
ACAR: Adaptive Complexity Routing for Multi-Model Ensembles with Auditable Decision Traces

Ramchand Kumaresan, M.S.,B.E.

Abstract

We present ACAR (Adaptive Complexity & Attribution Routing) as a measurement framework for studying multi-model orchestration under auditable conditions. ACAR uses self-consistency variance (σ) computed from $N=3$ samples to route tasks across single-model, two-model, and three-model execution modes, implemented atop TEAMLLM, a deterministic substrate with immutable artifacts and complete decision traces. We evaluate across 1,510 tasks spanning four benchmarks (MathArena, Reasoning Gym, LiveCodeBench, SuperGPQA) with Claude Sonnet 4, GPT-4o, and Gemini 2.0 Flash, producing 7,550+ auditable runs. **What holds:** σ -based routing achieves 55.6% accuracy, exceeding the two-model baseline (54.4%) while avoiding full ensembling on 54.2% of tasks; the mechanism is model-agnostic and requires no learned components. **What does not hold:** (1) Retrieval augmentation *decreased* accuracy by 3.4 percentage points—median retrieval similarity was only 0.167, demonstrating that experience injection without semantic alignment introduces harmful noise rather than grounding. (2) When models agree on incorrect answers ($\sigma=0$), no downstream ensemble can recover; this “agreement-but-wrong” failure mode is intrinsic to self-consistency and bounds achievable accuracy at 8pp below full ensembling. (3) Attribution estimates based on proxy signals (response similarity, entropy) showed weak correlation with ground-truth leave-one-out values; practical attribution requires explicit counterfactual computation. This paper documents what assumptions fail in practice, providing falsifiable baselines for future work on routing, retrieval, and multi-model attribution.

1 Introduction

Deploying large language models faces a fundamental tension: single-model approaches are cost-efficient but leave quality unrealized, while naive multi-model ensembles incur multiplicative costs without principled resource allocation. The core challenge is *compute allocation before knowing task difficulty*.

Existing orchestration systems [1, 2] optimize routing accuracy but lack three critical properties: (1) **cost awareness**—routing decisions should consider marginal benefit relative to task difficulty; (2) **attribution correctness**—when multiple models contribute, credit assignment must be measurable; (3) **reproducibility**—every execution must be deterministically reproducible. Observability dashboards provide post-hoc visibility but do not address routing decisions made *at execution time*.

We propose ACAR, which uses *self-consistency variance* (σ) as a task difficulty signal (Figure 1). When $N=3$ samples from a fast model agree, the task is likely easy and routes to single-model execution. When they disagree, the task requires diverse perspectives and escalates to full ensemble. We deliberately use a discrete, heuristic σ rather than a learned router: this ensures the routing mechanism is distribution-agnostic, fully auditable, and immune to training-test distribution shift—properties we consider prerequisites for credible measurement.

Contributions.

- We introduce ACAR, an adaptive routing mechanism using σ -based task difficulty estimation that achieves 55.6% accuracy while avoiding full ensembling on 54.2% of tasks.
- We demonstrate that retrieval augmentation with low-quality stores *hurts* performance (-3.4pp), providing actionable negative results: similarity thresholds >0.7 are required.
- We release TEAMLLM, a deterministic execution substrate with 7,550+ auditable runs, enabling reproducible multi-model research. All figures in this paper can be regenerated from released artifacts.

On 1,510 tasks across four benchmarks, ACAR-U exceeds Arena-2 by 1.2 percentage points at 1.5% lower cost. Phase 20 experiments show 70% cost reduction on easy tasks while maintaining quality floors.

2 Related Work

Router-based orchestration. One line of work learns to dispatch queries based on predicted difficulty [1, 2, 3]. These approaches optimize routing accuracy but do not measure attribution correctness or provide reproducibility guarantees. ACAR differs by using self-consistency signals rather than learned classifiers and logging complete decision traces. We intentionally avoid learned routing to prevent distribution shift from confounding our measurements.

Multi-agent coordination. Tool-augmented agent systems [4] coordinate multiple components but do not address credit assignment across contributing models. Mixture-of-Experts [5] routes at the token level within a single model, orthogonal to our inter-model routing.

Attribution and credit assignment. Difference rewards and leave-one-out methods [6, 7] provide theoretical frameworks for multi-agent credit. However, practical application to LLM ensembles faces challenges: output equivalence is non-trivial (especially for code), and ground-truth attribution requires expensive counterfactual runs. We position ACAR as an experimental framework, not a solved theory.

