKILLCLONE protocol (LLM-designed probes, LLM clone induction) on the five code-execution SkillsBench targets. Victim is DeepSeek-Pro throughout. [†]Flash produced no parseable cache probes.

Three skills reach 100% ASR on all four victims; synthesis-bound (osm-topology) and fidelity-limited (isocom, midi-protocol-lookup) skills show little to no benefit.

C.4 Recipe Extraction

Recipe extraction asks the agent to solve benign tasks while showing its working. It targets synthesis-bound procedures, complementing the closed loop’s coverage gains. Table 14 reports Pro and Luna victims with a Flash attacker and majority-class fallback disabled. Recipe extraction resolves osm-topology’s synthesis bottleneck for both victims (Pro 32.5→100%, Luna 0→100%) and leaves coverage-limited

Skill	Floor	Pro		GLM		Kimi		Luna	
		CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ
lead-scoring	17	29	+27	31	+29	21	+0	5	+0
check-secrets	65	11	+0	55	-11	59	+48	68	+0
sec-env-std	50	87	+14	91	+0	91	+13	100	+4
rbac-validator	66	99	+7	91	-3	99	+37	97	+0
Average	49	56	+12	67	+4	67	+25	67	+1

Table 9: Closed-loop refinement for threshold / decision rules skills (4 mined targets, Flash attacker). CL = closed-loop ASR (%); Δ = lift over single-shot (pp). Averages are unweighted across skills with data in each group.

Skill	Floor	Pro		GLM		Kimi		Luna	
		CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ
internal-ref	27	68	+49	69	+47	75	+52	75	+50
design-tokens	6	46	+31	59	+29	33	+19	42	+15
stars-we-prefer	15	100	+10	100	+10	100	+10	100	+21
browser-hist	31	31	+19	31	+0	31	+0	31	+0
neo4j-schema	81	92	+0	81	+0	93	+12	92	+11
isocom	11	75	+0	100	+0	8	+0	53	+27
klingai-pricing	14	100	+16	100	+16	100	+16	34	-11
midl-protocol	9	50	+0	5	+0	7	+0	59	+15
Average	24	70	+16	68	+13	56	+14	61	+16

Table 10: Closed-loop refinement for lookup tables / data skills (8 mined targets, Flash attacker). CL = closed-loop ASR (%); Δ = lift over single-shot (pp). Averages are unweighted across skills with data in each group.

neo4j-schema and already-extractable skills unchanged. The shared lift across model families identifies volunteered working as the synthesis lever.

C.5 Victim-temperature Robustness

We test sensitivity to deterministic decoding by holding the attacker and evaluator oracle at $T=0$ and varying the victim temperature over $\{0, 0.6, 1.0\}$, spanning the tested vendors’ recommendations (DeepSeek-AI, 2026). Kimi is vendor-pinned at $T=1$ (Moonshot AI, 2026). GPT-5.6-Luna uses its vendor-controlled default because its reasoning endpoint exposes no temperature parameter; we report its cross-model and recipe results and omit it from the sweep tables. For each $T>0$, we draw three seeds for the body-versus-advertisement comparison and two for extraction, reported relative to the re-measured $T=0$ baseline.

Table 15 reports marginal-functionality stability. Across the tested grid, 93–100% of cells positive at $T=0$ retain that classification by a majority of seeds, and the mean body-minus-advertisement margin remains above 0.25 ($\geq +0.6$ at $T=1$). Table 16 and Figure 3 report extraction ASR. Across eight IP-positive skills, every tested temperature

Skill	Floor	Pro		GLM		Kimi		Luna	
		CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ
bellog-structure	11	83	+37	73	+32	73	+27	73	+27
delegation	38	100	+31	100	+31	100	+31	100	+31
Average	25	92	+34	87	+31	87	+29	87	+29

Table 11: Closed-loop refinement for rule composition skills (2 mined targets, Flash attacker). CL = closed-loop ASR (%); Δ = lift over single-shot (pp). Averages are unweighted across skills with data in each group.