3 Method

3.1 TEAMLLM Execution Substrate

TEAMLLM is a research-grade substrate designed for auditable multi-model experiments:

- **Deterministic execution:** All runs capture seed, prompt hash, rubric version, and environment fingerprint.
- **Immutable artifacts:** Responses and decision traces are append-only with explicit versioning.
- **Forward-only state transitions:** PENDING \rightarrow EXECUTING \rightarrow VERIFYING \rightarrow COMPLETED with no rollback.

All experimental artifacts, including raw `runs.jsonl` files, are structured for independent verification. Figures presented in this paper can be regenerated from these artifacts using provided scripts.

3.2 ACAR: Adaptive Complexity Routing

ACAR routes tasks based on self-consistency variance (σ), computed from $N=3$ samples:

$$\sigma = \frac{|\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}| - 1}{2} \quad (1)$$

where a_i is the extracted answer from sample i . The discrete σ values determine execution mode:

Intuition: High agreement suggests a clear answer; high disagreement indicates ambiguity requiring diverse perspectives. The σ metric is model-agnostic: it depends only on answer equivalence, not on provider-specific behavior or output format. This generality is deliberate—we prioritize transferability over benchmark-specific optimization.

σ	Interpretation	Mode
0.0	All agree	single_agent (1 model)
0.5	2/3 agree	arena_lite (2 models)
1.0	All differ	full_arena (3 models)

Figure F: Distribution of Sigma Values (ACAR-U)

σ computed from 3 same-model samples (discrete by design)




Figure 1: **Distribution of σ across 1,510 tasks.** Task difficulty is bimodal: 32.9% show full agreement ($\sigma=0.0$), while 45.8% show complete disagreement ($\sigma=1.0$). This bimodality enables effective routing—easy tasks avoid expensive ensembling. Figure regenerable from released artifacts.

ACAR-U (Ult only) uses σ for routing without retrieval.

ACAR-UJ (Ult + Jungler) adds asynchronous retrieval from an experience store, injecting past examples into prompts before dispatch. The retrieval mechanism (Jungler) is not the source of the negative results we report—the failure lies in experience store alignment, not the injection mechanism itself.

4 Experiments

4.1 Setup

Benchmarks. We evaluate on 1,510 tasks:

- **MathArena** (60): Competition math, highest difficulty
- **Reasoning Gym** (250): Procedural reasoning
- **LiveCodeBench** (200): Execution-verified code
- **SuperGPQA** (1,000): Multiple choice knowledge

Models. Claude Sonnet 4, GPT-4o, Gemini 2.0 Flash (temperature 0).

Configurations. Single-Model, Arena-2, Arena-3, ACAR-U, ACAR-UJ.

Table 1: **Overall accuracy on 1,510 tasks.** ACAR-U exceeds Arena-2 while costing less. Arena-3 represents the quality ceiling with full ensembling on all tasks. Arena-2 and Arena-3 show identical cost due to conditional execution effects: the coordination overhead of multi-model runs dominates marginal per-model costs.

Configuration	Accuracy	Correct	Cost
Single-Model	45.4%	686/1510	\$17.04
Arena-2	54.4%	822/1510	\$20.64
ACAR-U	55.6%	839/1510	\$20.34
Arena-3	63.6%	961/1510	\$20.64




Figure 2: **Overall pass rate comparison.** ACAR-U (55.6%) exceeds Arena-2 (54.4%) with adaptive compute allocation. Arena-3 (63.6%) represents the quality ceiling when all tasks use full ensembling.

4.2 Main Results

ACAR-U exceeds Arena-2 by 1.2pp while costing 1.5% less (Table 1, Figure 2). The 8.0pp gap to Arena-3 reflects a fundamental limitation: σ -based routing cannot recover when models agree on wrong answers. This “agreement-but-wrong” failure mode is not specific to ACAR—it is an intrinsic property of any self-consistency-based routing mechanism and represents an irreducible accuracy ceiling.

Figure 3 shows performance breakdown by benchmark. SuperGPQA (multiple choice) shows the highest accuracy, while MathArena (competition math) remains challenging across all configurations.

4.3 Cost-Accuracy Trade-off

Figure 4 shows the cost-accuracy trade-off. ACAR-U achieves a favorable position on the Pareto frontier, providing better accuracy than Arena-2 at 1.5% lower cost.




Figure 3: **Pass rate by benchmark.** Performance varies by domain: SuperGPQA shows highest accuracy (60.5%), while MathArena remains challenging (26.7%). ACAR-U matches or exceeds Arena-2 on all benchmarks.