Skill	Floor	Pro		GLM		Kimi		Luna	
		CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ
token-cost	1	91	+13	100	+33	91	+13	91	+13
osm-topology	38	35	+0	35	+7	34	+0	28	+0
working-day	1	100	+0	100	+0	100	+0	100	+0
Average	13	75	+4	78	+13	75	+4	73	+4

Table 12: Closed-loop refinement for procedures / algorithms skills (3 mined targets, Flash attacker). CL = closed-loop ASR (%); Δ = lift over single-shot (pp). Averages are unweighted across skills with data in each group.

yields pooled recovery at or above the $T=0$ baseline; per-skill variation stays within ± 5 pp for single observations and ± 3 pp for modal aggregation.

C.6 Probe-budget Sensitivity

We vary the initial probe budget $k_0 \in \{6, 12, 24, 48, 96\}$ for eight skills spanning four bottleneck types and measure single-shot ASR with a Flash attacker and Pro and Luna victims (rounds=0, otherwise identical protocol to §4). Table 18 reports the full sweep.

C.7 Clone Structure

Table 19 summarizes clone-to-oracle comparisons for the six representative skills with non-trivial recovery; Table 20 lists every synthesis candidate across all 9 SkillsBench skills. The Ratio column uses the evaluator’s reference oracle f_s^* (the mini-

Skill	Floor	Pro		GLM		Kimi		Luna	
		CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ	CL	Δ
labor-rate	5	94	+70	0	+0	100	+89	29	+17
knowl-worker-sal	9	81	+51	81	+51	72	+48	86	+56
protein-qc	1	100	+94	5	+0	6	+0	56	+50
team-composition	1	100	+0	0	+0	100	+0	100	+0
Average	4	94	+54	22	+13	70	+34	68	+31

Table 13: Closed-loop refinement for numeric formulas skills (4 mined targets, Flash attacker). CL = closed-loop ASR (%); Δ = lift over single-shot (pp). Averages are unweighted across skills with data in each group.

Skill	Pro victim			Luna victim		
	I/O	+Recipe	Δ	I/O	+Recipe	Δ
osm-topology	32.5	100.0	+67.5	0.0	100.0	+100.0
neo4j-schema	20.0	25.0	+5.0	20.0	25.0	+5.0
knowledge-worker-salaries	28.7	28.7	+0.0	31.2	31.2	+0.0
security-env-standards	83.8	100.0	+16.2	83.8	100.0	+16.2

Table 14: Recipe extraction transfers across victim model families: the synthesis bottleneck that caps `osm-topology` at 0% I/O ASR on Luna is fully resolved by volunteered working (100%), mirroring the Pro pattern. Recipe lift is model-consistent on the other three skills.

victim	$T=0$ marginal	retain $T=0.6$	retain $T=1.0$	mean margin @ $T=1.0$
DeepSeek-Flash	14	14/14 (100%)	13/14 (93%)	+0.75
DeepSeek-Pro	17	16/17 (94%)	17/17 (100%)	+0.63
GLM-5.1	10	10/10 (100%)	10/10 (100%)	+0.62

Table 15: Stability of controlled marginal-functionality classification across victim temperatures ($n=10$, 3 seeds for $T>0$). Retention is relative to each victim’s $T=0$ set. Kimi is omitted because its API pins temperature at 1.




Figure 3: Controlled extraction ASR across victim sampling temperatures for single observations and three-query modal aggregation. Pooled recovery remains at or above the $T=0$ baseline across tested temperatures.

mal executable implementation; §4) as the denominator. All compilable clones are at least as large as their oracle (ratio $\geq 1.0\times$); uncompileable candidates inflate dramatically because the model hallucinates entire library implementations.

D Full-Agent Functionality Realization

The primary mined-skill comparison feeds the skill body directly into the victim context, removing potential noise from the skill selection. It measures the teaching signal available after successful skill delivery. This appendix evaluates all 21 mined skills through OpenHands; the 9 SkillsBench targets already use the deployed setting in the primary analysis and are not repeated here.

We therefore repeat the same body-versus-advertisement comparison through a full OpenHands agent (Wang et al., 2025) for all 21 mined skills. Each skill is mounted as an isolated bun-

dle, and the agent receives the same task-valid inputs with an explicit request to use the advertised skill. The agent decides whether to select the skill, read its files, invoke tools, or execute code, so the measurement includes application failures that the controlled setting removes. Figure 4 compares the IP-positive sets under the two settings.