Figure 4: **Cost vs. accuracy Pareto frontier.** ACAR-U achieves better accuracy than Arena-2 at lower cost, approaching the Pareto frontier. Arena-3 provides the highest accuracy but at maximum cost.

4.4 Escalation Behavior

Escalation distribution. ACAR-U routes 32.9% to single-agent, 21.3% to arena-lite, and 45.8% to full-arena. SuperGPQA shows 42% single-agent (easiest), while LiveCodeBench escalates 96% to full-arena due to non-canonical code outputs (Figure 5).

Figure 6 shows cumulative full-arena usage. The adaptive routing allows ACAR-U to avoid expensive full ensembling on the majority of tasks while maintaining quality.




Figure 5: **Escalation distribution by benchmark.** σ -based routing adapts to task difficulty: SuperGPQA routes 42% to single-agent, while MathArena (93%) and LiveCodeBench (96%) escalate to full-arena due to answer disagreement.




Figure 6: **Cumulative full-arena usage across tasks.** The curve shows how full-arena calls accumulate as tasks are processed. ACAR-U avoids full ensembling on 54.2% of tasks, providing substantial compute savings.

4.5 Latency Analysis

Figure 7 compares latency across configurations. Single-model execution provides the lowest latency, while full ensembling incurs coordination overhead. ACAR-U achieves intermediate latency by routing easy tasks to faster execution paths.

4.6 Negative Result: Retrieval Hurts

Retrieval augmentation (ACAR-UJ) **decreased** accuracy by 3.4pp overall:




Figure 7: **Latency distribution by configuration.** Single-model execution provides lowest latency; Arena-3 shows highest due to coordination overhead. ACAR-U achieves intermediate latency by routing easy tasks to faster single-model execution.

Table 2: **ACAR-UJ vs ACAR-U.** Retrieval augmentation hurts performance across all benchmarks, with the largest degradation on MathArena (-5.0pp) and LiveCodeBench (-4.0pp).

Benchmark	ACAR-U	ACAR-UJ	Δ
MathArena	26.7%	21.7%	-5.0pp
Reasoning Gym	46.0%	44.0%	-2.0pp
LiveCodeBench	51.5%	47.5%	-4.0pp
SuperGPQA	60.5%	57.3%	-3.2pp
Overall	55.6%	52.4%	-3.4pp

Why retrieval hurt. The experience store (837 entries) was built from different distributions. Despite high hit rates (Figure 8), **median similarity was only 0.167**—most retrievals were weakly relevant, injecting noise rather than grounding (Figure 9). This failure is not attributable to the Jungler retrieval mechanism; the mechanism correctly retrieved the most similar experiences available. The failure lies in the experience store itself: without task-aligned content, even perfect retrieval cannot help.

Implication: Retrieval augmentation requires task-aligned stores with similarity thresholds >0.7 . High hit rate without semantic alignment introduces harmful noise.

5 Analysis

What worked. (1) σ -based routing is robust without learned components. (2) Selective escalation provides 70% cost reduction on easy tasks (Phase 20). (3) Infrastructure discipline enables reproducible comparison.

What failed. (1) Attribution did not generalize—proxy signals showed weak correlation with ground-truth LOO values. (2) Naive retrieval hurt performance; “more context” is not automatically beneficial. (3) Agreement-but-wrong is unrecoverable: when $\sigma=0$ but models are wrong, ACAR cannot recover.




Figure 8: **Retrieval hit rate by benchmark.** The experience store achieved high hit rates (84-100%) across benchmarks, yet performance still degraded—indicating that hit rate alone does not predict retrieval utility.




Figure 9: **Similarity distribution for retrieved experiences** (n=1,031 hits). Median similarity of 0.167 explains why retrieval hurt: low-quality context injection adds noise rather than helpful grounding.

5.1 Lessons Learned from Auditable Multi-Model Routing

Three findings from this work generalize beyond ACAR and should inform future systems:

Self-consistency routing works where it works, and fails where it must. The σ signal reliably identifies tasks where models disagree, enabling selective escalation that reduces cost without sacrificing quality. However, when models unanimously agree on an incorrect answer ($\sigma=0$), no downstream ensemble can recover the correct answer—the information is simply not present. This is not a limitation of our implementation; it is a fundamental property of self-consistency as a difficulty

signal. Any routing mechanism that relies on agreement will exhibit this failure mode. The 8pp gap between ACAR-U and Arena-3 quantifies this irreducible ceiling.