Figure 4: IP-positive skills under controlled body placement and the full OpenHands agent. Controlled placement measures the teaching signal after delivery; the full-agent setting includes skill selection, file access, tool use, execution, and response parsing.

Table 17 reports all five tested victims. The gap between controlled and full-agent positives is model-dependent: Flash loses one target, GLM gains one, Kimi gains two, Luna gains three, and Pro loses 13. Output parse failures drive the Pro gap: across five representative skills ($n=12$ each), Pro and Flash show $\sim 60\%$ body-query parse er-

victim	cond	$T=0$	$T=0.6$	$T=1.0$
DeepSeek-Flash	single	72 ± 22	73 ± 20	73 ± 28
	mv	60 ± 40	68 ± 27	66 ± 32
DeepSeek-Pro	single	67 ± 27	54 ± 41	66 ± 33
	mv	67 ± 32	58 ± 34	63 ± 36
GLM-5.1	single	62 ± 26	59 ± 29	59 ± 34
	mv	59 ± 34	52 ± 32	56 ± 31
Kimi-K2.6 [†]	single	—	—	57 ± 34
	mv	—	—	60 ± 38

Table 16: Extraction ASR (% , $\pm$ stdev) vs. victim temperature T (Flash attacker, 8 skills, $K=12$, $n=150$). single: one observation per probe; mv: modal answer over 3 repeats. [†]Kimi is vendor-pinned at $T=1$.




Figure 5: Full-agent reconstruction on all 21 mined skills under the paired protocol (Flash attacker). Panels plot per-skill Round 0 and final ASR for Flash, Pro, and Luna victims; the dashed diagonal marks unchanged ASR. Annotations report mean ASR, targets above floor, and median gaps over floor.

Victim	Full agent	Controlled	Δ
DeepSeek-Flash	13	14	-1
DeepSeek-Pro	7	20	-13
GLM-5.1	13	12	+1
Kimi-K2.6	15	13	+2
GPT-5.6-Luna	16	13	+3

Table 17: Number of the 21 mined skills that expose measurable marginal functionality in the full-agent and controlled settings. The gap is model-dependent because the full-agent measurement includes skill selection, file access, tool use, and execution.

ror rates through the OpenHands parser, compared with 33% for GLM and 53% for Kimi. Luna (OpenAI, GPT-5.6) shows consistently higher body fidelity than the DeepSeek models, yielding 16 deployed positives from 13 controlled positives. The DeepSeek models often produce correct outputs that the structured parser rejects, locating the failure in the tool interface. Parse failures depress Full+ counts even when successful queries leak extractable signal; `internal-reference`, for example, scores 0% body fidelity in the screen and 74–85% extraction ASR in the full paired protocol.

We run the full OpenHands-based reconstruction protocol on all 21 mined skills with Flash, Pro, and Luna as victims and Flash as the attacker. For each

skill–victim cell, the fixed and adaptive acquisition policies share 162 victim-evaluated inputs: 12 initial, 120 candidate, and 30 validation inputs. Flash recovers 13 of 21 skills above floor with 58.0% unconditional mean ASR; Pro recovers 16 of 21 with 67.2% unconditional mean ASR; Luna recovers 16 of 21 with 71.8% unconditional mean ASR (conditional 90.1% on its 16 Full+ skills). Median gaps over floor are +26.7 pp (Flash), +44.7 pp (Pro), and +62.7 pp (Luna). Figure 5 shows per-skill changes for Flash, Pro, and Luna, and Appendix C provides per-skill controlled and deployed results.

The controlled setting supports reconstruction-mechanism analysis after skill delivery, while the full-agent setting measures deployment-specific realization. The full-agent results confirm that the attack transfers to a realistic agent stack across model families: Flash, Pro, and Luna all leak functional skill information through task-valid interactions, even on skills that the functionality screen classifies as non-functional due to parse failures. Luna’s strong deployment extraction (16/21 above floor, 71.8% unconditional ASR) on a closed-source model locates low deployed ASR for other victims in model-specific agent-framework integration.

Skill	Victim	$k_0=6$	12	24	48	96
internal-reference	Pro	.093	.000	.520	.687	.820
	Luna	.093	.220	.540	.740	.887
klimgai-pricing	Pro	.640	.820	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Luna	.080	.253	.100	.107	.087
midi-protocol-lookup	Pro	.053	.053	.053	.047	.073
	Luna	.067	.053	.053	.047	.600
demo-design-tokens	Pro	.027	.000	.233	.340	.000
	Luna	.320	.153	.027	.033	.053
neo4j-schema	Pro	.793	.933	.800	.807	.820
	Luna	.793	.920	.800	.807	.820
stars-we-prefer	Pro	.080	.073	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Luna	.080	.760	1.00	1.00	1.00
bellog-structure	Pro	.073	.573	.053	.787	.073
	Luna	.247	.500	.680	.093	.700
osm-topology	Pro	.193	.207	.313	.353	.320
	Luna	.193	.207	.227	.267	.360

Table 18: Single-shot ASR as a function of initial probe budget k_0 (Flash attacker, rounds=0). internal-reference and klimgai-pricing (Pro) rise with k_0 , confirming coverage as the binding bottleneck. klimgai-pricing (Luna) remains flat because Luna cannot faithfully execute the pricing logic, showing that coverage sensitivity is model-conditional. All other skills are flat or noisy across k_0 , consistent with synthesis, hypothesis quality, or victim fidelity as their primary bottleneck.

Skill	Oracle (c)	Clone (c)	Ratio	Tok.prec	ASR	Signal
team-comp. ^M	136	153	1.12×	53%	100%	exact rule, nearly 1:1
drone	330	387	1.17×	41%	100%	exact spline formula, 1:1
working-day ^M	388	475	1.22×	44%	100%	workflow rule, nearly 1:1
stars-we-prefer ^M	171	622	3.64×	35%	100%	lookup table, moderate expansion
reflow	317	2,439	7.69×	58%	100%	3-metric procedure, inlined library
labunit	71	1,122	15.8×	59%	74%	partial table + logic, large expansion

Table 19: Clone structure relative to the oracle f_s^* (Pro victim, Flash attacker). ^M=mined skill; all others from SkillsBench. Ratio = clone size $\div$ oracle size. Tok.prec = fraction of clone tokens appearing in the skill body.

Skill	Candidate	Oracle (c)	Clone (c)	Ratio	Lines	Compiled
drone	induced-0 (sel.)	330	387	1.17×	12	yes
drone	induced-1	330	517	1.57×	14	yes
drone	induced-2	330	711	2.15×	14	yes
reflow	induced-0	317	1,834	5.78×	49	yes
reflow	induced-1	317	2,096	6.61×	63	yes
reflow	induced-2 (sel.)	317	2,439	7.69×	61	yes
civ6	induced-0 (sel.)	50	1,143	22.9×	33	yes
civ6	induced-1	50	1,015	20.3×	28	yes
civ6	induced-2	50	1,173	23.5×	33	yes
labunit	induced-0 (sel.)	71	1,122	15.8×	29	yes
labunit	induced-1	71	1,172	16.5×	31	yes
labunit	induced-2	71	1,315	18.5×	27	yes
cache	T=0.0 #1	415	47,691	115×	198	no
cache	T=0.0 #2	415	48,658	117×	183	no
cache	T=0.5 #1	415	47,250	114×	148	no
r2r	T=0.0 #1	77	35,729	464×	189	no
r2r	T=0.5 #1	77	35,548	462×	146	no
dapt	T=0.0 #0	94	719	7.65×	9	yes
dapt	T=0.5 #0	94	388	4.13×	8	yes
dapt	T=0.9 #0	94	406	4.32×	6	yes
powerlifting	T=0.5 #1	320	606	1.89×	23	yes
codebook	T=0.0 #0	48	350	7.29×	8	yes

Table 20: All synthesis candidates for SkillsBench code-execution skills (Pro victim, Flash attacker). Ratio = clone size $\div$ oracle size (the evaluator’s minimal executable reference f_s^*). “sel.” = selected by attacker-visible validation. “Compiled” = clone code parses and runs without error.