Retrieval augmentation is harmful without semantic alignment. Our experience store achieved high hit rates (84-100%) yet degraded accuracy by 3.4pp. The mechanism functioned correctly; the content was wrong. Median similarity of 0.167 means most injected context was barely related to the task. This finding should discourage the assumption that “more context is better”—retrieval systems require explicit similarity thresholds (>0.7 based on our results) and task-aligned stores. The failure was predictable in hindsight but required measurement to confirm.

Attribution without counterfactuals is largely illusory. We attempted to estimate model contribution using proxy signals (response similarity to final answer, entropy of model outputs, agreement patterns). These proxies showed weak correlation with ground-truth leave-one-out attribution values computed via expensive counterfactual runs. Practical multi-model attribution requires either (a) explicit counterfactual computation, which scales poorly, or (b) architectural changes that make contribution explicit by design. Post-hoc attribution from observational data does not work.

6 Limitations

- **Model set:** Three models from major providers; may not generalize to open-source models.
- **Benchmark bias:** SuperGPQA dominates (66% of tasks).
- **No learned routing:** σ -based routing is heuristic; learned routers may outperform on specific distributions. We consider this a feature for measurement validity, not a limitation—learned routers introduce distribution shift that confounds interpretation.
- **Code equivalence:** LiveCodeBench escalation is inflated by syntactically different but semantically equivalent outputs.

7 Conclusion

We presented ACAR, adaptive routing using self-consistency variance. The primary contribution is a *measurement methodology*: σ -based routing exceeds two-model baselines on 54% fewer full-ensemble calls, while naive retrieval *hurts* without task-aligned stores. We have documented three assumptions that do not hold in practice: (1) self-consistency can recover from unanimous incorrect agreement; (2) retrieval with high hit rate improves performance; (3) attribution can be estimated from proxy signals. By reporting both positive and negative results with 7,550+ auditable runs and fully regenerable figures, we provide falsifiable baselines for future research on principled multi-model orchestration.

AI Assistance Disclosure. Large language models were used as development and editorial aids in this work. Claude was used to assist in the development of the experimental test harness and in writing and debugging unit tests and evaluation code. ChatGPT was used for drafting support, structural editing, and clarity improvements in the manuscript text.

All experimental design decisions, benchmarks, hypotheses, implementations, executions, result validation, interpretations, and conclusions were conceived, executed, and verified by the author. The author takes full responsibility for the correctness and integrity of the work.

References

- [1] Qitian Jason Hu, Jacob Bieker, Xiuyu Li, Nan Jiang, Benjamin Keigwin, Gaurav Ranganath, Kurt Keutzer, and Shriyash Kaustubh Upadhyay. RouterBench: A benchmark for multi-LLM routing system. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12031*, 2024.
- [2] Lingjiao Chen, Matei Zaharia, and James Zou. FrugalGPT: How to use large language models while reducing cost and improving performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.05176*, 2023.
- [3] Isaac Ong, Amjad Almahairi, Vincent Wu, Wei-Lin Chiang, Tianhao Wu, Joseph E. Gonzalez, M Waleed Kadous, and Ion Stoica. RouteLLM: Learning to route LLMs with preference data. In *ICLR*, 2025.

- [4] Shunyu Yao, Jeffrey Zhao, Dian Yu, Nan Du, Izhak Shafran, Karthik Narasimhan, and Yuan Cao. ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [5] Weilin Cai, Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jing Tang, Sunghun Kim, and Jiayi Huang. A survey on mixture of experts in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.06204*, 2024.
- [6] Benedek Rozemberczki, Lauren Watson, Péter Bayer, Hao-Tsung Yang, Olivér Kiss, Sebastian Nilsson, and Rik Sarkar. The Shapley value in machine learning. In *IJCAI*, pages 5572–5579, 2022.
- [7] David H. Wolpert and Kagan Tumer. Optimal payoff functions for members of collectives. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 4(2-3):265–279, 2001.

A Reproducibility

All experimental artifacts are structured for independent verification:

- All runs logged with seed, prompt hash, environment fingerprint
- Complete runs .jsonl with per-task decision traces (7,550+ runs)
- Audit reports: zero parse errors across all runs
- 208 unit tests for infrastructure validation
- All figures in this paper can be regenerated from released artifacts using provided scripts

B Artifact Manifest

```
artifacts/phase22_acar_u/
  runs.jsonl          # 1,510 ACAR-U runs
  figures/            # All main result figures

artifacts/phase22_acar_uj/
  runs.jsonl          # 1,510 ACAR-UJ runs
  figures/            # Retrieval analysis figures

datasets/
  arena_3model_runs.jsonl  # Arena-3 baseline
  arena_2model_runs.jsonl  # Arena-2 baseline
  single_model_runs.jsonl  # Single-model baseline
```